

Annex 3

**Responses to
North Kingston Development Brief Consultation**



Contents

<u>Emailed and posted responses to the consultation</u>	2
<u>Statutory Consultees</u>	2
<u>Business and Landowner</u>	18
<u>Resident Associations and Local Residents</u>	26
<u>Online questionnaire responses to the consultation</u>	39
<u>Question 1a & 1b - Do you support the vision for North Kingston?</u>	39
<u>Question 2a & 2b - Do you support the overarching objectives for North Kingston?</u>	62
<u>Question 3a</u>	73
<u>Question 3b - Do you have any comments?</u>	74
<u>Question 4a & 4b - To what extent do you agree with the proposed 'Public Realm & Public Open Space Strategy and Principles'?</u>	93
<u>Question 5a & 5b - To what extent do you agree with the proposed 'Development Form and Massing Strategy and Principles'?</u>	104
<u>Question 6a & 6b - To what extent do you agree with the 'Design Frameworks and their Principles'?</u>	120
<u>Question 7 - Do you have any comments?</u>	134

Emailed and posted responses to the consultation

The Council received 23 detailed responses via email/post from varying interest groups and local residents which have been set out below. Comments (as received) made have been numbered so corresponding responses are easily identifiable. The last column identifies the changes the Council have made to the document as a result of the consultation responses.

Statutory Consultees

ID	Respondent	Date Received	Comment	RBK Response	Document Update
2	Natural England	14/07/16	1. Natural England does not consider that this Draft North Kingston Development Brief poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.	1. Comment noted.	No change.
10	Historic England	23/08/16	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft development brief. Historic England is the Government's advisor on all matters relating to the historic environment and a statutory consultee on a broad range of applications affecting the historic environment including the Environmental Impact Assessment of projects.</p> <p>Accordingly, we have reviewed this consultation in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its core principle that for development to be sustainable it must seek economic, social and environmental gains jointly and simultaneously (para 8). This includes the protection and enhancement of the historic environment, in order that it can be enjoyed for its contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.</p> <p>Historic England welcomes the production of this development brief, but consider that it needs additional work to ensure that it will lead to good design that avoids harm to the historic environment. To help resolve these issues we are pleased to offer the following comments regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the planning status of the area ● good design in this context ● listed building and buildings of townscape merit ● the proposed building heights - setting and views ● archaeology <p>Planning status 1. We note that p.5 makes reference to an 'emerging opportunity area'. However this document does not appear to be a consultation on this</p>	<p>1. The London Plan states that "The Mayor is working with boroughs and other partners to identify, assess and realise the potential for new Opportunity and Intensification Areas in terms of Policy 2.13 including in the London boroughs of Haringey (Haringey Heartlands), Sutton (Sutton Hospital), and Hounslow (Great West Corridor including the 'Golden Mile') and in the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames (Kingston town centre)."</p> <p>2. Individual applications that come forward must be compliant with adopted Core Strategy policies which provide an overarching policy context. These include DM10,</p>	<p>Change. Page 27, para 1. Text added: New development must understand and respond to the character of Richmond Road, <i>particularly further north where the scale, rhythm, use and detail reflect the historic importance and character of this route</i>'.</p> <p>Change. Page 29, 5th bullet point in delivery principles. Text added: 'The plot width of development (at ground floor) should support the rhythm of the High Street <i>and historic character of this route</i>'.</p> <p>Change. Page 19, 5th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles.</p>

			<p>designation, nor to our knowledge, has there been such a consultation to date. As such we do not consider that this materially changes the planning context, which is largely set out in the Kingston Town Centre Area Action Plan (K+20) that is referenced throughout. Nevertheless we appreciate the pressures for growth are increasing, as well as the need for major change on this site, and note that this part of the borough was identified over eight years ago for significant mixed-use growth.</p> <p>Good Design We are pleased to see that the development strategy principles seek to establish a distinct character for this site based on an understanding of the history of the area. This is in line with paragraph 58 of the NPPF which encourages development that “correspond(s) to local character and history, and reflect(s) the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation”. 2. However, despite the Council having previously assessed the architectural character of the borough, we note that no further details are provided within the text of what the Council consider to be the important history of the area, or which distinctive local characteristics you are looking to build upon. Some additional commentary, using the available evidence base would help resolve this.</p> <p>3. Ensuring the quality of new buildings on the site is important given the poor standard of many of the buildings that make up its immediate context. This is particularly noticeable with many of the late 20th and early 21st century developments to the south and west of the site which are of little or no architectural merit and relate poorly to the historic core of Kingston.</p> <p>4. Paragraph 7.4 of K+20 seeks to “Protect and enhance the historic routes into the centre and other areas of quality Victorian and 20th century development that retain their original fabric and character.” As such, we would recommend that you provide more detail on how the Council consider the plots on the Richmond Road could be best developed, retaining its sense of being an historic route into the town centre.</p> <p>5. While the buildings 13-43 Richmond Road vary in their quality and age, the pattern of development appears to date to the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century. The small scale and tight grain of this group of buildings is characteristic of this period, and contributes to the context of the ancient town centre. You may wish to provide architects and designers with some good examples in the brief that show the scale and density you are seeking to achieve while expressing the tight grain that is a distinctive characteristic of this part of the site. Schemes such as the Bear Lane development in Southwark may illustrate this well.</p>	<p>DM11, DM12 and CS8 (Character Design and Heritage) which all seek to ensure the quality of new development. In addition the Council will use other supportive and guidance material (including the Borough Character Appraisal) to support discussions and negotiations with developers and in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>3. Regarding design quality, individual development proposals will be assessed against adopted Core Strategy policies, including DM10, DM11 and CS8 which are concerned with design standards.</p> <p>4. Regarding historic routes, the AAP seeks to protect and enhance the historic routes into the centre of Kingston. Richmond Road is one such route, and in certain areas has a distinctive and high quality character (as identified by the Borough Character Study). The Design Framework for Richmond Road suggests how the qualities of this environment must be understood and responded to.</p> <p>5. Comment noted.</p>	<p>Text added: ‘<i>Outline applications for tall buildings will not be acceptable</i>’.</p> <p>Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles. Text deleted: ‘Proposed buildings must seek to safeguard the panorama and strategic views as noted in the K+20’. Replaced with: ‘<i>Proposed buildings must positively contribute to the panorama and key views as noted in the K+20 and Core Strategy, and provide accurate visual representations alongside a robust assessment of the impact of these views</i>’.</p> <p>Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles: 1) Text added: ‘<i>Outline applications for tall buildings will not be acceptable</i>’. 2) ‘*Including CABE/English Heritage joint guidance’ deleted and replaced with ‘<i>Including Historic England Advice Note 4 (2015)</i>’</p> <p>Change. Page 22, para1/2. Text added: ‘<i>Space will be safeguarded along Sopwith Way to ensure future two-way working can be</i></p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>6. We also note that you are looking to amend the street pattern. While Kingsgate Road currently offers a very poor environment, it replaced a through road called Chapel Place which was designed to link to Acre Road. If you wish to successfully integrate this area with other adjacent residential areas, you may wish to consider how traditional city blocks, which are often more flexible and better appreciated by residents and visitors, could be set out on the site. This appears to be one of the major shortfalls of the other modern developments in this part of Kingston, reinforcing the disjointed nature of the townscape caused by poorly designed highways schemes.</p> <p>Listed building and Buildings of Townscape Merit</p> <p>7. We welcome the Council clearly setting out in the development brief that proposals should incorporate the existing buildings of townscape merit at Kingston College and the Grade II listed Former Gala Bingo building. These are important heritage assets which should act as a guide to the development around them. As such we would question whether the impact on their setting has been tested adequately to justify the scale of buildings proposed beside them.</p> <p>This is particularly evident for the College site, where a building of up to 7 storeys is proposed to wrap around the former Board School, which could appear almost double the height of the BTM, and is likely to visually dominate it. This would run contrary to the sympathetic approach that the College recently adopted when developing part of the site, which better revealed the attractive Victorian facades. We would therefore suggest that you provide clearer guidance in the text and the principles about how new development might celebrate these local buildings of special quality.</p> <p>Building Heights</p> <p>8. K+20 highlights the view from Thatched House Lodge Richmond Park towards Kingston town centre and the Grade II listed Guildhall as being significant, and illustrates it crossing over part of the North Kingston Site. The development form and massing principles also helpfully highlight the need to respect views and the setting of listed buildings. It is therefore surprising that this important consideration appears to have been overlooked in the suggested heights plan (p.18) showing where the Council consider taller elements could be located. Unless there has been visual testing that is not referenced in the text, it is unclear why a building up to 12 storeys should be located in the position that you are proposing. If testing has not taken place yet we would strongly encourage you to do so before adopting this document. If, as it appears they might, the 9 and 12 storey elements proposed would obscure the view of the town centre or Guildhall from Richmond Park, we would recommend reconsidering where their mass might be located, or reducing the heights that</p>	<p>6. Comment noted.</p> <p>7. Individual development proposals will need to be tested against existing Core Strategy policies, including CS8, DM10, DM11, and DM12, as appropriate.</p> <p>8. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate. The Town Centre Area Action Plan identified a key view for protection from Thatched House Lodge towards Guildhall, this view is also identified in the Core Strategy as a key view. The Council has worked to assure itself that the heights indicated in 'Development form and massing' plan are appropriate.</p> <p>9. Microclimatic aspects will be dealt with with regard to specific development proposals, as and when they come forward.</p>	<p><i>accommodated, ensuring the Council can deliver its preferred transport option as identified by the Town Centre Movement Study.</i></p> <p><i>North Kingston falls within an identified area of Archaeological Significance. Robust exploratory investigations to determine if significant remains are present on site must be undertaken and should define their character, extent, quality and preservation'.</i></p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<p>will be permitted.</p> <p>9. Similarly, if the justification for having 9 and 12 storey buildings in the proposed locations is to ensure they have acceptable microclimatic impacts on new public spaces at the heart of the development, we would encourage you to test this thoroughly too before adopting this brief. This is because the current location of these taller elements to the south and west of the main public space seems likely to maximise the amount of shading to the proposed public space, rather than minimising it.</p> <p>10. On an editorial note the 2007 CABE/EH Guidance on Tall Buildings was superseded in 2015 by Historic England's Advice Note 4: Tall Buildings (https://historicengland.org.uk/imagesbooks/publications/tall-buildings-advice-note-4/).</p> <p>Archaeology</p> <p>11. As the site lies within an archaeological priority area associated with Roman burials discovered in the 19th century, we recommend that the brief should advise applicants that an archaeological predetermination evaluation should be undertaken to inform any planning applications and decisions. This may involve some exploratory investigations to determine if significant remains are present on site and if so to define their character, extent, quality and preservation. For further advice on the archaeological implications of developing this site, please contact Laura O'Gorman in the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service.</p>	<p>10. Comments noted.</p> <p>11. Comments noted.</p>	
11	Thames Water	23/08/16	<p>1. Water Supply and Sewerage/Wastewater Infrastructure</p> <p>A key sustainability objective for the preparation of Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. New development should be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012, states: "Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:.....the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater...."</p> <p>Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states: "Local planning authorities should work with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment.....take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas."</p> <p>The web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) published in</p>	<p>Comments 1-4 noted.</p> <p>Issues of design will be dealt with with regard to specific development proposals, as and when they come forward.</p> <p>A review of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be made as part of the production of the Council's new Local Plan which will take into account the need of infrastructure and services in the Borough.</p>	No change.

			<p>March 2014 includes a section on 'water supply, wastewater and water quality' and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that "Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development" (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306).</p> <p>It is important to consider the net increase in water supply and wastewater demand to serve the development and also any impact that developments may have off site, further down the network.</p> <p>It is unclear at this stage what the net increase in demand on Thames Water's infrastructure will be as a result of the Development Brief proposals. It is therefore essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and wastewater infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate reports and appraisals to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water and sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water company to agree what improvements are required and how they will be delivered prior to any occupation of the development.</p> <p>2. SuDS</p> <p>With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, watercourses or surface water sewer. It is important to reduce the quantity of surface water entering the wastewater system in order to maximise the capacity for foul sewage to reduce the risk of sewer flooding.</p> <p>Thames Water recognises the environmental and economic benefits of surface water source control, and encourages its appropriate application, where it is to the overall benefit of their customers. However, it should also be recognised that SuDS are not appropriate for use in all areas, for example areas with high groundwater levels or clay soils which do not allow free drainage. SuDS also require regular maintenance to ensure their effectiveness.</p> <p>Limiting the opportunity for surface water entering the foul and combined sewer networks is of critical importance to Thames Water. Thames Water have advocated an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system. By doing this, SuDS have the potential to play an important role in helping to ensure the sewerage network has the capacity to cater for population growth and the</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>effects of climate change.</p> <p>SUDS not only help to mitigate flooding, they can also help to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● improve water quality ● provide opportunities for water efficiency ● provide enhanced landscape and visual features ● support wildlife ● and provide amenity and recreational benefits. <p>3. Water Conservation</p> <p>Water conservation and climate change is a vitally important issue to the water industry. Not only is it expected to have an impact on the availability of raw water for treatment but also the demand from customers for potable (drinking) water.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has designated the Thames Water region to be “seriously water stressed” which reflects the extent to which available water resources are used. Future pressures on water resources will continue to increase and key factors are population growth and climate change. Therefore, Thames Water supports water conservation and the efficient use of water. Thames Water support the mains water consumption target of 110 litres per head per day as set out in the NPPG (Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 56-015-20150327) and consider that this should be covered in the Development Brief.</p> <p>4. Proposed Change to Development Brief</p> <p>Thames Water recommends that developers engage with them at the earliest opportunity to establish the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The developments demand for water supply and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met; ● The developments demand for Sewage/Wastewater Treatment and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met; and ● The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met <p>Thames Water consider that text along the lines of the following should be added to the Development Brief:</p> <p>“Water Supply, Wastewater & Sewerage Infrastructure</p> <p>Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply, waste water capacity and surface water drainage both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water and/or wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>Drainage on the site must maintain separation of foul and surface flows.</p> <p>Where there is an infrastructure capacity constraint the Council will require the developer to set out what appropriate improvements are required and how they will be delivered.</p> <p>Further information for Developers on water supply and sewerage infrastructure can be found on Thames Water's website at: http://www.thameswater.co.uk/home/11425.htm</p> <p>Or contact can be made with Thames Water Developer Services By post at: Thames Water Developer Services, Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading RG1 8DB; By telephone on: 0800 009 3921; Or by email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk"</p>		
14	Kingston University	05/09/2016	<p>Kingston University supports the Council's promotion of the delivery of additional education uses within the North Kingston area and the additional student accommodation. We would note that the University Vision which has been communicated with the Borough, is to provide where practicable, managed student accommodation on its own land as this reduced rental costs, and allows the University to promote communal living and improved interaction between students. This leads to a significantly improved student experience. Whilst it is noted that there are a number of student accommodation developments within Kingston Town Centre, these are often double the cost of the University's owned and managed accommodation. 1. We consider that the need for affordable student accommodation should be specifically identified within the development brief and supported in principle.</p>	<p>Comment 1 noted however the demand for student accommodation is outside the scope of this brief but will be a matter for consideration under the London Plan policies and will be further considered in the emerging Local Plan in due course</p>	<p>No change.</p>
15	Transport for London	02/09/2016	<p>TfL supports the overall transport objectives of the document to provide a balanced transport network, that helps to facilitate town centre development opportunities, whilst delivering improved walking, cycling and public transport facilities to encourage movement.</p> <p>1. Integrating transport, regeneration and development, and Crossrail 2 The area covered by the development brief is in close proximity to Kingston Station. As stated on page 5, Kingston Station has been identified as a beneficiary of the Crossrail programme, which will increase connectivity and provide substantial regenerative benefits to the area. 1. Although this is acknowledged in the 'Drivers for Change' section the rest of the document</p>	<p>1.The Council is keen to explore these ideas and is investigating such matters as part of separate studies in the Kingston area. This is involving discussion with key partners such as Transport for London, Network Rail, developers and other bodies.</p>	<p>Change. Page 55, para 3. Wording added: 'High public transport accessibility, <i>which will be further improved by Crossrail 2</i>, reduces the need for development to provide car parking, which will support more intensive development at higher density.'</p>

			<p>could recognise future growth opportunities. In particular whether a new station development zone could be created, which includes land within the masterplan or expands the masterplan to include the station and a new interchange with potential for over-station development.</p> <p>2. The 'Planning Context: Land Use' section (page 50) discusses the London Plan housing targets for the borough. This section should also be looking to maximise opportunities from future transport investment, strengthening the relationship between transport and development. TfL understands why it is important to refer to the current character and PTAL of the site, however considering the area's central urban location close to a major railway station.</p> <p>3. Although Crossrail is not yet committed, work on the project is ongoing and TfL is in discussions with the council. If permitted, this major project will significantly improve the borough's connections to central London. It is essential this policy acknowledges this and it is recognised in the documents aspirations. Therefore, a paragraph on Crossrail 2 should be included within the 'Planning Context: Movement & Access – Transport Infrastructure' section of the document.</p> <p>Buses</p> <p>4. TfL previously held several discussions and worked closely with Kingston on the proposals for road layouts, vehicle access and rerouting buses in the area. Whilst the highway changes were something TfL was previously willing to work with, considering the new developments, Go Cycle schemes, town centre aspirations and potential Crossrail 2, further work needs to be carried out to fully understand the impacts it would have on the bus network. In particular the possible delays it would cause to route 65, and traffic congestion on Wood Street.</p> <p>5. TfL is unable to support the proposals for the junction of Sopwith and Richmond Road which requires route 65 to be diverted off Seven Kings Road until further work has been undertaken and funding identified to mitigate any impact to the service. TfL would like further work to be undertaken on the options including retaining the existing links, and ensuring the college along with all new developments retain direct bus access.</p> <p>6. Any options that would result in additional cost to route 65 or any other services would need to be covered by developers. In this case the cost could be £1,100,000 and this will need to be covered over 5 years. Any infrastructure related costs for replacing the shelters and/or advertising contracts would also have to be taken into account.</p> <p>Cycling</p>	<p>2. Comments noted.</p> <p>3. Comments noted.</p> <p>4 & 5. The Council is working with key partners such as TfL on an ongoing basis to bring about improvements to bus services in the area. Detailed investigations are carried out in respect of all major new development and other significant proposals to assess the impact on the transport network and identify the need for improvements.</p> <p>6. The Council collects contributions from developers in relation to the upkeep and upgrade of key infrastructure.</p> <p>7. The Council's transport policies give a high priority to cycle movement. Dedicated and segregated cycling facilities are being implemented across the borough, in particular including measures funded through the Go Kingston Cycling initiative. In the case of the North Kingston area, to ensure good connections by cycle, key cycling facilities are being introduced adjacent to the major new development sites. The aim is to encourage the greatest possible use of this mode</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>In general, TfL supports the aspirations to improve cycling facilities throughout the brief with references to shared use, cycling in parks and pedestrian and cycling routes. 7. However, given the current progress in cycling provision in London, and especially Kingston as a mini Holland borough, TfL would expect there to be more aspiration for dedicated and segregated cycling infrastructure. Cycling should be recognised as mode in its own right rather than being combined with walking. It is understood that this approach may be hard to always follow due to space constraints in some areas and that this level of design will be refined in the future, but perhaps some reference could be made specific facilities. It is also suggested that TfL's London Cycle Design Standards are referenced to show some commitment towards delivering a high level of service for cycling.</p> <p>Parking 8. Car parking should be kept to a minimum and overall there is a need to rationalise car parking in the town centre.</p> <p>9. Cycle parking should also be provided in accordance with TfL minimum standards and the addition of more publicly accessible cycle parking should be sought.</p> <p>Developer Contributions TfL requests that the council secure financial contributions towards transport infrastructure and capacity through CIL and s106. In particular s106 will be sought for bus network improvements, as these cannot be secured through CIL. Contributions towards station improvements as well as cycling should also be sought. TfL will comment separately on the council's SPD on Planning Obligations.</p> <p>Conclusion Generally TfL supports the aspirations of the document to improve access and transport links throughout the brief area. However, more work needs to be undertaken on the options available, including both short and long term measures. The policy also needs to address potential growth and the possibility of Crossrail 2 more positively to help support the case.</p>	<p>by making new development fully accessible.</p> <p>Comment 8 noted.</p> <p>9. The Council uses TfL's London Cycle Design Standards in the progression of new cycle infrastructure. Additionally, further publicly available cycle parking is being provided across the borough, particularly in the main centres and other key attractors. All possible steps are being taken to ensure a safe environment for cycling in the vicinity of the new development. The Council utilises TfL's minimum cycle parking standards in guiding new development on cycle parking levels.</p>	
12	Highways England	24/08/2016	<p>Thank you for your letter dated July 7 2016 inviting Highways England to comment on the Consultation on the Draft North Kingston Development Brief and the Consultation of the Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such</p>	<p>Comments 1 and 2 noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

			<p>Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>1. Highways England will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case this relates to the M25 junctions 9-10 and the A3 between the M25 J10 and the A309. Although not within the Borough, it should be noted that these sections of the SRN are currently operating at a high level of stress and any additional traffic would add to the existing congestion.</p> <p>Consultation on the Draft North Kingston Development Brief</p> <p>2. We have reviewed the consultation and have no particular comments at the present time. We look forward to being consulted on the Development Brief as it develops.</p>		
18	Environmental Agency	05/09/2016	<p>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above. This is an opportunity for the wider North Kingston area to work with developers and other stakeholders to push the boundaries in best practice sustainable development and co-ordinated infrastructure planning and delivery. As noted in our previous representation, we support the overall aims of the development brief and in particular improving the pedestrian and cycling links to surrounding areas, including to the town centre and the riverside and providing a more public open space and landscaping for North Kingston.</p> <p>1. All the proposed site allocations offer opportunities to improve surface water drainage by incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems. Development at these sites should be informed by the latest environmental good practice and deliver high standards of sustainable design and construction. All sites over 1 hectare should demonstrate how surface water will be managed in a Flood Risk Assessment in discussion with your drainage engineer.</p> <p>2. We encourage early pre application discussions to ensure development proposals do not increase flood risk and the site design and layout is informed by the latest flood risk data and climate change allowances and supported with quality Flood Risk Assessments. Before consulting us on applications in flood zone 2 and 3 please check our updated Flood Risk Standing Advice to see if you can apply comments without the need to consult us directly. For local planning authorities: https://www.gov.uk/flood-risk-assessment-local-planning-authorities and for developers: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-for-planning-applications.</p>	<p>Comments 1-7 noted.</p> <p>The impact of specific development proposals on flood risk and surface water flooding will be addressed as and when proposals are brought forward, where pre-application discussions will be encouraged to maximise quality design for this area.</p> <p>Development proposals should be compliant with Core Strategy policies CS1, CS2, and DM3 which are concerned with sustainable design for climate change mitigation/adaptation.</p> <p>5. Considerations of flood risk within the borough are to be reviewed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan review as part of the production of a new Local</p>	No change.

		<p>We have attached more comments below for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss this further.</p> <p>3. Land contamination and remediation</p> <p>We are pleased to know that parts of the development brief area have already commenced with the construction of the former gas holder site and the subsequent removal of a use which has blighted the area. Given the scale of regeneration planned on brownfield land, we consider that the council would want to address the impacts of past and future land uses, ensuring that these do not affect the health of people and the environment. Land contamination and remediation is the subject of planning and other regulatory regimes. The key to the successful development of brownfield land is early and continual engagement between landowner, developers, the council and the regulators.</p> <p>Regulatory advice and guidance is available. The Environment Agency documents 'Model Procedures' and 'The Guiding Principles' are particularly useful as they highlight the main stages in the process, best practice and refer to further guidance.</p> <p>4. Sustainable Drainage System</p> <p>The regeneration of the wider North Kingston offers an excellent opportunity to improve local drainage and introduce and retrofit Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) for example through street renewal and introduction of green roofs and walls. For more information visit http://www.greenroofcode.co.uk/</p> <p>All Development should utilise sustainable drainage systems unless there are practical reasons for not doing so, and should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible in line with the following drainage hierarchy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. store rainwater for later use 2. use infiltration techniques, such as porous surfaces in non-clay areas 3. attenuate rainwater in ponds or open water features for gradual release 4. attenuate rainwater by storing in tanks or sealed water features for gradual release. <p>Much of the proposed areas of potential growth or improvements are situated on geological strata which may constrain sustainable drainage design due to shallow groundwater tables or clay geology. Therefore careful consideration needs to be given to proposed sewer infrastructure for new development areas. The required water resources infrastructure also needs careful planning as well</p>	<p>Plan.</p>	
--	--	---	--------------	--

			<p>as making new development water efficient to as high a standard as possible.</p> <p>SUDs design must take appropriate account of historic contamination burdens in this area and mitigate risks accordingly. Groundwater quality must be protected as new development and infrastructure is brought forward.</p> <p>We have produced joint guidance on how new development can improve the environment which is available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-a-guide-for-developers</p> <p>5. Surface Water Flooding</p> <p>The Council is the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) responsible for local flood risk such as surface runoff, groundwater and from ordinary watercourses. We strongly recommend the planning team to consult the council drainage engineer to provide comments in terms of local flood risk given the proximity of the site to Critical Drainage Area -CDA8 Acre Road Flood Alleviation Scheme. There may be scope for additional investigations into compensatory flood storage that could benefit the wider community.</p> <p>Proposals for surface water management associated with new developments must aim to not increase, and where practicable reduce the rate of runoff from the site as a result of the development in accordance with sustainable drainage principles, SFRA and any guidance provided by the LLFA. Developments should utilise SUDS and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible.</p> <p>6. Open Space</p> <p>We are pleased to know that a new park will be provided as part of new development. Landscaping of the park should consider creating biodiverse habitats that are low maintenance but attractive, delivering benefits for people and pollinators. This can also deliver a net gain for biodiversity through the use of Sustainable drainage systems including green roofs and ponds.</p> <p>For the latest environmental maps and data click below: http://environment.data.gov.uk/ds/partners/index.jsp#/partners/login</p> <p>We have produced joint guidance on how development can improve the environment: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-a-guide-for-developers</p> <p>7. Climate Change Allowances</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Recent updates to climate change allowances may have an impact upon the development sites in terms of flood risk. The National Planning Practice Guidance refers planners, developers and advisors to the Environment Agency guidance on considering climate change in Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs). This guidance was updated in February 2016 and is available on Gov.uk</p> <p>The guidance can be used for planning applications, local plans, neighbourhood plans and other projects. It provides climate change allowances for peak river flow, peak rainfall, sea level rise, wind speed and wave height. The guidance provides a range of allowances to assess fluvial flooding, rather than a single national allowance. It advises on what allowances to use for assessment based on vulnerability classification, flood zone and development lifetime.</p> <p>National planning policy and guidance states that site-specific flood risk assessment should be carried out by (or on behalf of) a developer to assess the flood risk to and from a development site. The assessment should demonstrate to the decision-maker how flood risk will be managed now and over the development's lifetime, taking climate change into account, and with regard to the vulnerability of its users.</p> <p><i>River flows</i></p> <p>The guidance on Gov.uk provides central, higher central and upper end allowances for peak river flow over three different timeframes up to the year 2115. Use the Environment Agency River Basin District maps to determine the applicable river basin. The range of allowances is based on the following percentiles:</p> <p>Central –50th percentile</p> <p>Higher central –70th percentile</p> <p>Upper end –90th percentile.</p> <p>See Appendix 1 for an explanation of the percentiles.</p> <p><i>Peak rainfall</i></p> <p>The guidance on Gov.uk shows anticipated changes in extreme rainfall intensity in small catchments (<5 sq. km) and urban catchments. Central and upper end estimates are provided. The new allowances and supporting advice in 'Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances' are relevant when preparing strategic flood risk assessments for development plan documents</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>and flood risk assessments for planning applications falling within the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).</p> <p>To find out when and how to use climate change allowances in flood risk assessments and strategic flood risk assessments please visit: Flood risk assessment: Climate change allowances</p>		
22	London Borough of Richmond upon Thames	09/09/16	<p>Introduction</p> <p>The Development Brief covers an area of approximately 3ha. The site is located in a highly accessible area, 400m from the River Thames, 300m north of the main shopping core of Kingston Town Centre and just 60m from Kingston train station to the south, which has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 6a ('excellent'). It is bound by Richmond Road, Seven Kings Way, Sury Basin and Sopwith Way. Kingsgate Road bisects the site. The surrounding road network has created an 'island' effect which this Development Brief seeks to resolve.</p> <p>The site is part of a larger active development area north of the railway line, referred to as the North Kingston Character Area in the K+20, which has been the subject of major regeneration over the last 15 years, with the redevelopment of the former Power Station site, station yard and factory sites. This has resulted in the delivery of over 1,000 new residential units, a 700-space multi-storey car park, a 4,650m² supermarket, and a 3,100m² health and fitness centre, with a 142-bed hotel currently under construction on the former Power Station site.</p> <p>The Development Brief sets out a series of six objectives for the redevelopment of the site. Proposals for the whole or partial redevelopment of the site must demonstrate they are consistent with the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. deliver mixed tenure (including affordable) new homes in a central location 2. reinforce the identity of Richmond Road as a local high street, with public open space, diverse community facilities and retail improvements 3. provide modern and flexible employment spaces 4. deliver new high quality public realm 5. support existing surrounding education use 6. deliver environmental improvements, addressing issues of noise and air quality <p>Richmond Council supports these objectives.</p>	<p>1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate. The Town Centre Area Action Plan identified a key view for protection from Thatched House Lodge towards Guildhall, this view is also identified in the Core Strategy as a key view. The Council has worked to assure itself that the heights indicated in 'Development form and massing' plan are appropriate. However, understandably the impact of tall buildings can be understood as a cross-boundary issues and RBK would be more than happy to continue working with LBRuT throughout the production of both our Local Plans to address this issue.</p>	<p>Change. Page 19, 5th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles. Text added: '<i>Outline applications for tall buildings will not be acceptable</i>'.</p> <p>Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles. Text deleted: 'Proposed buildings must seek to safeguard the panorama and strategic views as noted in the K+20'. Replaced with: '<i>Proposed buildings must positively contribute to the panorama and key views as noted in the K+20 and Core Strategy, and provide accurate visual representations alongside a robust assessment of the impact of these views</i>'.</p> <p>Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles: 1) Text added: '<i>Outline applications for tall buildings will not be acceptable</i>'.</p>

			<p>See pages 18-19</p> <p>The 'Development Form and Massing' plan has been amended since the last consultation to show a maximum height of 12 stories (G+11)*. The strategy and principles provide guidance regarding building heights and the impact on the local area. Some of the key considerations regarding this strategy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● frontages along Richmond Road to be enhanced ● building form to derive from comprehensive masterplan approach ● heights, form and massing to not negatively impact public realm use ● height and form to respect key strategic and local views ● buildings to be of high quality ● buildings should help navigation <p>*height and location will be tested through the consultation process and through the application of a 3D model.</p> <p>Richmond Council generally supports these considerations. However,</p> <p>1. We have previously discussed that tall buildings in Kingston borough, especially Kingston Town Centre and alongside the riverside, are likely to be of concern for LBRuT and that this is a cross-boundary issue. It was previously noted that RBK is producing a Riverside and Public Realm SPD, which will consider tall buildings and identify key views that should be protected, e.g. Kingston Bridge to Richmond Hill. We said we would like to be involved / consulted on this work and we would be grateful for an update in this regard.</p> <p>2. It may be of interest to note that there is a revised policy on building heights in our draft Local Plan. In our past discussions we understood that Kingston and Tolworth are key areas of growth and tall buildings are welcomed in these areas. RBK is producing evidence (possibly a SPD) on 'views and heritage' but do not anticipate specifying heights.</p> <p>3. In addition, the SPD should ask for full planning applications to be required for any building that is considered to be a tall building.</p> <p>Regarding the Bullet points on P.19, Development Form and Massing Principles</p> <p>4. Building heights must respond to the surrounding area and must not negatively impact on neighbouring properties or spaces. This is especially the case with regard to locally and statutory listed buildings. LBRuT Comment: we would wish to amend the bullet point to ensure that tall buildings respect the local context, and that they should make a positive contribution to the local</p>	<p>The Royal Borough of Kingston look forward to working with The London Borough of Richmond in their approach to tall buildings and the protection of strategic views which we agree can be considered as a cross-boundary issue.</p> <p>The development of the Riverside Public Realm SPD is independent of the North Kingston Development Brief, and will be subject to separate consultation and engagement with stakeholders.</p> <p>2 The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames' revised policy on building heights in their draft Local plan is noted.</p> <p>3 The requirement for proposals for any tall building to be considered as full application, rather than in outline is acknowledged as best practice, and will be reiterated in the brief in the supporting text.</p> <p>Comment 4-8 noted regarding the wording of the bullet points on page 19.</p>	<p>2) *Including CABE/English Heritage joint guidance' deleted and replaced with '<i>Including Historic England Advice Note 4 (2015)</i>'</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

			<p>character and skyline, where possible enhancing the character of an area. In relation to listed buildings, they need to preserve and enhance designated heritage assets.</p> <p>5. The location and design of any taller buildings, 'landmarks' or 'gateways' must be explained and fully justified by a thorough townscape appraisal. LBRuT Comment: There is also an opportunity to create 'landmarks' without recourse to tall buildings.</p> <p>6. Any tall buildings must respond to their role and must be of high architectural quality to justify their increased prominence. Any prominent building must be of exceptional design quality, in line with national best practice*. LBRuT Comment: It is unclear what "respond to their role" would mean.</p> <p>7. Building heights must respect key strategic and local views. Proposed buildings must seek to safeguard the panorama and strategic views as noted in the K+20. LBRuT Comment: It would also be worth mentioning, at least in brackets, what the key strategic views are.</p> <p>8. All new development must celebrate existing local buildings of special quality, including Kingston College's main building and the listed Gala Bingo building, including in views along Richmond Road. * Including CABE/English Heritage joint guidance. LBRuT Comment: There is an updated advice note from HE on Taller Buildings, which supersedes the 2011 advice https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/setting-and-views/</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Business and Landowners

ID	Respondent	Date Received	Comment	RBK Response	Amendment
4	Russell-Cooke LLP	05/08/16	<p>1. Access Principles</p> <p>Richmond Road is a key focus throughout the Brief with the aim of creating a new mixed use model of land uses and a pedestrian corridor. 1. The Brief supports extensive movement and access principles, but fails to address the specifications on delivery.</p> <p>2. The Brief is very prescriptive in relation to Richmond Road with the provision of a minimum width of 17m to allow use by bikes, vehicles and pedestrians. Whilst the principle of a multi-surface is supported and understood the 17m figure seems somewhat arbitrary in terms of the existing layout of Richmond Road. Richmond Road to the south of Cowleaze Road currently enables a road width of 17m however North of Cowleaze Road the figures are closer to 14m within the existing built form.</p> <p>Within other area of the borough for example Portsmouth Road (a section of the A307) major cycle improvements works are being undertaken by reallocating carriageway space from vehicles to cycles which takes up a maximum space of 13m to 14m whilst still including all three forms of transport (cars, bikes and people).</p> <p>Therefore all the same principles of a multi-surface are being achieved elsewhere at a more realistic figure. However in the case of the Brief no supporting assessments are referenced within the Brief to describe how this figure was reached, how this width will work in reality or whether this figure is required. As the NPPF paragraph 154 states plans should be realistic.</p> <p>The Brief even appears to slightly contradict this 17m provision when considered in light of the Safeguarding zones (page 22). The safeguarding plan sets out an area safeguarded for highway which matches the current built form and does not suggest that the existing road layout will be extended beyond the current building edge.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that further land use modelling is required to accurately assess the road capacity of Richmond Road and determine the exact widths for the whole section of the road rather than one overarching figure. Appropriate modelling then needs to be carried out to demonstrate that pedestrian and cycle improvements can be combined within the physical constraints that exist within the streetscape of Richmond Road and for this to be made clear within the Brief. As currently the reference to new development considering widening of the footpaths is not overly clear as to whether land is to be sacrificed for this use.</p> <p>It must also be considered in relation to Richmond Road that the Brief references this road as not only providing access but also space with shopping and ground floor uses to occupy elements of the street. By increasing the width of the road into useable space will conflict with</p>	<p>1. The means for delivering change to Richmond Road is outlined on page 27 of the Design Framework. The means for dealing with and controlling deliveries to shops and other uses will be undertaken at the detailed level when planning applications are made.</p> <p>2. With regard to access principles on Richmond Road, the plans for the area include the widening of Richmond Road to accommodate two way traffic at its southern end and the left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road. The road will also be upgraded to accommodate the requirements of both pedestrians and cyclists in a safe manner, and ensure access to shops and other ground floor uses. The revised arrangements have been modelled to ensure their adequate operation.</p> <p>2. In regard to land ownership individual applications, the Council are looking at the site in a</p>	No change.

		<p>the size of the units that can locate here which in turn is contrary to the proposed objective of encouraging active uses on ground floor level. On the basis of other schemes within the area it would appear that the Brief should seek to minimise the proposed width to around 13m which is more achievable north of Cowleaze Road to ensure there is not a conflict with the units that can locate here and deter development occurring. Alternatively the figure of 17m should be removed and the safeguarding plan utilised instead in its current form.</p> <p>2. Land Ownership Concerns and Individual Applications</p> <p>The Brief lacks flexibility for individual applications to come forward. The Delivery Principles refers to: “the aim of these principles is to bring together the fragmented land ownership pattern into one sustainable development plan”</p> <p>The Brief aims to achieve this aim through a one ownership approach by utilising options agreements or joint venture partnerships. Whilst a one landownership approach would achieve the aim of ‘one development’ how this would work in reality needs to be considered in more detail within the Brief.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that all parties with existing land ownership would all agree to coordinate together and to submit joint applications especially given the different priorities that landowners will have. Therefore if the Brief intends to reduce land ownership to just one or two developers then it is highly probable that compulsory purchase powers will be required.</p> <p>If the Council needed to use compulsory purchase powers consideration needs to be given to the timeframe in which this can be achieved. Firstly, a developer would need to be found, who perceives a development opportunity in the scheme but also who is willing to adhere to the prescriptive nature of the Brief. If the Council are then successful in achieving this, a Compulsory Purchase Order will need to be made which will be subject to consultation and most likely will have to go through a public inquiry. This whole process could take over two years to achieve which will lead to delays in any actual development being carried out.</p> <p>If a Compulsory Purchase Order was successful then the Council needs to give consideration to compensation. For each property/parcel of land to be acquired the test will be whether there is an overriding public interest case for compulsory acquisition of each parcel. If this threshold is reached then compensation will be payable to the landowners if land is taken under any compulsory purchase powers, therefore this will add to the expense of the redevelopment of the Site. As the NPPF states at paragraph 173 that plans must ensure viability and deliverability, therefore this cost needs to be considered.</p> <p>Whereas if the Council were willing to allow individual applications to come forward on the basis of their existing land ownership provided they adhered to the Brief design principles and objectives no harm will be caused to the Brief. Individual applications would provide an impetus to development and aid the speed at which regeneration can be achieved. Individual development applications would not need to consider property matters and rather only the</p>	<p>comprehensive manner in order to achieve the best outcome for the site.</p> <p>Comments 3-5 noted.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>planning process would need to be adhered to.</p> <p>Individual proposals could even further the Brief by providing 'exemplary architecture and design' (page 6 of the Brief) due a range of ideas being used. By pursuing such an approach would further support the Kingston Core Strategy Policy CS8 which seeks to promote new development with 'recognised distinct local feature and character'. Individual applications could even in turn aid the regeneration offering especially along Richmond Road where individual units could add flare and uniqueness to the Site. Especially as Richmond Road is described as a unified environment despite "diverse building forms and heights" (page 26 of the Brief).</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that individual applications should be encouraged and explicitly referred to within the Brief. Whilst it is appreciated many people may not want to redevelopment their land in which case the alternative powers should be used. However the Brief should not discourage people from making planning applications if they want to provided they are in accordance with the design principles of the Brief.</p> <p>3. NPPF The considerations of core planning principles contained within the NPPF must be considered in light of all above recommendations and amends. The NPPF includes the 12 core planning principles in order to aid plan making and decision making. Two of the most pertinent principles are empowering local people to shape their surroundings and ensuring creativity. This Brief can be more aligned to the NPPF through a less rigid approach and permitting individual applications regardless of land ownership.</p> <p>4. Conclusion The Brief should seek to encourage development within its overall objective rather than deter development which accords with the majority of proposals but is an individual application and not within the prescribed land ownership zones. Small or piecemeal sites will not contravene the comprehensive approach to regeneration for the North Kingston Area provided they abide with the overall ethos of the Brief; after all development has begun on standalone schemes already.</p> <p>By promoting individuality in the Brief will ensure appropriate development is achieved. Once the Brief is adopted it will become a material consideration so the Council retain the right to refuse planning permissions if they do not accord with the overall aims of the Brief.</p> <p>5. Amendments to the Brief The principle of redevelopment of the Site is supported, however amends need to be made to the Brief to ensure the following points are adequately addressed to sure that the Brief can successfully be made a reality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further research and assessments are to be carried out in relation to Richmond Road to assess how multi surfaces for pedestrians, cars and cycles within the 		
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>parameters of the existing layout and relevant safeguard areas can be achieved without land being lost from the existing streetscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater emphasis is to be placed on individual applications provided they are in accordance with the ethos of the Brief. Any applications would be the subject of the planning process therefore appropriate conditions can be placed on any permission to ensure coherence whilst bringing originality and flare which will be particularly important for those units within the Richmond Road frontages. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A less rigid approach is to be taken in relation to land ownership if proposals are being actively put forward by existing landowners. ○ Greater consideration should be given to existing applications before the final Brief is published provided the development proposals are within the ethos of the Brief. 		
13	John Lewis	01/09/2016	<p>On behalf of John Lewis, a key stakeholder in Kingston Town Centre, we submit representations to the 'North Kingston Development Brief' Document.</p> <p>In summary, we are supportive of the growth agenda set by the Borough and GLA for Kingston and the Town Centre, and have made separate representations to the 'Direction of Travel' Document in this regard. We support the pro-active approach taken in the Development Brief to supporting investment and improving infrastructure, access and legibility in the Town Centre. 1. With an emerging Local Plan and Opportunity Area Planning Framework, the reliance on the K+20 Area Action Plan will not necessarily continue to form part of the Development Plan, and therefore, we would wish to see the principles for the site to be set out explicitly. Specifically, we would expect this document to be compliant with the emerging Local Plan and Opportunity Area Planning Framework, and the timing of its preparation and adoption will therefore be critical. 2. We also consider that in order to form a robust material consideration, in accordance with the emerging Development Plan, that maximum quanta of development should be used, to ensure that there is no unacceptable impact on other sites within the Town Centre, and that the infrastructure planning (including road network and public transport strategy) is sufficient to deliver this.</p> <p>3. Continuing on from this, in order to support the Retail Core of the Town Centre, we would expect guidance on the scale, nature and type of retail to be provided within the Development Brief Area, to ensure that there is no trade diversion or conflict, which could seek to fragment the Town Centre offer and detract from the Placemaking opportunity which exists through the emerging Opportunity Area Planning Framework.</p> <p>4. The wider transport and movement strategy should be considered throughout the emergence of this Development Brief. Early engagement with key stakeholders and landowners is welcomed, to develop a strategy which is comprehensively considered and ties in the key infrastructure opportunities. We would welcome the opportunity to remain involved in continued dialogue with the Borough to ensure that our priorities and aspirations are able to</p>	<p>1. The brief is prepared in line with the adopted Development Plan. This constitutes the Core Strategy and K+20. Neither the emerging Local Plan of the Opportunity Area Planning Framework have been adopted or yet reached sufficient certainty to provide a statutory basis for the purposes of writing this brief.</p> <p>2-3. The purpose of this brief is to set out the general principles that the Council would wish to see delivered on the site rather than to set out the precise form and scale of development on the site. The Council will be able to consider the impacts on other uses and infrastructure through any planning application.</p> <p>4. Movement and access</p>	No change.

			<p>be considered.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact us to discuss any of the issues raised in our representations, and we look forward to engaging throughout this process.</p>	<p>is an identified issue in this brief and principles relating to this topic have been identified. Given the scope of this DB, it is not considered that this document should seek to influence wider transport and movement issues in the town centre. John Lewis will be able to comment on other planning documents and thus contribute to the development of planning policy in the borough</p>	
19	Berkley Homes	05/09/2016	<p>1. BHWL supports the preparation of the North Kingston Development Brief as framework for helping to deliver the Council's vision for transformational change in this part of Kingston Town Centre. BHWL is currently building out the Gas Works redevelopment that will form a core part of the transformational change. This development includes the delivery of a linear park between Sury Basin and Kingsgate Road that will form the northern part of the North South Linear Park proposed in the Development Brief. BHWL is currently discussing the detailed design and delivery with the Council and adjacent landowners.</p> <p>2. BHWL supports the vision of a high quality public realm and considers this an essential part of linking the development sites together and creating a new place. BHWL supports the closure of Kingsgate Road and the proposed delivery of the southern part of the North South Linear Park, which will link the new public realm to the station and other parts of the town centre. The design and quality of the northern part of the linear park that BHWL is delivering should set the standard and character for the areas to be delivered by other parties.</p> <p>3. The Development Brief should specifically encourage the early delivery of the public realm as part of any development, and the Council should use its planning powers to control this (for example, through a 'prior to occupation' obligation in a s106 agreement).</p>	<p>Support and comments 1-3 noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
20	Kingston Gate Properties Limited.	Not stated	<p>Purpose of the Document</p> <p>1. We recommend that the status and role of the document is made much clearer, as follows.</p> <p><i>3rd paragraph, page 2: The Development Brief will not form part of the formal development plan, which is the starting point for the determination of planning applications. However, once adopted, this Brief will be a material consideration in this process. The Brief will provide an important framework to coordinate and guide development and infrastructure investment within North Kingston.</i></p>	<p>Comments 1-2 noted.</p> <p>3-9. In regard to land use, the North Kingston Development Brief will fall in line with and be fully compliant with K+20, the Town Centre Area Action</p>	<p>Change. Page 50, para 4. Text removed: 'The site has been identified as Urban' in character as described in the Sustainable</p>

		<p>2. We consider it important that the Development Brief references the recently published Direction of Travel document and the Council's growth agenda, as follows.</p> <p><i>4th bullet under 5th para (p.2): Changing planning context – Kingston has been identified as an emerging Opportunity Area, within which the London Plan seeks to optimise residential and non-residential densities.</i></p> <p><i>Additional bullet point under fifth para (p.2): The Council has recently published a Direction of Travel document in partnership with the Mayor of London, which provides supplementary planning advice to support the development and intensification of areas within the borough, including Kingston Town Centre, to provide new homes, jobs and investment.</i></p> <p>Land Use</p> <p>3. We are concerned that the Land Use Plan on p14 too rigidly repeats the allocations in the Area Action Plan, with the Kingsgate Business Centre site shown as 'office, commercial and student accommodation'. We are also concerned that the Land Use Principles state 'land uses to be fully compliant with K+20'.</p> <p>4. The allocation in the K+20 AAP for Kingsgate Business Centre and Printworks is either for the retention of the existing uses, or redevelopment for employment uses and student accommodation. However, the purpose of this Brief is to encourage the delivery of a residential-led development on a wider site incorporating Kingsgate Business Centre, Printworks, Canbury car park and the Richmond Road frontage. In this respect, the Council's aspirations have moved on since the K+20 and these need to be reflected in the Brief.</p> <p>5. With this in mind, we are concerned that the Brief states that land uses should be 'fully compliant with K+20' and we recommend that this reference is deleted as this only repeats the primacy of development plan documents in section 38(6) of the Act. This reference suggests that any variance from the specified uses would be considered in conflict with the Brief. The effect of these references is that the residential-led scheme that the Council is seeking to encourage could be interpreted as not being fully compliant with this part of the Brief.</p> <p>6. We propose that residential use is added to the list of permissible uses for the orange area on the Land Use Plan.</p> <p>7. Alternatively, the shading for the Kingsgate Business Centre and Printworks on the Land Use Plan could be amended to show that, for this site, in addition to the land uses set out in P19c in the Area Action Plan, the land uses proposed for the adjacent P20 would also be considered acceptable.</p> <p>8. We understand that the Council is keen to avoid any direct conflict between the adopted</p>	<p>Plan, including the identified land uses. The Council does not see any conflict with this and delivering a new residential and learning mixed use quarter.</p> <p>9-16. In regard to heights, the heights indicated on the Heights Plan have been considered with regard to the different impacts that the height of buildings have. This is very much more than solely visual impact. Increased height has impact on sunlight, daylight, microclimate, relationship to neighbouring properties, quality of proposed internal and external living environment and character. The views shared only test the block massing of development in local views at fixed points.</p> <p>The Council will ensure that each of these aspects are appropriate in considering the most appropriate height. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure this is achieved.</p> <p>Comment 17-18 noted.</p>	<p>Residential Quality matrix in the London Plan'. Replaced with 'The site has been identified as 'Central' in character as described in the Sustainable Residential Quality matrix in the London Plan</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>policy in the AAP and the guidance with this Development Brief. However, our suggested amendments would not remove any uses that are currently allocated in the AAP. Instead, they would simply indicate that the Council may take a more flexible approach to land uses in light of the aspirations in the Brief for a comprehensive development across the development parcel shown on page 21.</p> <p>Key to Land Use Plan (p.14): Office, Commercial, Student Accommodation and Residential</p> <p>Land Use Principles, first bullet (p.15): Land uses to be fully compliant with K+20</p> <p>Heights</p> <p>9. Our client is happy to support a maximum height of 12 storeys (although previously proposed 18 storeys), provided that heights are not pushed down too much around the edges of the site.</p> <p>10. We consider there to be strong urban design grounds for a moderate increase in height from that shown on the current heights plan, particularly in the western part of the site.</p> <p>11. We suggest that the western half of the site can accommodate greater heights than the four to seven storeys indicated on the Heights Plan. This part of the site is further removed from the lower density residential streets to the east, further away from the line of the protected view of the Guildhall, and further away from the listed Gala Bingo building.</p> <p>12. The relationship between the Berkeley Gas Works scheme (seven to nine storeys) and the student scheme (seven to nine storeys) has been endorsed by both the Appeal Inspector and the Council.</p> <p>13. We consider that, by virtue of a greater separation distance between the buildings as now proposed, a small increase in height would not have any adverse impact on views or the experience of moving through this route. An increase in height to around 9 storeys would not affect the function or quality of the east-west route through the site. The images below illustrate the subtle difference between the heights proposed in the current Heights Plan, and those identified on our Amended Heights Plan.</p> <p>14. The south-west corner of the development will function as an important entrance to the development and will act as a wayfinder to draw people along the new route through the site and into the new public spaces within it. This corner was identified as a local landmark in the previous iteration of the Development Brief.</p> <p>15. There will be a key view of the building revealed as you pass under the railway bridge and turn into Sopwith Way. The existing and permitted context around the south-west corner (Royal Quarter, building south of Sopwith Way, Gas Works scheme, and student scheme) ranges from seven to nine storeys. In this context, we consider that there is potential to</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>increase the upper end of the suggested height range from seven storeys to nine storeys.</p> <p>16. As shown in the adjacent image, we consider that a height of 11 storeys would sit comfortably in this view.</p> <p>Delivery</p> <p>17. The text on Development Parcels on page 21 states that development within the identified parcels can be brought forward in different or complementary phases.</p> <p>The Development Parcels Plan identifies that the Richmond Road frontage could be distinct phase from the rest of the development parcel. Given the current ownership status, the Printworks site should also be identified as a potentially distinct phase. This is shown on the plan below.</p> <p>Density</p> <p>It is stated on p50 of the Brief that the site has been identified as 'Urban' in character as described in the Sustainable Residential Quality matrix in the London Plan.</p> <p>18. We disagree and consider this to be a 'Central' location, by virtue of its location within a Metropolitan centre, containing a mix of different uses and buildings of (an in excess of) the four to six storeys identified in the definition of Central.</p> <p>We note that the Council has classified this location as 'Central' in the committee reports for other major schemes in Kingston town centre, notably, the Post Office scheme, Eden Walk, and the Gas Works which is adjacent to this site.</p> <p><i>Housing, 3rd para (p.50): The site has been identified as 'Central' in character as described in the Sustainable Residential Quality matrix in the London Plan. New development will need to respond to the height, scale and massing principles set out in the Design Framework, with appropriate densities that correlate to the site's location and PTAL rating, and to the guidance in the Mayor of London's supplementary planning guidance on Housing.</i></p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Resident Associations and Local Residents

ID	Respondent	Date Received	Comment	RBK Response	Amendment
17	North Kingston Forum	04/09/2016	<p>Re-routing northbound traffic along a widened Seven Kings Way (SKW) - originally planned as a link road between Kingsgate Rd and Sury Basin.</p> <p>1. How would Northbound traffic travelling from Wood Street be encouraged to move along Sopwith Way towards the Richmond Road at the new proposed left turn junction? Further traffic modeling of options is necessary, including for the phased introduction of traffic management measures following the closure of Kingsgate Road, is necessary to ensure balanced movement along both Seven Kings Way and Sopwith Way northbound towards the Richmond Road.</p> <p>2. Pedestrians and cyclists must be able to move safely across Seven Kings Way, and at the junction of Seven Kings Way with Sury Basin. Traffic management measures will be required to ensure safe passage both across Seven Kings Way and at the Sury Basin junction when entering the Supermarket site from Seven Kings Way.</p> <p>3. A direct route for resident's cars to access the Queenshurst and Royal Quarter developments via Sury Basin when approaching from the North would make a lot of sense. Currently, cars can only access Seven Kings Way from the South via the Kingston one-way system, adding to the pollution currently experienced in the town centre.</p> <p>The overall density proposed and particularly a 12 storey building:</p> <p>4. We understand that the expected density of the whole site as indicated by the GLA density Matrix for a Central location with a PTAL level of 6, would be 215-405 dwellings per Ha. As the whole site is approximately 3 Ha, the area would therefore be expected to support between 645-1215 dwellings. How will sufficient social infrastructure and services be financed? Developer CIL contributions alone will not be able to meet the level of financial support needed for such densification and rapid change.</p> <p>5. Is a 12 storey building necessary? And how was this height determined? It is very much appreciated that the NKDB states that the height should be a 'maximum' of 12 storeys, but residents are certainly</p>	<p>1. The main option for northbound traffic from Wood Street would be to travel along Seven Kings Way before taking a right onto Sury Basin and left onto Richmond Road. It is the long-term ambition of the Council to implement a left turn on from Sopwith Way onto Richmond Road, in which case this would provide an alternative route for northbound traffic. Page 22 of the brief identifies the Council's intention to safeguard land for this purpose.</p> <p>A traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>2. The remodelling and upgrading of the road network in the North Kingston Development Brief include new/improved crossings for cyclists and pedestrians at key locations to allow the safe passage of these road users.</p>	No change.

		<p>worried that this will set an even greater precedent for future increases in height. Other options could be considered that will still allow a similar number of units. Without the certainty of a specific design to assess, or indeed a comprehensive urban design strategy, we do not believe that a building of such height can be justified, and would therefore request the council reduce the proposed height to 9 storeys. The Council's development brief should make it absolutely clear that "NO BUILDINGS OVER 9 STOREYS WILL BE PERMITTED", and in any event only a building of clear architectural merit will be considered.</p> <p>6. No doubt Berkeley Homes and CNM estates will be made aware that a 12 storey tower is being considered. This might well affect the sale of their penthouse dwellings by giving concern for privacy and key views.</p> <p>The mixture of pedestrian and cycle routes</p> <p>7. On routes shared by pedestrian and cyclists, measures, including signage, clearly giving priority to pedestrians are essential.</p> <p>Reinstating and creating new affordable business opportunities needed to bolster the local economy.</p> <p>An objective of the NKDB is to, Provide modern and flexible employment space that benefits from the close proximity to public transport and the highly accessible highway network. There are SMEs in North Kingston desperate to expand in Kingston who cannot find affordable units for this purpose. It seems only logical for the council to encourage and support local SMEs, with the effect of reducing the requirement for road and rail transportation.</p> <p>8. It is essential that new employment space be created for this need, and be available at an affordable rate. A scheme should be investigated whereby reduced business rates could be offered for the first year to help and encourage entrepreneurship, if not already considered.</p> <p>9. It is also essential that the Council encourages developers to support independent traders rather than relying solely on chain stores. Independents are a key component of our high streets, and bring diversity and vibrancy along with their direct connection to local economies.</p> <p>Sainburys supermarket site and other key local services</p>	<p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. The infrastructure needs of the Borough are significantly greater than the funding likely to be realised through CIL or planning obligations or a combination of both. The Council will seek to prioritise CIL use as a match or gap funding source, linked to other infrastructure funding. As part of the production of the Council's new Local Plan for the Borough, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be reviewed. It is important to note that growth in the Borough is set to continue and the production of a new Local Plan and supporting evidence studies is intended to strengthen the Council's position to maximise opportunities for planned growth, including the provision of adequate infrastructure. Without this, the predicted growth will result in piecemeal development that is unable to secure maximum public benefits.</p> <p>5. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p> <p>Comment 6 noted.</p> <p>7. In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes. Transport for London's new Cycling Design Standards (Dec 2014) advises that cyclists and</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>10. We appreciate the supermarket/gym site is just outside the NKDB area, however, we feel that this amenity and others such as the petrol service station on the Richmond Road are so important to our local community, that we wanted to remind the council of this fact, and that we should try to protect them as far as is possible.</p> <p>Air Quality</p> <p>An objective of the NKDB is to: Deliver environmental improvements including addressing issues of noise and air quality.</p> <p>11. In order to minimize pollution a comprehensive traffic survey is necessary and traffic management options tested before any plans are agreed. This may involve some very difficult choices (such as limiting the amount of car parking)</p> <p>12. We would also like the council to consider implementing the following within the NKDB area (and more widely if applicable):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new developments and houses to be Electric Vehicle 'charging ready' if not already planned. • Schemes to retrofit existing residential development car parks with EV charging points (including mobility scooters) • All employer car parks to install EV charging points and to allow employees to charge during the working day at a reasonable/reduced cost • All supermarket car parks to have EV charging points (Sainsbury's) • Schemes to retrofit polluting vehicles with exhaust filters • Green Roof/wall initiatives • Smart parking – a mobile phone app that helps visitors to Kingston know where available parking spaces are. This will help prevent cars driving around looking for available spaces. 	<p>pedestrians should not be forced together where there is space to keep them apart, creating unnecessary conflict which can only increase as the number of cyclists rises. Where possible and appropriate the Council will introduce segregated cycle lanes.</p> <p>8 & 9. This suggestion is noted; the development brief does not deal with issues of commercial operation of landlords. However the brief will be fully compliant with the London Plan which supports Small and Medium Enterprises (SME).</p> <p>10. The supermarket (Sainsbury's) and petrol station are outside of the development brief and is not being considered for relocation/redevelopment at this time. Any future plans for this site will be explored through the Local Plan process, or through a planning application at which time a formal consultation would be undertaken.</p> <p>11. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p> <p>12. Issues relating to how new developments will contribute to air quality will be dealt with with regard to specific development proposals, as and when they come forward.</p>	
1	Des McRow	01/08/16	As resident of the Royal Quarter Development, I have considerable	1. The introduction to the brief on the Council's	No change.

		<p>concern over what is proposed for my “front garden”, namely Seven Kings Way (SKW).</p> <p>1. Concern over the introduction to this Consultation – this made via the Council’s website. It makes references to the Place and Sustainability Committee’s adoption on 28 November 2013 of Draft Brief (1), the implication being that full agreement had been given to what had been recommended in the Brief. No mention is made of the fact that this agreement was contingent upon the undertaking of “a stage 2 Brief containing detailed studies including traffic volumes and flows, route capacities”. Here the Committee paid all due attention to the level of concern raised over the proposals for SKW and I find it surprising that this was not deemed to be worthy of mention in the introduction’s reference to the “adoption”.</p> <p>Draft Brief (2) dated 15 September 2014 went out for consultation but no conclusion was reached, presumably due to the intervention of overlapping planning issues. However there is again the suggestion in the introduction that the content of this Brief was approved – but this certainly was not the case.</p> <p>In the 2014 Brief (2), reference was made to the Traffic Management Study that had been undertaken, suggesting that SKW “should be able to cope with the proposed increase in traffic flow”. No reference was made to the fact that this Study had not been finalised as it’s brief had been extended to cover other matters. Given the lack of publication none of us was able to test the assumptions that were made to lead such a conclusion, nor indeed to establish if such a conclusion was actually reached.</p> <p>Following on from Draft Brief (2), the Study was completed in 2014 – but with the Draft Brief (3) claiming on Page 11 that the Study had “tested the closure of Kingsgate Road.</p> <p>What was not said was that the Executive Summary of the Study recommended :</p> <p><i>Closure of Kingsgate Road to traffic, and creation of a new cycling and walking link along this alignment</i> <i>New left-hand turn from Sopwith Way to Richmond Road</i> <i>New left-hand turn from Sury Basin to SKW for access to the gas-holder development site (access only)</i></p> <p>I find it hard to link the Study’s conclusions to any of the Council Officials’ proposals for SKW and I am struggling to avoid the conclusion that their presentation of the facts is bordering on being</p>	<p>website explains that previous versions of this brief - Brief (1) and Brief (2) have provided an important basis for this brief.</p> <p>Brief Stage 1: Land Use and Spatial Parameters was adopted by the Place and Sustainability Committee on 28th November 2013. This marked the start of Stage 2: Consultation Draft which was concerned with more detailed studies including traffic volumes and flows. The website introduction does not state that this Stage 2 brief was adopted and this can be confirmed here.</p> <p>The current North Kingston Development Brief supersedes the previous North Kingston Development Brief (Stage 2: Consultation DRAFT, 2014), and once adopted will supercede the adopted North Kingston Development Brief (Stage One: Land Use and Spatial Parameters).</p> <p>This draft brief is based on the 2014 Movement Study that has been made available for public viewing on the Council’s website. The report provides a number of highway options and puts forward a recommended set of highway improvements for Kingston Town Centre.</p> <p>A traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to local residents.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>disingenuous.</p> <p>2. Page 33 of Draft Brief (3) stipulates that new homes must not be compromised by “negative environmental impacts, including noise and air quality”.</p> <p>Agree with the statement, however the question must be raised as to how converting an already existing residential road (SKW) into a major route for traffic from Kingston to Richmond does not cause noise and air quality problems for the residents along both sides of this road. Surely our planners are not just concerned about new homes?</p> <p>The fact is that SKW is a small road with: <i>- on its west side, the Royal Quarter Development (6/8 storeys, 447 units), the rear of 12 Skerne Road (6/8 storeys, 124 units) and the side of the 5 storey Seven Kings public car park</i> <i>- on its east side, the Berkeley Homes Development (Queenshurst) in course of construction (6/9 storeys, 315 units)</i></p> <p>The residents, including those yet to arrive in Queenshurst, would be subjected to a substantial increase in traffic, this including the movement of heavy goods vehicles, emergency services, and buses (these running for 24 hours per day!).</p> <p>This apparent lack of regard for the well-being of such residents conflicts dramatically with the care taken over those living in Down Hall Road (on one side of which there is a railway line). The effective conversion of this road into what is to become a cul-de-sac is (per TMO-P230) “intended to create a street scene appropriate to what has become a mainly residential area”.</p> <p>I am in full support of this objective but fail to understand why SKW is not also regarded as having become or is in course of becoming a mainly residential area.</p> <p>The obvious way to facilitate the closure of Kingsgate Road is to adhere to the recommendations contained in the Kingston Town Centre Movement Study (these set out by me at the top of Page 2). No doubt Council Tax payers have stumped up a significant sum for the production of this Study and it does seem strange for Council Officers to be completely ignoring the points contained in the Study's Executive Summary.</p> <p>I do appreciate that Draft Brief (3) does allow for a small link road</p>	<p>Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>The Council is continuing with its traffic and transport studies of Kingston town centre accounting for ongoing discussions with the Greater London Authority and Transport for London on matters such as growth targets for the area.</p> <p>2. The Council’s policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>between Sopwith Way and Richmond Road but this will do little to alleviate the problems caused to residents of SKW. Nor will the Planners' suggestion that all will be well if SKW " is widened and realigned to take up its role in better dealing with traffic flows" (page 11).</p> <p>I am sorry to burden you with such a long missive – it could even have been somewhat longer had I responded to many other points made in the Brief with which I query or disagree.</p> <p>I should perhaps mention that I have not yet responded to the Consultation but, when I do so I shall be very supportive of much of what is proposed. It is just such a pity that the architects of the Brief have failed to consider the well-being of those residing in SKW, seemingly intent upon pursuing their long-standing aim of converting this small road into a major traffic thoroughfare.</p>		
3	Brian Gaff	08/07/16	<p>1. Incidentally, might I suggest that for those with reading issues and the blind you regularly commission a short snappy audio version explaining things in words, no graphic would be possible of course. keep it short and snappy with a telephone contact point.</p>	<p>1. Working closely with the 'Visual Impaired Parliament' Group, the council prepared audio summaries uploaded to CD's for this consultation in order to maximise consultation accessibility for the visually-impaired. On the back cover page of our consultation documents we include information regarding how to access alternative versions of the documents. CD's can be produced at request.</p>	No change.
5	Alan George	21/08/16	<p>I write to lodge my very strong objection to the traffic elements in your North Kingston Development Brief (NKDB).</p> <p>I should explain that my flat (where I have lived since 2004) directly overlooks Seven Kings Way and I would be very directly affected by the planned conversion of this relatively quiet road into a quite major thoroughfare carrying heavy trucks and 24-hour bus services.</p> <p>1. Opposite me right now the new Queenshurst development is under construction. When completed, this will have 9 storeys. My building in Royal Quarter has 7 storeys. Seven Kings Way is a narrow road. Under the NKDB, even if widened (and the scope for widening is in fact very limited), the road would be like a deep canyon and would function as a 'trap' for vehicle pollution and noise.</p> <p>2. I fear that it will be impossible for me to continue living here. Already because of Queenshurst I have lost the fine views I once enjoyed.</p>	<p>All comments noted.</p> <p>1 & 2. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	No change.

			<p>Now it appears that I face a future afflicted with 24-hour noise and pollution.</p> <p>3. Despite all this, the NKDB pays frequent lip service to respect for the environment and quality of life for residents!</p> <p>4. I must point out that plans to transform this residential road into a major thoroughfare were first made public in 2013. There was a storm of objections from residents, as a result of which independent consultants were commissioned to produce a Kingston Town Movement Study. This was published last year and recommended that, following closure of Kingsgate Road, traffic should be channelled into Richmond Road via a left turn from Sopwith Way. There was no proposal whatsoever in this Study that Seven Kings Way should be transformed in the way now suggested in the NKDB.</p> <p>I understand and support the broad shape of the NKDB; but I cannot accept the Seven Kings Way element, and especially not when the Council's own independent consultants recommended an alternative that appears to me to remain entirely viable.</p> <p>Please respect my right, and the right of my many neighbours, to live free of traffic noise and vehicle pollution.</p>	<p>3. The brief acknowledges the North Kingston Area is deficient in green space and the new public realm and public park are intended to go some way to address this. The addition of high quality green open space and the upgrading of surrounding public realm, retail, commercial, educational and transport facilities are designed to improve liveability within the context of an increasing density.</p> <p>4. The current road network plans for the North Kingston Development Area are based on the 2014 Kingston Town Centre Movement Strategy which identifies the upgrading of Seven Kings Way as a option in a number of scenarios.</p> <p>The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p>	
6	John and Jenny Greenwood	21/08/16	<p>1. I read with disbelief that you plan to disregard our objections for the re-routing of traffic virtually through our development. This is in spite of the many objections from other nearby residents and even contrary to the result of the independent consultation recommendations.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North</p>	No change.

			<p>It beggars belief In that you so totally ignore ratepayers concerns.</p> <p>We implore you to re-think this plan.</p>	<p>Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	
7	John Grove	21/08/16	<p>1. I am extremely concerned about the proposal to increase the use of Seven Kings Way. I live overlooking this minor road which is already congested and often dangerous. It is already over used in many occasions. Being a local resident I know the road very well and I fear that it will be used more if your current plans go ahead.</p> <p>2. Please do reconsider the idea to use seven kings way as a more major road. Please do ensure it is not used by other vehicles. Please respect the health and safety of the people of kingston by minimising the use of this road. Please ensure there are alternative routes for</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and</p>	No change.

			<p>vehicles to access the Richmond Road from the one way system.</p>	<p>make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>2. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	
8	Tony Ashton	21/08/16	<p>1. I am dismayed to see that the proposal to convert Seven Kings Way into a major highway rather than improve the connection of Sopwith Way with Richmond Way still appears to form part of the Development Plan.</p> <p>2. This cannot be right when one side of Seven Kings Way is a large residential development and the other side with shortly be similarly residential. The noise, pollution and change of character to this area will be most detrimental to a very large number of residents.</p> <p>3. A much better solution would be to improve the Sopwith Way - Richmond Road junction which has been proposed over a number of years by many parties.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses</p>	No change.

				<p>and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>2. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p> <p>3. It is the long-term ambition of the Council to implement a left turn from Sopwith Way onto Richmond Road to ease traffic in this area. This is subject to land ownership issues. Page 22 of the brief identifies safeguarding methods the Council will employ to help deliver this in the future.</p>	
9	Gemma James	21/08/16	<p>1. As a resident of Royal Quarter, I would like to register my objection and continued dismay at the proposals to make Seven Kings Way a major thoroughfare as part of the redevelopment of the traffic system, please. 2. The increased volume of traffic will, so far as I can imagine, lead to a most unpleasant level of noise and pollution as well as access difficulties to the home of myself and all other residents of Royal Quarter. The new Queenshurst development will be even higher than our buildings, which will surely magnify this effect as the roadway becomes darker, increasing the reverberation of vehicle noise and emissions. I remain concerned at the likely danger of crossing the road on foot and of it becoming harder to drive in and out of the steep slope leading to our underground car park</p>	<p>1. The A traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards</p>	No change.

				<p>out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>2. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	
16	D Halladay	05/09/2016	<p>1. I object in the strongest way possible to the proposed use of Seven Kings Way as a main through road. I cannot understand the thought process that believes it acceptable to move the volume of traffic from a relatively open area to what shortly will be a canyon seven stories high and in some areas only 23 Meters wide with several hundred people living on both sides. 2. The effect on both buildings and occupants of the buses alone , over 800 double deck per week 24/7 . Pollution of dirt , noise and worst of all the diesel fumes in such a confined area is an unnecessary risk to the health of all occupants. I urge you to reject this plan.</p>	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider</p>	No change.

				<p>movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>2. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	
21	V Mackay	05/09/2016	<p>1. Seven Kings Way is becoming increasingly busy and polluted. The new hotel on Skerne Road and new housing development will increase traffic significantly already along Seven Kings Way therefore additional diversion of other traffic will make it a 'rat run' and potentially more dangerous for residents (and the increasing number of children in the area) accessing both Royal Quarter and the new development (as this is already quite dangerous). 2. For residents facing Seven Kings Way at the Royal Quarter increased noise will add to the future reduction of quality of life. I find this proposal totally unacceptable in what is already becoming a very busy road, increasingly dangerous to cross, with existing proven high levels of pollution. The quality of life will be reduced severely in a residential area that is already supposed to be of high density.</p>	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>2. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts.</p>	No change.

				<p>Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	
23	Chris Watkins	09/09/16	<p>1. I am afraid I may have missed the official date for comments on the North Kingston Development Brief but I would like to offer my support and congratulations particularly on the imaginative idea of closing Kingsgate Road, which does open up much more possibilities for the area.</p> <p>Two thoughts.</p> <p>1 I would hope the central square will be more people friendly and less harsh than the 'Modern Movement' architectural image proposed. See contrasting images attached below.</p> <p>2 Could the two major traffic intersections be made more pedestrian friendly/ pizza like, rather than traffic engineering dominated i.e. outside Sainsbury's and the new Entertainments Centre (old Bingo Hall). Something like the Poynton Scheme ?</p>	<p>1. Support and comments noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Online questionnaire responses to the consultation

The Council received 54 responses to the development brief via the online questionnaire on the Council's website. Comments made (as received) have been numbered in bold so corresponding responses are easily identifiable. The last column identifies the changes the Council have made to the document as a result of the consultation responses.

Question 1a & 1b - Do you support the vision for North Kingston?

ID Number	Respondent	Question 1a: Do you support this vision for North Kingston?	Question 1b: Do you have any comments?	RBK Response	Document Update
1	Yvette (Local resident)	Strongly oppose		Noted.	No change.
2	Anthony Quinn (Local resident)	Neutral	1. I do not really understand the statement that this whole area is largely derelict! There are a few areas such as the old gasworks that are but much of the rest is existing residential, open space or commercial. 2. I would be against any loss of open space and anything that impacts on London's Blue Ribbon	1. The brief suggests that this part of Kingston Town Centre was 'previously largely derelict'. This statement is based on the former vacant land uses covering many of the key sites in the area, including the decommissioned gas holders. 2. The brief intends to increase access to green space in the North Kingston area.	No change.
3	John De'Ath (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. It appears to be badly thought out, why do we need a public realm so close to Canbury Gardens. 2. Why have a cycle path that links middle of Sury basin with A one way system. There are cycle routes each end of Sury basin and this connects with neither. Is it April 1st ?	1. Despite being in close proximity to Canbury Gardens, the North Kingston area is deficient in green open space which is important for the creation of healthy environments that provide residents space for recreation, leisure and enjoyment. Adequate green spaces also enhance liveability of urban areas by improving air quality, managing water flows and air temperatures as well as providing space for biodiversity. This understanding and approach is consistent throughout national policy as well as the London Plan and Kingston's Core Strategy.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

				<p>2. Part of the brief's objectives is to create an integrated cycle network throughout the North Kingston area that will connect to the borough-wide cycle network. The new cycle routes proposed will create a new/improved crossing on Sury Basin to allow cyclists and pedestrians safely and conveniently access the local amenities. Sury Basin allows two-way traffic and this is not to be changed as part of the brief, allowing cyclists to connect to a cycle route on Richmond Road in the east or to quieter roads to the west that are more suitable for cyclists, such as Skerne Road and Skerne Walk.</p>	
4	Russell Pedley (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Noted.	No change.
5	K. Mayer (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	<p>I am opposed to yet more development in this area because: 1. Kingston has become VERY noticeably over-crowded already in the last couple of years, and it is becoming an unpleasant place to live as a consequence. I certainly do not wish to see over-population spread further into North Kingston. 2. I am also concerned that if there is yet more increase in the population, the infrastructure will breakdown (e.g. Kingston Hospital). 3. I don't see any need for any 'faith' facilities in any development such as this. 'Faith' should be kept out of such developments, and should be private. 4. I am concerned that once again, the council will propose more tall buildings, above four floors in height, further marring the area. The council should leave North Kingston alone, and redevelop other parts of Kingston (there are many areas south of Kingston that could really do with development). Leave North Kingston alone, please. 5. There is an additional potential problem in concreting over yet more land so close to the river, with the potential that this brings of flooding to other areas of North Kingston (the water not being able to sink through concrete surfaces). I trust yet another development will not go ahead.</p>	<p>1. The appropriate density for new developments is set through the London Plan prepared on behalf of the Mayor of London. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6. Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The addition of high quality green open space and the upgrading of surrounding public realm, retail, commercial, educational and transport facilities are designed to improve liveability within the context of an increasing density.</p> <p>2. A review of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be made as part of the production of the Council's new Local Plan which will take into account the need of infrastructure and services in the Borough.</p> <p>3. Comment 3 noted.</p> <p>4. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning</p>	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

				<p>application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Issues of design that affect flood risk will be dealt with with regard to specific development proposals, as and when they come forward. Additionally, the issue of flood risk is to be reviewed as part of the preparation and review of the Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	
6	Maurice Bentley (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
7	E John (Local resident)	Neutral	1. there is no 'derelict' part of Kingston town centre	1. The brief suggests that this part of Kingston Town Centre was 'previously largely derelict'. This statement is based on the former vacant land uses covering many of the key sites in the area, including the decommissioned gas holders.	No change.
8	Chris Kent (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
9	G T KNIGHT (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
10	Carl Clarke (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Affordable living needs to take a higher priority	1. The delivery of affordable housing will be achieved by the requirements of current policy applied to individual planning applications on a case by case basis to take account of factors such as viability. The Council will seek to ensure any proposed developments accord with the Core Strategy (including DM15, and the Affordable Housing SPD) as well as current Government and Mayoral policy.	Change. Page 33, para 5. Text added: <i>'The provision of affordable homes on site must accord with policies set out in the London Plan, Government policy and the other elements of the development plan.'</i>
11	Steve	Somewhat	1. To reduce use of cars, public transport	1. The Council is working with key partners such as	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

	Hollands (Local resident)	favour	needs to be lower cost and more efficient. Richmond road is only served by one service, 65, which can be inconsistent. Although the route goes from Kingston to Ealing, when I have used the service, most of the passengers get off in Richmond, so we need a service, which just runs between Kingston and Richmond, which would allow a more reliable service to be run. If there are issues up in Ealing, Kingston loses a bus service to Richmond.	Transport for London on an ongoing basis to bring about improvements to bus services in the area. Detailed investigations are carried out in respect of all major new development and other significant proposals to assess the impact on the transport network and identify the need for improvements.	
12	S Watson (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
13	Andrew Payne (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	1. This area was once a great place to live but I feel the density of new build housing, retail and other, needs to be carefully managed as I feel the area has lost a lot of its character and now seems very urban. 2. Obviously any scheme would have to be looked at in detail and judged on its own merits, but generally I wonder if the surrounding infrastructure can support or cope as it exists now. Perhaps the focus should be on planning and improving the infrastructure carefully before any large residential developments are allowed.	1. The appropriate density for new developments is set by the London Plan prepared on behalf of the Mayor of London. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6. Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare. The addition of high quality green open space and the upgrading of surrounding public realm, retail, commercial, educational and transport facilities are designed to improve liveability within the context of an increasing density. 2. As part of the planning process, developers will be expected to contribute towards upgrading infrastructure that is necessary to support the development. The Council will be conducting a review of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan as part of the preparation for the Local Plan.	No change.
14	Matt Williams (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

15	Rachel Hapoienu (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
16	Jessamy Oldfield (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose		Noted.	No change.
17	Jonathan rollason (Local resident)	Strongly favour	Have concerns about 1. density, 2. height and 3. traffic assumptions. Traffic set to increase by 50% in next ten years. Will the plan accommodate this?	<p>1. The appropriate density for new developments is set by the Greater London Authority (GLA) through the London Plan. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6. Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The addition of high quality green open space and the upgrading of surrounding public realm, retail, commercial, educational and transport facilities are designed to improve liveability within the context of an increasing density.</p> <p>2. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p> <p>3. There is no evidence to suggest that traffic will increase by 50% in the next 10 years. Surveys have shown that traffic has actually decreased gradually over the last 10-15 years across London, including outer London. While anticipated growth and new development may change the trend to some extent over the next 10 years, the Transport for London predictions for the future are for relatively stable traffic conditions with no major increases in traffic levels. The</p>	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

				plan's evidence base accounts for all transport matters over the period of the plan.	
18	John Roscoe (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	<p>1. It's a good idea to have homes close to the centre and to public transport, in conjunction with provision of open spaces for people to live in a high quality environment. 2. Over the past ten years, I believe north Kingston has been excessively developed with too much housing and insufficient open spaces - the area has become too crowded. Opening up disused space for a variety of uses is a good idea. Please keep the density of housing lower than it has been - too many people in one place creates a feeling of tension.</p>	<p>1. Support noted.</p> <p>2. The appropriate density for new developments is set by the Greater London Authority (GLA) through the London Plan. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6. Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The addition of high quality green open space and the upgrading of surrounding public realm, retail, commercial, educational and transport facilities are designed to improve liveability within the context of an increasing density. The brief intends to increase access to green space in the North Kingston area.</p>	No change.
19	Rupert Moor (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	<p>1. More detail needed before further comment can be made.</p>	<p>1. This brief is intended to provide guidance and a long-term vision for the area. The specific detail of the future developments on the site will come forward in individual planning applications which will be assessed on their own merit in the context of the this overall vision for the area set out by the Council and will be subject to individual consultation.</p>	No change.
20	Neil Fulk (Local resident)	Strongly favour	<p>1. There should be a car link between North Kingston and Kingston Bridge without having to go around the one way system</p>	<p>Comment 1 noted.</p>	No change.
21	Richard Williams (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	<p>1. I am surprised that the geographical area covered by the consultation is quite limited, as the plans appear to have implications for surrounding roads and parks</p>	<p>1. While there may be some implications for surrounding roads and parks, the majority of the impact will be immediate and unfortunately there is a limit to how wide the Council is able to consult on proposals.</p>	No change.
22	John Pitts (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		<p>Support noted.</p>	No change.

<p>23</p>	<p>Samantha Murphy (Local resident)</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>1. I found many of the drawings/ plans in the document difficult to read. There were no clear road names on the plans so orientating them was hard. 2. I wish to comment that any proposals for new housing in this area, there should be consideration into the support services required for this including health facilities/ rail capacity and education. There should be clear CIL benefits from any housing proposals and this money must be used in these services. 3. I am concerned that in closing Kingsgate Road and funnelling all the traffic down Seven Kings Way would lead to air quality issues for the housing there and traffic congestion. 4. Will the junction of Seven Kings Way & Sury Basin be modified to cope with the increased volume of traffic going through there? Will the road markings be improved so it is clear which lane you should be in to turn right but needing to be in the left lane to go up Richmond Road. 5. It was unclear in the Design Framework Plan how pedestrians & cyclists (coloured pink) would get across the road network to get on to that pink line safely. Will this mean more pelican crossings and therefore more driver delay on the roads? 6. If the Richmond Road is to be narrowed to 17m (I am guessing this is between Acre Road and Cowleaze Road), will sufficient width still be provided to ensure there is a bus lane for buses travelling southwards towards Kingston & a lane for other traffic. 7. Is there sufficient turning circle space for buses to go around Seven Kings Road & then up Sury Basin? 8. What will happen to traffic if a bus were to break down on Seven Kings Road blocking the road? what contingency space or plan would there be other than to cause a backlog on to the Loop. At least at present if a bus breaks down on Kingsgate vehicles can go up Seven Kings Road. 9. Who will own or have responsibility for the new public space in this area? given the Government's recent consultation on the role of public parks &</p>	<p>Comment 1 noted.</p> <p>2. The need for social & physical infrastructure needed to support development is to be addressed in the preparation for the future Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. CIL payments and S106 Agreements are sought by the Councils from developers for the upgrading/provision of infrastructure that is deemed necessary as a result of the proposed development.</p> <p>3. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p> <p>4. As part of the remodelling of the road network in the development brief area, the roads will benefit from improved junctions and new/improved crossing for pedestrians/cyclists as well as appropriate road signage.</p> <p>5. The 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' (coloured pink) exits onto Sury Basin where a new/improved crossing will allow cyclists to turn right to join the cycle lanes on Richmond Road or left to access quieter road that are more appropriate for cyclists such as Skerne Road.</p> <p>6. The plans for the area include the widening of Richmond Road to accommodate two way traffic at its southern end and the left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road. The road will also be upgraded to accommodate the requirements of both pedestrians and cyclists in a safe manner, and ensure access to shops and other ground floor uses. The revised arrangements have been modelled to ensure their</p>	<p>Change. Page 5, plan title change from 'Figure Ground Plan showing large voids in the urban fabric highlighting the sites underutilisation' to 'Figure Ground Plan 2015: the large voids in the urban fabric <i>display</i> the sites underutilisation'. Slight amendment to Ground Plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 7, Plan showing current land ownership boundaries; Page 10, Movement and Access Plan; Page 12, Activity and Edges Plan; Page 14, Land Use Plan; Page 16, Public Realm & Public Open Space Plan; Page 18, Heights Plan; Page 21, Development Parcels; Page 22, Safeguarding Plan; Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 42, Lan Ownership Plan. Road names '<i>Sury Basin</i>' and '<i>Sopwith Way</i>' have been added to plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 8, Concept Plan: Wording of 'Proposed Quiet Route' changed to 'Proposed <i>Cycle Route</i>'.</p> <p>Change. Page 10, Movement and Access Plan: 'Potential Dedicated Cycle Route' has been removed from map. Wording of 'indicative Shared Space Route' has</p>
-----------	---	----------------	--	--	--

			<p>spaces alongside their funding, is their funding to maintain this public space or will it be a privately owned space with caveats? 10. How will you ensure any new housing in this area the waste collection services have been adequately provided for? i.e. where bins would be stored and if it is a vehicle free area, how service vehicles collecting the bins/ rubbish will get to them? 11. If it is a vehicle free zone how will you enforce residents to not have a car? where will they park as you cannot control residents owning a car so this provision needs to be thought out now at the strategic level as it will have an impact on the wider existing residential neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>adequate operation.</p> <p>7. There will be sufficient space for buses to turn from Seven Kings Way onto Sury Basin.</p> <p>8. The revised highway arrangements in North Kingston build in an element of resilience to allow for incidents such as a broken down vehicle blocking the road. All new development will be required to meet the Council's standards in terms of providing adequate servicing and parking facilities to avoid any problems of overspill parking and unwarranted intrusion of larger vehicles.</p> <p>9. Regarding the ownership and maintenance of open space, this is critical to its long term success. This aspect of the scheme will be subject to agreement between the Council and landowners.</p> <p>10. Site specific design issues for individual sites such as bin storage will be addressed as and when individual planning applications come forward. These issues will take into account rubbish collection and feasibility of vital services.</p> <p>11. All new development will be required to meet the Council's/London Plan standards in terms of providing appropriate levels of parking and servicing to ensure a safe environment and avoid unwarranted intrusion of larger vehicles.</p>	<p>been changed to <i>'Shared Space Car Park Access'</i>. Wording of 'Indicative Quiet Route' has been changed to 'Indicative <i>Cycle Route</i>'. Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 14, Land Use Plan Addition of wording <i>'(including A2/A3)'</i> after 'retail' on the 2nd and 5th points of the key.</p> <p>Change. Page 18, Heights Plan: Asterisk removed from 'Up to maximum 12 storeys*' Note at bottom of page amended from '*Please note: 'Storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor' to 'Please note: <i>All 'storey'</i> heights are inclusive of ground floor'</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan: Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 26, Design Framework: Richmond Road; Page 28, Framework Plan: North South Linear Park; Page 30, Framework Plan: East West Linear Park; Page 34, Surrounding Infrastructure; Page 36, Humanise Surrounding Streets 1) 'Potential Cycle Only</p>
--	--	--	---	--	---

					<p>Route' removed from key</p> <p>2) 'Potential Shared Space Car park Access' changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>' on key.</p> <p>3) 'Proposed Quiet Way' changed to '<i>Indicative Cycle Route</i>' on key.</p> <p>4) 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' changed to '<i>Indicative Pedestrian and Cycle Route Only</i>' on key.</p>
24	J Langridge (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
25	Frances Noel (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	<p>1. One of the objectives is education, yet no new primary school planned, despite the vast increase in population density the extra housing will create. 2. This needs to be addressed as well as increase in GP provision etc. 3. The new road network proposed is vague on the plans but routing a lot more cars around Seven Kings/Sury Basin is not going to work. Overall the vision seems good but a great deal of attention needs to be paid to ensure North Kingston does not get more congested with people and cars and I'll thought through road system.</p>	<p>1. The responsibility for providing new schools now falls to the Education Funding Agency (EFA). The EFA have successfully gained planning consent for a new primary school in Norbiton, which will help address need locally.</p> <p>2. The need for increased GP provision is to be addressed by preparation for future Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There is currently no envisaged need for a new primary school on the site.</p> <p>3. A traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road</p>	No change.

				and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.	
26	M Ellis (Local resident)	Neutral	<p>1. It is not clear whether the North Kingston Plan has taken into consideration the recent high-rise buildings that have been built in the immediate vicinity, or those being built in the old gas site. Whilst it sounds good in isolation, there will actually be a huge increase in the built environment with many residents crammed into a small space. As a long-term resident of North Kingston (and several generations of my family have lived in North Kingston), I disagree that this is an extension of Kingston town centre. It is not. The character and feel of North Kingston is a quiet residential suburb with houses and gardens, not blocks of flats. 2. The proposed public parks seem to be more for cycle traffic. 3. I would like to see priority given to improving wildlife corridors and linking quality planting (that is usable by wildlife, not just a box-ticking exercise). This should link existing green space to the river and Canbury Gardens.</p>	<p>1. The appropriate density for new developments is set by the Greater London Authority (GLA) through the London Plan. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6. Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p> <p>2. While the proposed public park will provide cycle routes throughout, it is intended for the enjoyment of everybody and not specifically aimed at cyclists.</p> <p>Comment 3 noted.</p>	<p>Change. Wording added to page 17, para 2: 'New public spaces will need to accommodate an appropriate means of dealing with water drainage to support biodiversity and address climatic issues'</p>
27	Chris Parry (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	<p>1. It is a neglected part of Kingston and has always disappointed us as we drive through to our home in North Kingston. An improved public realm and a better quality of buildings would improve the area.</p>	<p>1. Support noted</p>	<p>No change.</p>
28	C Parkins-Godwin (Local resident)	Strongly favour	<p>1. Increased retail and housing will not only challenge the demands of this area of north Kingston but surrounding areas. What plans do the council have to address the rat runs from Kingston Hill down Crescent Rd, down Kings Rd to Richmond Rd. These roads will have increased traffic, creating the opposite of promoting smooth movement through 'Go cycle' from Kingston Hill to Richmond Park, and</p>	<p>1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

			not providing " environmental improvements" or "addressing issues of noise and air quality" for Local residents to Richmond Park.	are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets. In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes. Transport for London's new Cycling Design Standards (Dec 2014) advises that cyclists and pedestrians should not be forced together where there is space to keep them apart, creating unnecessary conflict which can only increase as the number of cyclists rises. Where possible and appropriate the Council will introduce segregated cycle lanes.	
29	Pat Lally (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Architecture should be Victorian in style, not lots of glass and balconies. 2. Also the height of residential buildings should be limited in height to less than five storeys.	1. The design of individual sites will be judged on their own merit as and when these come forward and must be compliant with the design frameworks outlined in the brief. 2. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	No change.
30	Anne (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
31	Simon Pain (Local resident)	Neutral	1. I would like to see a commitment to architectural excellence and highest quality, innovative design. Currently it sounds a bit bland and inoffensive.	1. Issues of specific design will be dealt with as and when applications come forward.	No change.
32	Marilyn Mason (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Developing current "high street" outlets on Richmond Road should help to improve local air quality and traffic, provided that it goes hand	1. The Council's transport policies give priority to pedestrian and cycle movement. There is a consistent approach across all areas of the borough including	No change.

			<p>in hand with improving cycling and walking facilities (not in expanding parking and thereby encouraging yet more traffic). 2. The proposed linear park should contribute to this by going all the way into the town centre/station area. 3. "Exemplary architecture" sounds good, but what does it mean? 4. Educational provision should also be for primary age pupils - more residents will surely mean more children and primary schools should be smallish and within cycling or walking distance from homes.</p>	<p>North Kingston. The aim is to encourage the greatest possible use of these modes by making new development fully accessible to these users.</p> <p>2. The ambition to extend Linear Park to the town centre is supported by the Design Framework with particular reference to North South Linear Park, and Supporting Infrastructure.</p> <p>3. Individual development proposals will need to be tested against existing Core Strategy policies, including DM10, DM11 and CS8.</p> <p>4. There is currently no envisaged need for a new primary school on the site. The responsibility for providing new schools now falls to the Education Funding Agency (EFA). The EFA have successfully gained planning consent for a new primary school in Norbiton, which will help address need locally.</p>	
33	Alison Pope (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	<p>1. I strongly welcome the regeneration of the site. As a North Kingston resident the area would benefit from a face lift. My main concern is the rejuvenation of the high street. Has the council consulted with retailers currently present, or those that might consider the area? My main concern is whether the intended retail spaces at street level will attract retailers. There are many empty retail spaces beneath recent developments that have remained empty for years and are more of a blight on the area than the Richmond Road high street currently is. For example, the retail space next door but one to Tesco Express by Kingston Station has been up for let for at least 5 years, and the unlet retail spaces along London Road by the railway bridge look particularly downtrodden. In many shop parades in the area there has been much campaigning from retailers on allowing free parking and my concern with the Richmond Road and the lack of nearby side road or frontage parking is that much of the retail space will be unlet. There cannot be a "build it and they will come" attitude to the regeneration. As</p>	<p>1. A2/A3 uses are identified in the Town Centre Area Action Plan as appropriate uses for site 19e (directly north of the College building on Richmond Road) and 20 (Kingsgate Car park and Richmond Road Frontage). The Development Brief will be in compliance with the land uses as identified in the AAP.</p>	<p>Change. Page 14, Land Use Plan: addition of wording in key '<i>(including A2/A3)</i>' after 'retail' on the 2nd and 5th points of the key.</p>

			<p>a Local resident I do not want a high street of empty bare concrete shells or boarded up shops. Unfortunately, although not very green, some consideration to customers popping to the shops and pulling up in a car should be considered. The A1 status should also be expanded to include A3.</p>		
34	J Sellars (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	<p>1. Would like clear demarcation between pedestrian and cycle routes. Also to keep present arrangements for traffic along Gibbon Road</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes. Transport for London's new Cycling Design Standards (Dec 2014) advises that cyclists and pedestrians should not be forced together where there is space to keep them apart, creating unnecessary conflict which can only increase as the number of cyclists rises. Where possible and appropriate the Council will introduce segregated cycle lanes.</p>	No change.
35	Denise Fraser (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	<p>1. I do not agree that Seven Kings Way should be the main thoroughfare for traffic onto Sury Basin and Richmond Road, or that it should be made 2 way. The volume of traffic, together with the increased noise and pollution for the residents of Royal Quarter and the new Queenshurst development would have a detrimental impact.</p>	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>The Council's policies seek to protect the residential</p>	No change.

				<p>and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	
36	Michael McGrail (Local resident)	Strongly favour	<p>1. Yes, the proposal to route the Kingston one-way ring road system along Seven Kings Way is verging on the ridiculous and contradicts the intent of this scheme.. The proper route should be along Sopwith Way and then along the Richmond Road for traffic wanting to go in that direction. This routing plan contradicts the intent of this Development Brief.</p> <p>2. Far from bringing communities together it will physically divide them with a noisy, polluting highway. How does this help towards reducing noise levels and pollution for the people living in the adjacent flats to Seven Kings Way? Seven Kings Road cuts through what will soon be a high density residential area which runs from the Thames to the Richmond Road.</p> <p>Michael McGrail</p>	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>It is the long-term ambition of the Council to implement a left turn from Sopwith Way onto Richmond Road to further ease traffic in this area. This is subject to land ownership issues. Page 22 of the brief identifies safeguarding methods the Council will employ to help deliver this in the future.</p> <p>2. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road</p>	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

				network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.	
37	Robert Marshall (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Want to ensure that traffic flow to and from Richmond Road is as smooth as possible and that there are cycle lanes on Richmond Road in both directions from the kings road traffic lights to the railway station.	1. The plans for the area include the widening of Richmond Road to accommodate two way traffic at its southern end and the left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road. The road will also be upgraded to accommodate the requirements of both pedestrians and cyclists in a safe manner, and ensure access to shops and other ground floor uses. The revised arrangements have been modelled to ensure their adequate operation.	No change.
38	Duncan Combe (Local resident)	Neutral	1. Priority needs to be given to pedestrian movement and impact on existing residents of any proposed changes. Cycling needs to be considered as a second priority below pedestrian movement.	1. The Council's transport policies give priority to pedestrian and cycle movement. There is a consistent approach across all areas of the borough including North Kingston. The aim is to encourage the greatest possible use of these modes by making new development fully accessible to these users.	No change.
39	Mary Graham (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted.	No Change.
40	Joanne Melbourne (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. What are you doing? Having lived here for 21 years have sadly witnessed how you have massacred an 'area of opportunity'. Fields and open spaces have been hideously concreted over to provide boxes for people to live in - I have never in my born days seen anything so disgraceful and you have the cheek to write to us about the objectives you have for the area...its a concrete jungle! What happened to the lessons learned from the 60's when it was realised people do not function and prosper emotionally or physically in built up concrete jungles. But its obvious it doesn't affect you so you don't care. I have taken an interest in my area for many years - I campaigned to stop the Sainsbury's and car park being built. I	All comment noted. 1. The appropriate density for new developments is set by the Greater London Authority (GLA) through the London Plan. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6. Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare. The Council recognises that the North Kingston area is deficient in green space and the addition of high quality green open space including a new public park	No change.

		<p>requested a school to be built there 15 years ago plus some larger houses as the extension restrictions prevented any loft extensions at the time. I was told this was 'contaminated land and no houses could ever be built on the site'. I campaigned myself to have zebra crossing on King's Road outside of St Agatha's Church for all the schoolchildren for 2 years and to have tree planting on behalf of BRAG residents committee as all trees were removed and we were experiencing increased pollution from Richmond Road. 2. There is too much traffic in this area which is in a 'vale' and thus traps all toxins and air pollutants. The road layout you propose will only add to traffic jams and congestion in an area which probably already exceeds any safety limits for permitted air pollution. You have not listened to anyone so far..apart from the greedy consulting firm Indigo whose only operating principles are to con the public with promises of 'employment' and improving area by sticking in a piece of grass and pavement. You treat residents like numpty's as if they can be conned and bought off with mention of 'cycle route or personal walkway'. We all know the park will be a hang out for students who litter the area with Sainburys rubbish, gum and cigarette butts! I have no respect for Kingston Council - you do not listen to residents - I have been to meetings and see the words of residents are met with defensive responses and no regards - playing into the hands of scheming developers...BRAVO!! I think what you are planning for this Royal Borough is a travesty - I hope you hang your heads in shame....all of you. What about Chessington, Tolworth and beyond - plenty of space and opportunity there. I remember the "Tree People' who tried to save the Beeches and stop the awful development overlooking the river - how the residents provided food for them, talked to them for years and understood what they were trying to do - before they were forcibly removed. No matter</p>	<p>is intended to go some way to improve this. This is intended as part of a wider strategy to improve green space connections to Canbury Gardens and the Riverside. This, along with the upgrading of surrounding public realm, retail, commercial, educational and transport facilities are designed to improve livability and quality of life for residents within the context of an increasing density.</p> <p>2. In regard to travel & movement in the area, a traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>what anyone says or does Kingston Council will plough on with their 'scheme' because Central Government told us to. Common sense, privilege and a thought for the future of this great borough certainly does not prevail - only targets, greed and money for the council. R.I.P Royal Borough of Kingston. Yes we know the site was a derelict gas work - what you have done to this area is vile and a disgrace!!</p>		
41	Jonathan Rollason (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the north Kingston development plan. I am supportive but have two issues. 1. The first is the density and the effect this will have on the quality of life in the neighbourhood. The money developers provide never covers the whole cost of improvements needed and we have seen a serious erosion of services. As an example it now takes two weeks to see a Doctor for a routine appointment. It used to take 3 days. I would request the council adopts a target density of 215 units per hectare to protect the borough. 2. The second is connected and is the height of the tower on the council land. I understand the council wants to maximise the income from the site but surely not at any cost. The site is surrounded by much smaller buildings on all sides. A 12 storey building is simply too large and we know developers will suggest 15 storey's. This will be followed by a huge fight and they will eventually accept 12 storey's if that's is what the plan says. The maximum height should not exceed 9 storey's which would fit in with adjacent buildings. Please amend the plan.</p>	<p>1. The appropriate density for new developments is set by the Greater London Authority (GLA) through the London Plan. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6. Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The infrastructure needs of the Borough are significantly greater than the funding likely to be realised through CIL or planning obligations or a combination of both. The Council will seek to prioritise CIL use as a match or gap funding source, linked to other infrastructure funding. As part of the production of the Council's new Local Plan for the Borough, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be reviewed. It is important to note that growth in the Borough is set to continue and the production of a new Local Plan and supporting evidence studies is intended to strengthen the Council's position to maximise opportunities for planned growth, including the provision of adequate infrastructure. Without this, the predicted growth will result in piecemeal development that is unable to secure maximum public benefits.</p> <p>2. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed</p>	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

				<p>development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p> <p>The issues of developer contributions is addressed by the Developer Contributions section of the Development Brief. A review of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be made as part of the production of the Council's new Local Plan which will take into account the need of infrastructure and services in the Borough.</p>	
42	Richard Robinson (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted.	No change.
43	Kingston Cycling Campaign (local organisation)	Somewhat favour	<p>1. Richmond Road has a very degraded environment because of the level of traffic. It would appear that active frontage is important in the other parts of the proposed development where people will want to walk and cycle away from adjacent high traffic flows.</p>	<p>1. The plans for the area include the widening of Richmond Road to accommodate two way traffic at its southern end and the left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road. The road will also be upgraded to accommodate the requirements of both pedestrians and cyclists in a safe manner, and ensure access to shops and other ground floor uses. The revised arrangements have been modelled to ensure their adequate operation.</p>	No change.
44	Xxx xxx (unknown)	Somewhat favour	<p>1. In favour of redevelopment, but not chosen use of space, in particular, high rise buildings.</p>	<p>1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p>	No change.
45	Robert James (Local resident)	Strongly favour	<p>1. Hope that "rejuvenated high street" does not price the variety of individual shops out of the area but allows it to retain a character different from the main Kingston centre with its dominance by national chains.</p>	<p>1. This suggestion is noted; the development brief does not deal with issues of commercial operation of landlords. However the brief will be fully compliant with the London Plan which supports Small and Medium Enterprises (SME).</p>	No change.
46	Des McRow (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	<p>1. The aim to make "North Kingston a great place to live" cannot be faulted. However no consideration appears to be given to include</p>	<p>1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and</p>	No change.

			<p>those living, and to live, on either side of Seven Kings Way within this happy band. This is a narrow road with apartment blocks of up to 8 storeys on one side and (when fully completed in 2017/2018) up to 9 storeys on the other. With the intention for it to undertake the Kingsgate Road traffic following the closure of that road, Seven Kings Way will face the arrival of the majority of traffic heading to Richmond Road – this including large commercial vehicles, emergency service vehicles (with sirens blaring) and a bus route that operates for 24 hours per day. This narrow road will in effect form a high-sided form of tunnel with the adverse implications of noise and air quality appearing to be totally disregarded or not fully appreciated in the thinking behind the Development Brief .</p>	<p>environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	
47	Sumit Thakur, Chairman (Royal Quarter Residents Association)	Strongly oppose	<p>1. The aim to make “North Kingston a great place to live” cannot be faulted. However no consideration appears to be given to include those living, and to live, on either side of Seven Kings Way within this happy band. This is a narrow road with apartment blocks of up to 8 storeys on one side and (when fully completed in 2017/2018) up to 9 storeys on the other. With the intention for it to undertake the Kingsgate Road traffic following the closure of that road, Seven Kings Way will face the arrival of the majority of traffic heading to Richmond Road – this including large commercial vehicles, emergency service vehicles (with sirens blaring) and a bus route that operates for 24 hours per day. This narrow road will in effect form a high-sided form of tunnel with the adverse implications of noise and air quality appearing to be totally disregarded or not fully appreciated in the thinking behind the Development Brief.</p>	<p>1. The Council’s policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	No change.
48	Sumit Thakur (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	<p>1. I fully support the vision to make “North Kingston” a great place to live. However, it seems that not a proper attention has been</p>	<p>1. The Council’s policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and</p>	No change.

			<p>given to the impact on the residents on either side of the Seven Kings Way. This is a narrow one way road which will have 8 storey buildings on either side and a right turn on the Sury Basin on the other end of the road. If all the traffic is diverted through this road, I am afraid and deeply concerned that this will lead to a major inconvenience to the residents of the Seven Kings Way. 2. The right turn at the end to Sury Basin will also act as a bottleneck and therefore create further traffic jams on this road. This is in addition to the noise and pollution that this traffic would create. I strongly oppose the development brief and believe that the full implications of the development on the residents of Seven Kings Way has not been considered.</p>	<p>environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p> <p>2. a traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p>	
49	Shinjini Thakur (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	<p>1. I fully support the vision to make "North Kingston" a great place to live. However, it seems that not a proper attention has been given to the impact on the residents on either side of the Seven Kings Way. This is a narrow one way road which will have 8 storey buildings on either side and a right turn on the Sury Basin on the other end of the road. If all the traffic is diverted through this road, I am afraid and deeply concerned that this will lead to a major inconvenience to the residents of the Seven Kings Way. 2. The right turn at the end to Sury Basin will also act as a bottleneck and therefore create further traffic jams on this road. This is in addition to the noise and pollution that</p>	<p>1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p> <p>2. a traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road</p>	

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

			<p>this traffic would create. I strongly oppose the development brief and believe that the full implications of the development on the residents of Seven Kings Way has not been considered.</p>	<p>network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p>	
50	Iain Martin MSc CMILT	Somewhat favour	<p>1. Further consultation is needed on the specific proposals as there are too many general aspirations with insufficient detail or explanations.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. This brief is intended to provide guidance and a long-term vision for the area. Individual planning applications for specific developers will be made available on our website for public consultation as and when these come forward.</p>	No change.
51	Beverley Tourle	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.
52	Diane Watling (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Noted	No change.
53	Sarah Olney (North Kingston Liberal Democrats)	Strongly oppose	<p>Please find below the response on behalf of North Kingston Liberal Democrats. A 12 week minimum period for consultation is accepted as good practice by the Consultation Institute and this should have been the case here – particularly over the main holiday period. We are concerned that not enough Local residents will have had an opportunity to respond. We object to the development brief for three reasons: 1. Height and massing - proposing nine and 12 storey buildings (which are likely to be tested by developers seeking to maximise profit) is unacceptable in this location - opposite the listed former Gala bingo hall and in a site</p>	<p>Comments 1-3 noted.</p> <p>1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p> <p>2. The delivery of affordable housing will be controlled on individual planning applications. The Council will ensure any proposed development's accordance with</p>	<p>Change. Page 33, para 5. Text added: <i>'The provision of affordable homes on site must comply with policies set out in the London Plan and the Local Plan'</i>.</p>

			<p>that acts as a gateway to mainly two and three storey residential neighbourhoods. 2. Lack of affordable housing. We would like to see a very clear commitment to a high proportion of affordable housing on this site. The delivery of affordable housing by this Conservative administration to date has been woeful - only 229 out of 4,316 new housing units. This brief offers an excellent opportunity to redress the balance for local people struggling to get a home of their own, and we would like to see this commitment set out very clearly in the brief. 3. A new primary school? The local schools are already completely full and catchment areas continue to shrink. With yet more housing proposed, the council urgently needs to address school place provision in this part of the borough. The Liberal Democrats had originally proposed to convert the gas holders site into a new school, but this plan was cancelled by the Conservatives. With the lack of any other feasible proposal for additional places, it is time for the Conservatives to revisit the original proposal, and the development brief provides an excellent opportunity to take this plan forward. To sum up, the development brief needs to ensure that it is meeting the real needs of North Kingston residents - both present and future - and the two most pressing needs currently are more affordable housing and more school places. It would be a huge wasted opportunity if the brief failed to address these needs and instead delivered yet another large scale private development - out of keeping with the surrounding, cut off from the community and providing nothing of any value to residents. Sarah Olney Chair, North Kingston Liberal Democrats Lib Dem Prospective Parliamentary Candidate, Richmond Park and North Kingston</p>	<p>the Core Strategy (including DM15, and the Affordable Housing SPD).</p> <p>3. There is currently no envisaged need for a new primary school on the site. The responsibility for providing new schools now falls to the Education Funding Agency (EFA). The EFA have successfully gained planning consent for a new primary school in Norbiton, which will help address need locally.</p>	
54	Yasmene Davies (Local resident)	Strongly favour	<p>1. This area is no doubt in need of huge improvement for all - residential, educational, commercial, public space. It must not however</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p>	No change.

			<p>become simply a local hang out for students, with a high street aimed at cheap retail/food shops. No one will want to live or spend time there besides students if that becomes the case. The target population for the flats, high street and park should be aimed predominantly at local families and professionals, as well as students.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Question 2a & 2b - Do you support the overarching objectives for North Kingston?

ID Number	Respondent	Question 2a: Do you support the overarching objectives for North Kingston?	Question 2b: Do you have any comments?	RBK Response	Document Update
1	Yvette (Local resident)	Strongly oppose		Noted.	No change.
2	Anthony Quinn (Local resident)			Noted.	No change.
3	John De'Ath (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	1. The Richmond Road shops are scruffy, as the area is only few hundred metres from main Kingston shops, it just attracts the tatty residue. There is a supermarket one end of site so accept that the shops aren't needed. Make it residential or provide a decent car park for town centre workers so you don't have to keep creeping the residents zone boundaries as all it does is move the all day Parkersburg, not encourage them to take public transport	1. Comment noted.	No change.
4	Russell Pedley (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
5	K. Mayer (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. See section 1 for all my objections to the plan.	1. Comment noted.	No change.
6	Maurice Bentley (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
7	E John (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
8	Chris Kent (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

9	G T KNIGHT (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
10	Carl Clarke (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
11	Steve Hollands (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
12	S Watson (Local resident)		<p>1. In favour of development of area to improve environment and public space- not in favour of yet more residential spaces. Bringing more residents in to this area will snarl up the roads even more- these residents will have cars!! 2. Biggest concern is the impact on schools in the area- local primary schools at maximum- you need to build the infrastructure to support the increase in residential spaces- invest in more (proper) primary schools.</p>	<p>1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p> <p>2. There is currently no envisaged need for a new primary school on the site. The responsibility for providing new schools now falls to the Education Funding Agency (EFA). The EFA have successfully gained planning consent for a new primary school in Norbiton, which will help address need locally.</p>	No change.
13	Andrew Payne (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	<p>1. I really feel that improvements cannot be made in the borough's air quality, when the residential density keeps increasing, this is also so as regards to noise.</p>	<p>1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

14	Matt Williams (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
15	Rachel Hapoienu (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
16	Jessamy Oldfield (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose		Noted.	No change.
17	Jonathan rollason (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
18	John Roscoe (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
19	Rupert Moor (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. More detail needed before further comment can be made.	1. Comment noted. This brief is intended to provide guidance and a long-term vision for the area. Individual planning applications for specific developers will be made available on our website for public consultation as and when these come forward.	No change.
20	Neil Fulk (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
21	Richard Williams (Local resident)	Neutral	1. My main concern with the plan is the impact on the area just outside the boundary: in particular, Richmond Road between Sury Basin and King's Road. This is already a busy and dangerous stretch of road - particularly so during the rush hour when children living in Canbury ward cross Richmond Road to catch the northbound number 65 bus. There is also considerable pedestrian traffic associated with the Sainsbury's supermarket. The alterations to the road layout appear likely to funnel more traffic down Sury Basin towards Richmond Road, creating a busier left turn at the junction of Sury Basin and Richmond Road. This will have a direct impact on the pedestrian crossing used by schoolchildren and shoppers. This stretch of	1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.	No change.

			Richmond Road is already very busy. Cars are driven at high speed on the two-lane northbound section of the road, before the traffic is funnelled into a single lane after the King's Road junction. Traffic calming measures are needed here, and I believe this need will be increased if the North Kingston plan is implemented. Measures could include one or more of the following: (1) narrowing the northbound section of the road by introducing a bus and cycle lane; (2) speed bumps and speed cameras; (3) an additional set of traffic lights at the junction of Richmond Park Road, breaking up the flow of traffic (under this proposal, Richmond Park Road would become one-way west to east, and King's Road one-way east to west, between Richmond Road and Burton Road).		
22	John Pitts (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
23	Samantha Murphy (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted.	No change.
24	J Langridge (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
25	Frances Noel (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	See above.	Support noted.	No change.
26	M Ellis (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
27	Chris Parry (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
28	C Parkins-Godwin (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
29	Pat Lally (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Need a wide variety of retail shops along Richmond Road	1. Comment noted.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

30	Anne (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
31	Simon Pain (Local resident)	Neutral	1. why is it written so small?? didn't I just read this document?	1. Comment noted. Admittedly the presentation of this information on the online questionnaire was small and illegible. This was intended for display purposes only and links were provided to give full access to the document. The Council has noted this to avoid this issue in the future.	Quality of image has been improved.
32	Marilyn Mason (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Affordable housing is vital as there is not enough of this in Kingston, 2. and affordable retail/business units designated to independent traders and start-ups would help to give the area its own character rather than allowing it to be dominated by chain store and chain food outlet branches, and supermarkets . Active movement through the area and environmental improvements sound promising - hope they are enforced.	1. The delivery of affordable housing will be controlled on individual planning applications. The Council will ensure any proposed development's accordance with the Core Strategy (including DM15, and the Affordable Housing SPD). 2. The development brief does not deal with issues of commercial operation of landlords. However, the brief will be fully compliant with the London Plan which supports small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).	Change. Page 33, para 5. Text added: ' <i>The provision of affordable homes on site must comply with policies set out in the London Plan and the Local Plan</i> '.
33	Alison Pope (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
34	J Sellars (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Favour provided cycle routes are clearly demarcated from pedestrian routes. Also that present traffic flow arrangements along Gibbon Road are maintained.	1. In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes. Transport for London's new Cycling Design Standards (Dec 2014) advises that cyclists and pedestrians should not be forced together where there is space to keep them apart, creating unnecessary conflict which can only increase as the number of cyclists rises. Where possible and appropriate the Council will introduce segregated cycle lanes.	No change.
35	Denise Fraser (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. I do not believe that the proposals adequately addresses the issues of noise and air quality as	1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the	No change.

			per objective 6. If Seven Kings Way is opened to two way traffic or becomes a main thoroughfare then the noise would increase and the air quality would decrease for the residents of Royal Quarter.	borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.	
36	Michael McGrail (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
37	Robert Marshall (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
38	Duncan Combe (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted.	No change.
39	Mary Graham (Local resident)	Neutral	1. The most important issue is truly affordable housing for rent - it is becoming impossible for people on the national minimum wage to find housing in the borough and this needs to be addressed	1. Comment noted. The delivery of affordable housing will be controlled on individual planning applications. The Council will ensure any proposed development's accordance with the Core Strategy (including DM15, and the Affordable Housing SPD).	Change. Page 33, para 5. Text added: ' <i>The provision of affordable homes on site must comply with policies set out in the London Plan and the Local Plan</i> '.
40	Joanne Melbourne (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. No - they are a load of flowery rubbish with no substance or significance on what people require or what this town needs - and it is not more high rise and more traffic. What does "support existing surrounding education use" mean -it's subjective nonsense! More retail outletsshops already closing down in rapid succession in Kingston so why do we need more? They will remain boarded up - there are already many empty shops on Richmond Road - NO MORE SHOPS GREED< DISREGARD AND MORE GREED - that is what I see - sad day for Kingston upon Thames	1. Comments noted. One of the development brief objectives is to 'reinforce the identity of Richmond Road as a local high street, with public open space, diverse community facilities and improvements to the retail'. The brief seeks to support educational facilities in the area such as Kingston College and the Creative Industries Centre with the intention to create a new mixed-used education quarter that will contribute to Kingston's reputation for the delivery of quality education.	No change.

<p>41</p>	<p>Jonathan Rollason (Local resident)</p>	<p>Neutral</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the north Kingston development plan. I am supportive but have two issues. 1. The first is the density and the effect this will have on the quality of life in the neighbourhood. The money developers provide never covers the whole cost of improvements needed and we have seen a serious erosion of services. As an example it now takes two weeks to see a Doctor for a routine appointment. It used to take 3 days. I would request the council adopts a target density of 215 units per hectare to protect the borough. 2. The second is connected and is the height of the tower on the council land. I understand the council wants to maximise the income from the site but surely not at any cost. The site is surrounded by much smaller buildings on all sides. A 12 storey building is simply too large and we know developers will suggest 15 storey's. This will be followed by a huge fight and they will eventually accept 12 storey's if that's is what the plan says. The maximum height should not exceed 9 storey's which would fit in with adjacent buildings. Please amend the plan.</p>	<p>1. The appropriate density for new developments is set by the Greater London Authority (GLA) through the London Plan. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6. Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The infrastructure needs of the Borough are significantly greater than the funding likely to be realised through CIL or planning obligations or a combination of both. The Council will seek to prioritise CIL use as a match or gap funding source, linked to other infrastructure funding. As part of the production of the Council's new Local Plan for the Borough, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be reviewed. It is important to note that growth in the Borough is set to continue and the production of a new Local Plan and supporting evidence studies is intended to strengthen the Council's position to maximise opportunities for planned growth, including the provision of adequate infrastructure. Without this, the predicted growth will result in piecemeal development that is unable to secure maximum public benefits.</p> <p>2. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>42</p>	<p>Richard Robinson (Local resident)</p>	<p>Neutral</p>		<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

43	Kingston Cycling Campaign (local organisation)	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
44	Xxx xxx (unknown)	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
45	Robert James (Local resident)	Strongly favour	<p>1. Hope that the identity of Richmond Road as a shopping centre will remain different from the town centre 2. Hope that the proportion of affordable housing will be high and mix rented, bought and shared equity properties. 3. A variety of employment would be welcome, especially if it aims to include a good proportion of high skill, high income work for residents in Kingston's expensive property. 4. Welcome the inclusion of the improvement of air quality as an objective in this heavily trafficked area.</p>	<p>1. The brief aims to establish an 'improved' High Street by locating commercial, retail, cafe/restaurant or leisure uses on the ground floor on Richmond Road developments to strengthen the draw of Richmond Road.</p> <p>2. The delivery of affordable housing will be controlled on individual planning applications. The Council will ensure any proposed development's accordance with the Core Strategy (including DM15, and the Affordable Housing SPD).</p> <p>Comment 3 noted.</p> <p>4. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	<p>Change. Page 33, para 5. Text added: '<i>The provision of affordable homes on site must comply with policies set out in the London Plan and the Local Plan</i>'. Change. Page 27, para 2: wording change from 'A mixed use model with homes located above commercial, retail or leisure use is the preferred option' to 'A mixed use model with homes located above commercial, retail, cafe/restaurant or leisure use is the preferred option'.</p>
46	Des McRow (Local resident)	Strongly favour	None	Noted.	No change.
47	Sumit Thakur, Chairman (Royal Quarter Residents Association)	Strongly favour		Noted.	No change.

48	Sumit Thakur (Local resident)	Strongly favour	1. I fully accept and support the objectives but just not the conversion of the Seven Kings Way into a major road to feed traffic onto the Richmond Road.	1. Support noted. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.	No change.
49	Shinjini Thakur (Local resident)	Strongly favour	1. I fully accept and support the objectives but just not the conversion of the Seven Kings Way into a major road to feed traffic onto the Richmond Road.	1. Support noted. A traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area	No change.
50	Iain Martin MSc CMILT	Somewhat favour	1. Objectives are too vague.	1. Comment noted	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

51	Beverley Tourle	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
52	Diane Watling (Local resident)	Strongly favour	1. The council should consider affordable private rental accommodation such as: The collective Essential Living Y:Cube BedZed Zed factory - Z Pod (good use of car parks) More Pocket developments	1. Comment noted.	No change.
53	Sarah Olney (North Kingston Liberal Democrats)	Strongly oppose		Noted.	No change.
54	Yasmene Davies (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. For sure the area, including the Richmond road retail units that will be the high street, needs smartening up - 100%. Both structurally and in the diversity of shops and services on offer. 'Improvements' to retail are definitely needed. At the moment it is a rather grubby area that no one wants to spend any time on. It is the kind of place that people just pass by as quickly as possible. Having said that it could easily be made into a high street aimed at students - of course it would be good to be inclusive of students needs but not if it ends up being aimed at cheap food/retail units and becomes a student hang out. It should include and inspire all. 2. The development is strongly in favour of intense residential development but there is no cap on this and little comment in the brief to state for sure how increased demand for primary school places locally will be met by this new influx of residents. Does the Councils' School place planning strategy 2013 - 2020 take into account the number of residents who might increase from this, and/or does this development take into account the maximum number of school places that will be available? The surrounding Royal Quarters is dedicated to high rise flats which are an eye sore and it would be a shame to carry on this intensity of soulless and imposing residential development. 3. The vision points towards a modern and flexible employment space but there	Comments 1-3 noted. 2. There is currently no envisaged need for a new primary school on the site. The responsibility for providing new schools now falls to the Education Funding Agency (EFA). The EFA have successfully gained planning consent for a new primary school in Norbiton, which will help address need locally. 3. Regarding small/medium sized local business, the development brief does not deal with issues of commercial operation of landlords. However, the brief will be fully compliant with the London Plan which supports small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). An Article 4 Direction was introduced in October 2015 to mitigate against the conversion of commercial land to residential use.	Change. Page 27, para 2: wording change from 'A mixed use model with homes located above commercial, retail or leisure use is the preferred option' to 'A mixed use model with homes located above commercial, retail, <i>cafe/restaurant</i> or leisure use is the preferred option'.

		<p>is no clarification of what kind of space, or how or where this is being done. Until the large land parcel at 54 Kingsgate Road (now owned by Investra) was demolished in January, there was formerly a huge office facility on this land - this was a much used service for local independent businesses. Since the planning laws changed so that commercial units could be developed into residential units without permission, a huge proportion of offices and commercial units have been developed into residential units. This is a massive constraint and challenge on local business growth. It is becoming stifling for small businesses to find work places in town centres, where they need to be to do business with clientele. I strongly agree that modern and flexible employment space is needed, but this does not seem to get much emphasis in the brief. If this is supposed to be a mixed use area, it is an opportunity to not only address residential needs, but also redress the balance of commercial needs. Do we really need so many more flats in an area that has already been built up so intensely with flats? Could we not look at making it a really bustling and diverse area which is more in balance for commercial / office as well as residential and education?</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Question 3a

Enhancing existing pedestrian connections



Site pedestrian and cycle connections to local amenities including Kingston station



Sopwith Way and Seven Kings Way junction improvements



Left turn from Sopwith Way onto Richmond Road



Richmond Road remodelling to become two-way



Widening and realignment of Seven Kings Way



Closure of Kingsgate Road



■ Strongly favour
 ■ Somewhat favour
 ■ Neutral
 ■ Somewhat oppose
 ■ Strongly oppose
 ■ Don't know

Base: All respondents (in brackets for each measure) Note: Not all figures may add up to 100% due to rounding

Question 3b - Do you have any comments?

ID Number	Respondent	Question 3b: Do you have any comments?	RBK Response	Document Update
3	John De'Ath (Local resident)	1. Why not close Sopwith Way and make it one big gyratory, you could get rid of those signalised crossings from the area to the station	1. Comment noted.	No change.
7	E John (Local resident)	1. Street names should have been put on the above map	1. Comment noted.	<p>Change. Page 5, plan title change from 'Figure Ground Plan showing large voids in the urban fabric highlighting the sites underutilisation' to 'Figure Ground Plan 2015: the large voids in the urban fabric <i>display</i> the sites underutilisation'. Slight amendment to Ground Plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 7, Plan showing current land ownership boundaries; Page 10, Movement and Access Plan; Page 12, Activity and Edges Plan; Page 14, Land Use Plan; Page 16, Public Realm & Public Open Space Plan; Page 18, Heights Plan; Page 21, Development Parcels; Page 22, Safeguarding Plan; Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 42, Land Ownership Plan. Road names 'Sury Basin' and 'Sopwith Way' have been added to plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 8, Concept Plan: Wording of 'Proposed Quiet Route' changed to 'Proposed <i>Cycle</i> Route'.</p> <p>Change. Page 10, Movement and Access Plan:</p>

				<p>'Potential Dedicated Cycle Route' has been removed from map. Wording of 'indicative Shared Space Route' has been changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>'. Wording of 'Indicative Quiet Route' has been changed to '<i>Indicative Cycle Route</i>'. Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 14, Land Use Plan Addition of wording '<i>(including A2/A3)</i>' after 'retail' on the 2nd and 5th points of the key.</p> <p>Change. Page 18, Heights Plan: Asterix removed from 'Up to maximum 12 storeys*' Note at bottom of page amended from '*Please note: 'Storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor' to 'Please note: <i>All 'storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor</i>'</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan: Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 26, Design Framework: Richmond Road; Page 28, Framework Plan: North South Linear Park; Page 30, Framework Plan: East West Linear Park; Page 34, Surrounding Infrastructure; Page 36, Humanise Surrounding Streets 1) 'Potential Cycle Only Route'</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

				<p>removed from key</p> <p>2) 'Potential Shared Space Car park Access' changed to 'Shared Space Car Park Access' on key.</p> <p>3) 'Proposed Quiet Way' changed to 'Indicative Cycle Route' on key.</p> <p>4) 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' changed to 'Indicative Pedestrian and Cycle Route Only' on key.</p>
12	S Watson (Local resident)	1. These road closures will not improve traffic flow- envisage a future of traffic misery	1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.	No change.
13	Andrew Payne (Local resident)	1. Air quality and noise will increase,also feel that traffic problems could become far worse in an area which has existing congestion, and particularly the air quality of the nearby existing residential area would be adversely effected.	1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.	No change.
15	Rachel Hapoienu (Local resident)	1. How would such reconstruction work, logistically? You would have to close at least some of the lanes for weeks if not months, exacerbating an already horrendous traffic situation. 2. It sounds like these changes would only make the traffic situation worse, not better - for instance, though it is mildly inconvenient that Richmond Road is only	<p>1. Understandably there are concerns about the disruption caused during construction phases, particularly of the road network in the North Kingston area. The necessary mitigation measures will be in place in order to minimise the impact to existing residents.</p> <p>2. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated</p>	No change.

		<p>way, it goes a long way toward helping ease the traffic congestion in this area. To make it two-way would attract more cars and more traffic.</p>	<p>safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p>	
17	Jonathan rollason (Local resident)	<p>1. Concerned about traffic flows and where traffic will back up during rush hours. Could a tunnel be build rather than just closing Kingsgate Road that would allow site development? 2. Also concerned about road safety with circle route crossing major road.</p>	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>2. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	No change.
18	John Roscoe (Local resident)	<p>1. With the river to one side, there are limited ways to get from north Kingston south to the M3, etc. Already richmond road jams, so I'm not sure how the changes will help this. I don't believe much of the traffic could change to cycle or pedestrians, since surely people already walk if they can given the traffic and parking difficulties.</p>	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this</p>	No change.

			<p>route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>The Council's transport policies give priority to pedestrian and cycle movement. There is a consistent approach across all areas of the borough including North Kingston. The aim is to encourage the greatest possible use of these modes by making new development fully accessible to these users.</p>	
19	Rupert Moor (Local resident)	1. The road layout is fine, but consider adding (and maintaining) more trees and shrubs, closing Seven Kings Way at junction with A307, and making it access only from Sury Basin.	1. Comment noted.	No change.
21	Richard Williams (Local resident)	1. My main concern with the plan is the impact on the area just outside the boundary: in particular, Richmond Road between Sury Basin and King's Road. This is already a busy and dangerous stretch of road - particularly so during the rush hour when children living in Canbury ward cross Richmond Road to catch the northbound number 65 bus. There is also considerable pedestrian traffic associated with the Sainsbury's supermarket. The alterations to the road layout appear likely to funnel more traffic down Sury Basin towards Richmond Road, creating a busier left turn at the junction of Sury Basin and Richmond Road. This will have a direct impact on the pedestrian crossing used by schoolchildren and shoppers. This stretch of Richmond Road is already very busy. Cars are driven at high speed on the two-lane northbound section of the road, before the traffic is funnelled into a single lane after the King's Road junction. Traffic calming measures are needed here, and I believe this need will be increased if the North Kingston plan is implemented. Measures could include one or more of the following: (1) narrowing the northbound section of the road by	<p>1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p> <p>2. It is the long-term ambition of the Council to implement a left turn from Sopwith Way onto Richmond Road to further ease traffic in this area. This is subject to land ownership issues. Page 22 of the brief identifies safeguarding methods the Council will employ to help deliver this in the future.</p>	No change.

		<p>introducing a bus and cycle lane; (2) speed bumps and speed cameras; (3) an additional set of traffic lights at the junction of Richmond Park Road, breaking up the flow of traffic (under this proposal, Richmond Park Road would become one-way west to east, and King's Road one-way east to west, between Richmond Road and Burton Road).</p> <p>2. I also believe it will be very difficult to introduce a left turn into Richmond Road from Sopwith Way and to make the stretch of Richmond Road between Sopwith Way and Richmond College two-way without disrupting pedestrian and cycle traffic.</p>		
23	Samantha Murphy (Local resident)	<p>1. As my comments earlier, I am concerned about the air quality impacts of having all vehicles going past properties on Seven Kings Way. 2. I am concerned about if a vehicle breaks down on Seven Kings Way there is no contingency for vehicles getting through & this causing back up on to the Loop I am concerned there is inadequate turning space for buses/ HGVs using Seven Kings Way I am concerned about signage on the road on Seven Kings Way & request this be carefully thought about. 3. I am concerned about the increased level of traffic on Seven Kings Way & Sury Basin given the new housing and hotel development. I do not understand how cyclists will get to the centre pink coloured route from the Loop and Sury Basin and whether this would mean that there would be a need for more pelican crossings causing more driver delay. I am concerned that narrowing the Richmond Road to 17m should still include a dedicated bus lane & a lane for other traffic.</p>	<p>Comments 1-3 noted.</p> <p>1.The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p> <p>2. The revised highway arrangements in North Kingston build in an element of resilience to allow for incidents such as a broken down vehicle blocking the road.</p> <p>3. A traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p>	No change.

24	J Langridge (Local resident)	<p>1. I would be concerned with traffic congestion on Richmond Road especially heading toward the town centre, currently Richmond Rd suffers badly from jams at rush hour and when the schools are finishing (often backing up to the schools themselves) this is likely to get even worse now that there is an extra school sited there. Although it is only a small section that is currently one way before Sopwith Way it does help to free up traffic flow a little, if the proposal is to make this section 2 way without widening the road to 3 lanes, I think this will be a bad idea. I do very much approve of the proposed 2 way cycle lane along Richmond Rd from the station to Sury Basin, something that is much needed.</p>	<p>1. The plans for the area include the widening of Richmond Road to accommodate two way traffic at its southern end and the left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road. The road will also be upgraded to accommodate the requirements of both pedestrians and cyclists in a safe manner, and ensure access to shops and other ground floor uses. The revised arrangements have been modelled to ensure their adequate operation.</p> <p>The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p>	No change.
25	Frances Noel (Local resident)	<p>1. This area needs detailed consideration and modelling. I do not agree with bringing high volume of traffic round Seven Kings car park with more congestion encroaching further into North Kingston.</p>	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p>	No change.
26	M Ellis (Local resident)	<p>1. From a personal perspective, it would be helpful if vehicle travel times from North Kingston through central Kingston and out again were not increased due to these changes.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p>	No change.
27	Chris Parry (Local	<p>1. Closure of roads causes the re-routing of traffic. this is all very well if the balance and</p>	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston</p>	No change.

	resident)	<p>ease of passage through the area is maintained for all road users. There's opportunity to ensure that the new junctions are sufficiently large to accommodate with-flow pedestrian and cycle facilities. What we don't want is another all red pedestrian crossing phase at the junction of Seven Kings Way and Sury Basin, or again the junction of Sury Basin and Richmond Rd, if it is being remodelled. Again if Richmond Rd is being made two way (I would imagine mainly for local access and buses) it is essential that three full lanes fed by two standard lane of 3.5metre are offered southbound. No per all red at the junction either. This will ensure North Kingston residents retain their ability to get south and west through Kingston by road. The southbound bus lane is effectively obsolete in normal peak period conditions, because the flow southbound is constrained by the poor layout (lack of two good queuing lanes) at the junction of Richmond Rd and Kings road. Providing the bus lane is removed between Sury Basin and Sopwith Way then the planned changes should in the development brief should work.</p>	<p>Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>The remodelling and upgrading of the road network in the North Kingston Development Brief include new/improved crossings for cyclists and pedestrians at key locations to allow the safe passage of these road users.</p> <p>In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes.</p>	
30	Anne (Local resident)	<p>1. Not the clearest of maps. Word have helped with a few main roads marked.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p>	<p>Change. Page 5, plan title change from 'Figure Ground Plan showing large voids in the urban fabric highlighting the sites underutilisation' to 'Figure Ground Plan 2015: the large voids in the urban fabric <i>display</i> the sites underutilisation'. Slight amendment to Ground Plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 7, Plan showing current land ownership boundaries; Page 10, Movement and Access Plan; Page 12, Activity and Edges Plan; Page 14, Land Use Plan; Page 16, Public Realm & Public Open</p>

				<p>Space Plan; Page 18, Heights Plan; Page 21, Development Parcels; Page 22, Safeguarding Plan; Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 42, Lan Ownership Plan. Road names '<i>Sury Basin</i>' and '<i>Sopwith Way</i>' have been added to plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 8, Concept Plan: Wording of 'Proposed Quiet Route' changed to 'Proposed <i>Cycle Route</i>'.</p> <p>Change. Page 10, Movement and Access Plan: 'Potential Dedicated Cycle Route' has been removed from map. Wording of 'indicative Shared Space Route' has been changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>'. Wording of 'Indicative Quiet Route' has been changed to '<i>Indicative Cycle Route</i>'. Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 14, Land Use Plan Addition of wording '<i>(including A2/A3)</i>' after 'retail' on the 2nd and 5th points of the key.</p> <p>Change. Page 18, Heights Plan: Asterix removed from 'Up to maximum 12 storeys*' Note at bottom of page amended from '*Please note: 'Storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor' to 'Please note: <i>All 'storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor</i>'</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan: Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 26, Design Framework: Richmond Road; Page 28, Framework Plan: North South Linear Park; Page 30, Framework Plan: East West Linear Park; Page 34, Surrounding Infrastructure; Page 36, Humanise Surrounding Streets</p> <p>1) 'Potential Cycle Only Route' removed from key</p> <p>2) 'Potential Shared Space Car park Access' changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>' on key.</p> <p>3) 'Proposed Quiet Way' changed to '<i>Indicative Cycle Route</i>' on key.</p> <p>4) 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' changed to '<i>Indicative Pedestrian and Cycle Route Only</i>' on key.</p>
31	Simon Pain (Local resident)	1. how am I supposed to form a view based on this map? I can't even tell where it is. It could be anywhere.	1. Comment noted.	<p>Change. Page 5, plan title change from 'Figure Ground Plan showing large voids in the urban fabric highlighting the sites underutilisation' to 'Figure Ground Plan 2015: <i>the large voids in the urban fabric display the sites underutilisation</i>'. Slight amendment to Ground Plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 7, Plan showing current land ownership boundaries; Page 10, Movement and Access Plan; Page 12, Activity and Edges Plan; Page</p>

				<p>14, Land Use Plan; Page 16, Public Realm & Public Open Space Plan; Page 18, Heights Plan; Page 21, Development Plan; Page 22, Safeguarding Framework Plan; Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 42, Lan Ownership Plan. Road names '<i>Sury Basin</i>' and '<i>Sopwith Way</i>' have been added to plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 8, Concept Plan: Wording of 'Proposed Quiet Route' changed to 'Proposed <i>Cycle Route</i>'.</p> <p>Change. Page 10, Movement and Access Plan: 'Potential Dedicated Cycle Route' has been removed from map. Wording of 'indicative Shared Space Route' has been changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>'. Wording of 'Indicative Quiet Route' has been changed to '<i>Indicative Cycle Route</i>'. Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 14, Land Use Plan Addition of wording '<i>(including A2/A3)</i>' after 'retail' on the 2nd and 5th points of the key.</p> <p>Change. Page 18, Heights Plan: Asterisk removed from 'Up to maximum 12 storeys*' Note at bottom of page amended from '*Please note: 'Storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor' to 'Please note: <i>All</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>'storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor'</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan: Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 26, Design Framework: Richmond Road; Page 28, Framework Plan: North South Linear Park; Page 30, Framework Plan: East West Linear Park; Page 34, Surrounding Infrastructure; Page 36, Humanise Surrounding Streets</p> <p>1) 'Potential Cycle Only Route' removed from key</p> <p>2) 'Potential Shared Space Car park Access' changed to 'Shared Space Car Park Access' on key.</p> <p>3) 'Proposed Quiet Way' changed to 'Indicative Cycle Route' on key.</p> <p>4) 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' changed to 'Indicative Pedestrian and Cycle Route Only' on key.</p>
32	Marilyn Mason (Local resident)	1. Enhancing and increasing pedestrian and cycling connections N-S and E-W is a good idea, and should include bridges over busy roads.	1. Support noted.	No change.
34	J Sellars (Local resident)	1. As previous	1. See Response to Question 2.	No change.
35	Denise Fraser (Local resident)	1. The detrimental effect that the widening and realignment of Seven Kings Way would have on the residents of Royal Quarter has not been given enough consideration and needs to be re-considered.	1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston	No change.

			area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.	
38	Duncan Combe (Local resident)	1. Severn Kings Way is already a race track and busy thoroughfare. Any works will have to dramatically slow traffic speeds in this area and prioritise pedestrian movement/crossing. I am not in favour of closing Kingsgate Road as this is a more logical exit route to Richmond. If this road were to be closed, it is essential to have a left turn from Sopwith Way onto Richmond Road to avoid future gridlock. As an example, during the Nov/Dec Christmas shopping period, traffic is already backed up on to the one way system from Seven Kings Road and this must be able to disperse more easily to support better vehicle flows.	1. The A traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.	No change.
39	Mary Graham (Local resident)	1. I can't understand how making Richmond Road two way is going to improve traffic flow - the worst pollution comes from idling cars. 2. Also you have just completely closed Thameside to through traffic and the only sensible way to access our homes at the end of Downhall Road is by way of Seven Kings Way and then turn left and left again - we did not receive written notification of these changes and now have to explain to delivery drivers how to gain access - how will we access Downhall Road (where a new 4 star hotel is just about to open) whilst this is taking place?	1. The plans for the area include the widening of Richmond Road to accommodate two way traffic at its southern end and the left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road. The road will also be upgraded to accommodate the requirements of both pedestrians and cyclists in a safe manner, and ensure access to shops and other ground floor uses. The revised arrangements have been modelled to ensure their adequate operation. A traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. 2. While the Council appreciates that construction phases of projects of this nature can be frustrating, especially for Local residents, the Council will work with developers and partners to do all they can to minimise disruption.	No change.
40	Joanne Melbourne (Local resident)	1. YOU HAVE NOT THOUGHT THIS THROUGH - YOUR APPROACH SEEMS TO BE 'LET'S JUST CLOSE OUR EYES AND HOPE IT GOES AWAY'.....BUILDING ALL THESE FLATS WILL INCREASE VEHICLES AND CONGESTION IN THE AREA. THIS IS NOT GOING TO WORK YOU ARE GOING TO CAUSE CHAOS! T There is no room in this area for more roads	1. Comments noted. A traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy	No change.

		- plus Richmond Road passes through Petersham where there is terrible road congestion already and traffic jams constantly along Richmond Road from Ham to Kingston. NO! NO! NO!	goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.	
41	Jonathan Rollason (Local resident)	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the north Kingston development plan. I am supportive but have two issues. 1. The first is the density and the effect this will have on the quality of life in the neighbourhood. The money developers provide never covers the whole cost of improvements needed and we have seen a serious erosion of services. As an example it now takes two weeks to see a Doctor for a routine appointment. It used to take 3 days. I would request the council adopts a target density of 215 units per hectare to protect the borough. 2. The second is connected and is the height of the tower on the council land. I understand the council wants to maximise the income from the site but surely not at any cost. The site is surrounded by much smaller buildings on all sides. A 12 storey building is simply too large and we know developers will suggest 15 storey's. This will be followed by a huge fight and they will eventually accept 12 storey's if that's is what the plan says. The maximum height should not exceed 9 storey's which would fit in with adjacent buildings. Please amend the plan.	<p>1. The appropriate density for new developments is set by the Greater London Authority (GLA) through the London Plan. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6. Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The infrastructure needs of the Borough are significantly greater than the funding likely to be realised through CIL or planning obligations or a combination of both. The Council will seek to prioritise CIL use as a match or gap funding source, linked to other infrastructure funding. As part of the production of the Council's new Local Plan for the Borough, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be reviewed. It is important to note that growth in the Borough is set to continue and the production of a new Local Plan and supporting evidence studies is intended to strengthen the Council's position to maximise opportunities for planned growth, including the provision of adequate infrastructure. Without this, the predicted growth will result in piecemeal development that is unable to secure maximum public benefits.</p> <p>2. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p>	No change.
43	Kingston Cycling Campaign (local organisation)	1. A separated cycle facility is needed on Sury Basin where people can cycle separately from traffic. Access to Sainsbury's and the gym are needed. A Toucan crossing facility is needed between Gibbon Road and Sury Basin.	1. Comment noted. In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes.	No change.
44	Xxx xxx (unknown)	1. The one way system is so awful to navigate and traffic is a reason that many people site for actively avoiding visiting	1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated	No change.

		<p>Kingston. It seems closing a road will force people travelling towards Richmond Rd to spend longer on the one way system. I would suggest routing traffic away from the one way system would be a better idea. 2. Great to create separate cycle lanes, however it's no use of cycles don't use them. On the current cycle lanes there are always cyclists who opt not to use them as they find the roads quicker. It adds to traffic congestion and increases risk for cyclists. Suggest some policing of cycle lanes.</p>	<p>safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>2. In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes. Transport for London's new Cycling Design Standards (Dec 2014) advises that cyclists and pedestrians should not be forced together where there is space to keep them apart, creating unnecessary conflict which can only increase as the number of cyclists rises. Where possible and appropriate the Council will introduce segregated cycle lanes.</p>	
45	Robert James (Local resident)	<p>1. Welcome emphasising and prioritising pedestrian and cycling connections and routes. Hope that attention will be paid to connections with routes to and from the development area: ~ Crossing Richmond Road-Acre Road ~ Provision for 2-way cycling in Acre Road ~ Crossing Richmond Road to existing cycle route on Canbury Park Road both from development area and from cycle route from station and Go Cycling station plaza. ~ Making Canbury Passage cyclable as part of the proposed quiet route.</p>	<p>1. Support noted. In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes. Transport for London's new Cycling Design Standards (Dec 2014) advises that cyclists and pedestrians should not be forced together where there is space to keep them apart, creating unnecessary conflict which can only increase as the number of cyclists rises. Where possible and appropriate the Council will introduce segregated cycle lanes.</p>	No change.
46	Des McRow (Local resident)	<p>1. The proposals for Seven Kings Way and its relationship with Sopwith Way makes very little sense . This matter is covered in greater depth in my response to Question 7.</p>	<p>1. See response to Question 7</p>	No change.
47	Sumit Thakur, Chairman (Royal Quarter Residents)	<p>1. The proposals for Seven Kings Way and its relationship with Sopwith Way makes very little sense . This matter is covered in greater depth in our response to Question 7</p>	<p>1. See response to Question 7</p>	No change.

	Association)			
48	Sumit Thakur (Local resident)	1. The proposals for Seven Kings Way and its relationship with Sopwith Way makes very little sense. I strongly oppose widening and realignment of the Seven Kings Way.	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. In addition to the changes being made to Sury Basin, Richmond Road, and Sopwith Way, these proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	No change.
49	Shinjini Thakur (Local resident)	1. The proposals for Seven Kings Way and its relationship with Sopwith Way makes very little sense. I strongly oppose widening and realignment of the Seven Kings Way.	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. In addition to the changes being amde to Sury Basin, Richmond Road, and Sopwith Way, these proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	No change.
50	Iain Martin	1. The proposals are too dependent on the introduction of Crossrail 2 which is not yet	Comments 1-8 noted.	No change.

	MSc CMILT	<p>fully committed. 2. The 20mph speed limit on the Inner Ring Road gyratory system is unrealistic. 3. There is insufficient provision for road traffic including buses on the radial routes. 4. The design of road junctions will be critical to the smooth flow of traffic. 5. More consultation is needed on the specific proposals as it is too dependent on so-called public transport hubs. 6. The new Seven Kings Way route needs to be better defined. 7. Kingston is in danger of ceasing to be an attractive location in South West London if traffic congestion and accessibility are compromised by new development.</p>	<p>1. The Council will actively plan for the arrival of Crossrail 2, although new growth in Kingston is not dependant on its delivery.</p> <p>2, 3 & 4: The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety.</p> <p>7. The Council works to increase the quality of the built environment as well as the quality of life within the borough. This includes ensuring the borough remains competitive and actively manages the impact of traffic and congestion through its long term development plans.</p>	
52	Diane Watling (Local resident)	<p>1. I fully appreciate how the closure of Kingsgate Road can be of benefit to the site, but further modelling of traffic options needs to be carefully considered both in terms of overall traffic movement benefit and pollution mitigation. I am concerned that the proposed widening of Seven Kings Way will make pedestrian and cyclist movement from East<->West difficult and dangerous across Seven Kings Way at a time when the council should be encouraging the use of this Quiet Route. A balance of traffic flow Northbound down both Seven Kings Way and Sopwith Way is essential. It is essential that pedestrian and cyclist movement across Seven Kings Way is safely prioritised. The Left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road is a good idea, but I understand that an interim measure along Walter Street will be necessary prior to the redevelopment of the Richmond Road frontage. A direct route for resident's cars to access the Queenshurst and Royal Quarter developments via Sury Basin when approaching from the North would make a lot of sense. Currently, cars can only access Seven Kings Way from the South via the Kingston one-way system, adding to the pollution currently experienced in the town centre. 2. Pedestrians and cyclists must be</p>	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>2. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	No change.

		able to move safely across Seven Kings Way, and at the junction of Seven Kings Way with Sury Basin. Traffic management measures will be required to ensure safe passage both across Seven Kings Way and at the Sury Basin junction when entering the Supermarket site from Seven Kings Way.		
54	Yasmene Davies (Local resident)	1. It is difficult for me to know whether this new plan will cope well with traffic. 2. However there seems to be no plans for both residents and customers to the new high street to find convenient parking.	1. The proposed changes to the road network as part of the North Kingston Development have been tested as part of the Kingston Town Centre Movement Study undertaken by Steer David Gleave on behalf of the council. The study demonstrates the proposed amended North Kingston highway layout operates satisfactorily. Proposed improvements to the highway network to accommodate development traffic have been designed to ensure the revised highway layout is not overly dominated by vehicular traffic and accessibility for non-car modes of transport is enhanced. 2. The North Kingston development site benefits from excellent accessibility for non-car modes of transport due to its close vicinity of Kingston train station, numerous local bus services and enhanced pedestrian and cycle links implemented as part of the development, which will encourage sustainable travel and reduce the need for on-site parking. Nevertheless, the development will ensure there is sufficient on-site facilities for servicing, emergency and disabled access. There will be existing public parking facilities across Kingston town centre which can be used by future users of the site.	No change..

The following consultees submitted a response but did not comment specifically on Question 3 of the survey.

ID	Name	ID	Name
1	Yvette (Local resident)	20	Neil Fulk (Local resident)
2	Anthony Quinn (Local resident)	22	John Pitts (Local resident)
4	Russell Pedley (Local resident)	28	C Parkins-Godwin (Local resident)
5	K. Mayer (Local resident)	29	Pat Lally (Local resident)

6	Maurice Bentley (Local resident)	33	Alison Pope (Local resident)
8	Chris Kent (Local resident)	36	Michael McGrail (Local resident)
9	G T KNIGHT (Local resident)	37	Robert Marshall (Local resident)
10	Carl Clarke (Local resident)	42	Richard Robinson (Local resident)
11	Steve Hollands (Local resident)	51	Beverley Tourle
14	Matt Williams (Local Resident)	53	Sarah Olney (North Kingston Liberal Democrats)
16	Jessamy Oldfield (Local resident)		

Question 4a & 4b - To what extent do you agree with the proposed 'Public Realm & Public Open Space Strategy and Principles'?

ID Number	Respondent	Question 4a: To what extent do you agree with the proposed 'Public Realm & Public Open Space Strategy and Principles'?	Question 4b: Do you have any comments?	RBK Response	Document Update
-----------	------------	--	--	--------------	-----------------

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

1	Yvette (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
2	Anthony Quinn (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. This Council and biodiversity!! That is a first! I do not envision anything meaningful being achieved in the area indicated and feel more attention should be given to our more rural areas.	1. Comment noted.	Change. Wording added to page 17, para 2: 'New public spaces will need to accommodate an appropriate means of dealing with water drainage to support biodiversity and address climate issues'.
3	John De'Ath (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. Keep the cross shape, but move the ends to the corners, so it is X Shaped. As orientated all the bits lead nowhere, so have to then walk half way along surrounding roads before continuing journey. May as well not bother if you need to continue journey along one of the roads.	1. Comment noted.	No change.
4	Russell Pedley (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
5	K. Mayer (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. See general objections under Question 1	1. See response to question 1.	No change.
6	Maurice Bentley (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
7	E John (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
8	Chris Kent (Local resident)			Noted	No change.
9	G T KNIGHT (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
10	Carl Clarke (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
11	Steve Hollands (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
12	S Watson (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

13	Andrew Payne (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
14	Matt Williams (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
15	Rachel Hapoienu (Local resident)	Neutral	1. I don't understand what these public spaces are or how they would be used or accessed.	1. The public spaces referred to in the brief (see page 16-17) refer to a new public park and green access routes (north-south and east-west) through the development site for pedestrians and cyclists (identified as public open space on the plan, p.16). These are for the enjoyment of everybody, accessible via numerous entrances surrounding the site. Additionally, residents of the developments will have access to the green open spaces identified as private on the plan, p.16.	No change.
16	Jessamy Oldfield (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
17	Jonathan rollason (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Concern about road safety with mixed users	1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.	No change.
18	John Roscoe (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

19	Rupert Moor (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. More detail needed before further comment can be made.	1. This brief is intended to provide guidance and a long-term vision for the area. The specific detail of the future developments on the site will come forward in individual planning applications which will be assessed on their own merit in the context of the this overall vision for the area set out by the Council and will be subject to individual consultation.	No change.
20	Neil Fulk (Local resident)	Strongly favour	1. Canbury Gardens should be looked at. Improvement required to cycle path and clearance of self sprouting trees on the river bank	1. Comment noted. Canbury Gardens is outside the scope of this development brief.	No change.
21	Richard Williams (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
22	John Pitts (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
23	Samantha Murphy (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. I agree with the provision of public realm spaces and increasing openness. However it should be clear how the public space will be funded given the Government's recent consultation on the funding issues surrounding public parks.	1. The ownership and maintenance of open space is critical to its long term success. This aspect of the scheme will be subject to agreement between the Council and landowners.	No change.
24	J Langridge (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Noted.	No change.
25	Frances Noel (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
26	M Ellis (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Anything is better than nothing but this looks like 2 cycle tracks with a bit of planting at the side. You only need to look at Skerne Walk to see how these schemes can end up looking boring and dull with limited variety of planting, most of it evergreen and low level, and not a flower, bird or butterfly to be seen. Any green space must be usable by wildlife, particularly as a desperately needed wildlife corridor. How about planting meadows? Proper hedging that encourages nesting birds? Trees that support wildlife?	1. Comment noted. The Council is committed to protecting and enhancing the borough's natural and green environment. This new public park will go some way to reduce green space deficiency in the area and is intended to contribute to improving green space connections to Canbury Gardens and the Riverside.	Change. Wording added to page 17, para 2: 'New public spaces will need to accommodate an appropriate means of dealing with water drainage to support biodiversity and address climatic issues'.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

27	Chris Parry (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Maximising green spaces is always a preferred option for residents,. And enhances the public realm.	1. Comment noted.	No change.
28	C Parkins-Godwin (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted	No change.
29	Pat Lally (Local resident)	Strongly favour	1. Provide plenty of lighting and surveillance to make public areas safe at night	1. Comment noted.	No change.
30	Anne (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Again a few landmarks named would make it much more clear.	1. Comment noted.	<p>Change. Page 5, plan title change from 'Figure Ground Plan showing large voids in the urban fabric highlighting the sites underutilisation' to 'Figure Ground Plan 2015: the large voids in the urban fabric <i>display</i> the sites underutilisation'. Slight amendment to Ground Plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 7, Plan showing current land ownership boundaries; Page 10, Movement and Access Plan; Page 12, Activity and Edges Plan; Page 14, Land Use Plan; Page 16, Public Realm & Public Open Space Plan; Page 18, Heights Plan; Page 21, Development Parcels; Page 22, Safeguarding Plan; Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 42, Lan Ownership Plan.</p> <p>Road names '<i>Sury Basin</i>' and '<i>Sopwith Way</i>' have been added to plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 8, Concept Plan: Wording of 'Proposed</p>

					<p>Quiet Route' changed to 'Proposed <i>Cycle</i> Route'.</p> <p>Change. Page 10, Movement and Access Plan: 'Potential Dedicated Cycle Route' has been removed from map. Wording of 'indicative Shared Space Route' has been changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>'. Wording of 'Indicative Quiet Route' has been changed to 'Indicative <i>Cycle</i> Route'. Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 14, Land Use Plan Addition of wording '<i>(including A2/A3)</i>' after 'retail' on the 2nd and 5th points of the key.</p> <p>Change. Page 18, Heights Plan: Asterix removed from 'Up to maximum 12 storeys*' Note at bottom of page amended from '*Please note: 'Storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor' to 'Please note: <i>All 'storey</i>' heights are inclusive of ground floor'</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan: Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Framework Plan; Page 26, Design Framework: Richmond Road; Page 28, Framework Plan: North South Linear Park; Page 30, Framework Plan: East West Linear Park; Page 34, Surrounding Infrastructure; Page 36, Humanise Surrounding Streets</p> <p>1) 'Potential Cycle Only Route' removed from key</p> <p>2) 'Potential Shared Space Car park Access' changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>' on key.</p> <p>3) 'Proposed Quiet Way' changed to '<i>Indicative Cycle Route</i>' on key.</p> <p>4) 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' changed to '<i>Indicative Pedestrian and Cycle Route Only</i>' on key.</p>
31	Simon Pain (Local resident)	Don't know	1. see previous comments. What is this a map of?	1. Comment noted.	<p>Change. Page 5, plan title change from 'Figure Ground Plan showing large voids in the urban fabric highlighting the sites underutilisation' to 'Figure Ground Plan 2015: <i>the large voids in the urban fabric display the sites underutilisation</i>'. Slight amendment to Ground Plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 7, Plan showing current land ownership boundaries; Page 10, Movement and Access Plan; Page 12, Activity and Edges Plan; Page 14, Land Use Plan;</p>

					<p>Page 16, Public Realm & Public Open Space Plan; Page 18, Heights Plan; Page 21, Development Parcels; Page 22, Safeguarding Plan; Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 42, Lan Ownership Plan. Road names '<i>Sury Basin</i>' and '<i>Sopwith Way</i>' have been added to plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 8, Concept Plan: Wording of 'Proposed Quiet Route' changed to 'Proposed <i>Cycle</i> Route'.</p> <p>Change. Page 10, Movement and Access Plan: 'Potential Dedicated Cycle Route' has been removed from map. Wording of 'indicative Shared Space Route' has been changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>'. Wording of 'Indicative Quiet Route' has been changed to 'Indicative <i>Cycle</i> Route'. Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 14, Land Use Plan Addition of wording '<i>(including A2/A3)</i>' after 'retail' on the 2nd and 5th points of the key.</p> <p>Change. Page 18, Heights Plan: Asterisk removed from 'Up</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>to maximum 12 storeys* Note at bottom of page amended from '*Please note: 'Storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor' to 'Please note: All 'storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor'</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan: Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 26, Design Framework: Richmond Road; Page 28, Framework Plan: North South Linear Park; Page 30, Framework Plan: East West Linear Park; Page 34, Surrounding Infrastructure; Page 36, Humanise Surrounding Streets 1) 'Potential Cycle Only Route' removed from key 2) 'Potential Shared Space Car park Access' changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>' on key. 3) 'Proposed Quiet Way' changed to '<i>Indicative Cycle Route</i>' on key. 4) 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' changed to '<i>Indicative Pedestrian and Cycle Route Only</i>' on key.</p>
32	Marilyn Mason (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
33	Alison Pope (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

34	J Sellars (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.
35	Denise Fraser (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.
36	Michael McGrail (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Noted	No change.
37	Robert Marshall (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.
38	Duncan Combe (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted	No change.
39	Mary Graham (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted	No change.
40	Joanne Melbourne (Local resident)	Strongly favour	1. With the introduction of Sainsbury's plus car parks - the area is descending into a dirty and polluted environment. Needs cleaning up and the pavements and walkways along Richmond Road from Sury Basin are lethal to both pedestrians and cyclists - there are so many potholes and cracked pavements	1. Support noted. The development brief is intended to facilitate public realm and road networks upgrades throughout the brief area.	No change.
41	Jonathan Rollason (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.
42	Richard Robinson (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted.	No change.
43	Kingston Cycling Campaign (local organisation)	Neutral		Noted.	No change.
44	Xxx xxx (unknown)	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
45	Robert James (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Noted.	No change.
46	Des McRow (Local resident)	Strongly favour	None	Noted.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

47	Sumit Thakur, Chairman (Royal Quarter Residents Association)	Strongly favour		Noted.	No change.
48	Sumit Thakur (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Noted.	No change.
49	Shinjini Thakur (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Noted.	No change.
50	Iain Martin MSc CMILT	Somewhat favour	More green spaces and safeguarding of existing ones is required.	Comment noted.	No change.
51	Beverley Tourle	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
52	Diane Watling (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	<p>1. I think it important to ensure the wonderful open spaces are kept open to sunlight as much as possible. The height of the developments to the south of the area must allow sufficient sunlight to flood the rest of the area. 2. Pedestrian vs cyclist routes must be carefully planned to give pedestrians priority along routes. It might be worth considering special surfaces in cycling lanes to prevent speed cycling. 3. Green roofs/walls should be encouraged to mitigate pollution effects. Planting of native species to ensure biodiversity is maximised. Developers to incorporate watering systems into their design for overnight automatic irrigation. So many street based planting areas are not watered regularly and die. Grassy areas will naturally turn brown during the summer, then weeds take over.</p>	<p>Comments 1-3 noted.</p> <p>1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p> <p>2 & 3. Specific design aspects such as quality of green spaces, green wall/roofs and management systems will be dealt with with regard to specific development proposals, as and when they come forward.</p>	No change.
53	Sarah Olney (North Kingston Liberal Democrats)	Neutral		Noted.	No change.
54	Yasmene Davies (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Noted.	No change.

Question 5a & 5b - To what extent do you agree with the proposed 'Development Form and Massing Strategy and Principles'?

ID Number	Respondent	Question 5a: To what extent do you agree with the proposed 'Development Form and Massing Strategy and Principles'?	Question 5b: Do you have any comments?	RBK Response	Document Update
1	Yvette (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
2	Anthony Quinn (Local resident)	Neutral	1. A previous council allowed a development which obliterated an important London view from Richmond Park!	1. Comment noted. The Town Centre Area Action Plan identified a key view for protection from Thatched House Lodge towards Guildhall; this view is also identified in the Core Strategy as a key view. The Council has worked to assure itself that the heights indicated in 'Development form and massing'	Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles. Text deleted: 'Proposed buildings must seek to safeguard the panorama and

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

				are appropriate. Wording of the Principles of page 19 has been amended to strengthen the awareness of and protection for key views.	strategic views as noted in the K+20'. Replaced with: <i>'Proposed buildings must positively contribute to the panorama and key views as noted in the K+20 and Core Strategy, and provide accurate visual representations alongside a robust assessment of the impact of these views'</i> .
3	John De'Ath (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. When many buildings around site are 6 storey, why limit some parts to 1-3, then stick a 12 Storey part in. Would be much better if it was uniform so it looks designed as a whole, not like a scaled up 2 year olds Lego set in height	1. Comment noted. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	No change.
4	Russell Pedley (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. I would like to see taller more eloquent buildings clad with more expensive materials around the Station rather than short fat ones with poor quality materials that have been approved and built in this area	1. Comment noted. Individual development proposals will need to be tested against existing Core Strategy policies, including DM10, DM11 and CS8.	Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles: 1) Text added: <i>'Outline applications for tall buildings will not be acceptable'</i> . 2) <i>'Including CABE/English Heritage joint guidance'</i> deleted and replaced with <i>'Including Historic England Advice Note 4 (2015)'</i>
5	K. Mayer (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. No buildings in Kingston should be above FOUR storeys. Any more ruin the area.	1. Comment noted. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	No change.
6	Maurice Bentley	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

	(Local resident)				
7	E John (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose		Noted	No change.
8	Chris Kent (Local resident)				No change.
9	G T KNIGHT (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
10	Carl Clarke (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
11	Steve Hollands (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Need to ensure that new property developments are not purchased to be left empty. Queenshurst is not a development with affordable units. Lowest cost £420K for a small studio. Developers claim to be putting money into local education, but they are just recouping this from the purchasers, not from their profits.	1. Comment noted.	Change. Page 33, para 5. Text added: <i>'The provision of affordable homes on site must comply with policies set out in the London Plan and the Local Plan'</i> .
12	S Watson (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted	No change.
13	Andrew Payne (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. Can the infrastructure that exists in the area cope with this size of development. With the density of new build in this corner of Kingston, some on going(Sury Basin) I seriously doubt whether it can.	1. To be addressed by preparation of the future Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No change.
14	Matt Williams (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. These heights of buildings will give any public amenity. It,s not a park in any sense when such high buildings are looming over you and blocking the light. This provides for the house builders to make a good profit, but please don't pretend that it will be apeasure to pass through there. All the nicest town	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

			centres in London and beyond are low rise, but Kingston has historically given permission to tall and often very ugly buildings (line the student accommodation with lurid yellow window frames opposite the station). Please don't continue your past mistakes.	appropriate. Individual development proposals will need to be tested against existing Core Strategy policies, including DM10, DM11 and CS8.	
15	Rachel Hapoienu (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
16	Jessamy Oldfield (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. The proposed levels are too high. 12 storeys is significantly higher than would fit appropriately - there are already too many over-high new builds in the area. These buildings already draw repeated comment for being out of place and unattractive. We should not be looking to add more. Overall, there is a preponderance of buildings of 4 storeys or above - this would create just one more built-up area, however modern and well planned.	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	No change.
17	Jonathan rollason (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. Twelve stories are simply too high.	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	No change.
18	John Roscoe (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. Too dense population, too high, too much housing, too many people.	1. The appropriate density for new developments is set by the Greater London Authority (GLA) through the London Plan. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6. Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

19	Rupert Moor (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. All this will do is create more unaffordable housing in an already expensive area.	1. The delivery of affordable housing will be controlled on individual planning applications. The Council will ensure any proposed development's accordance with the Core Strategy (including DM15, and the Affordable Housing SPD).	Change. Page 33, para 5. Text added: <i>'The provision of affordable homes on site must comply with policies set out in the London Plan and the Local Plan'</i> .
20	Neil Fulk (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
21	Richard Williams (Local resident)	Neutral	1. I would oppose any element of the plan which involved large-scale demolition and rebuilding of the existing properties along Richmond Road.	1. Comment noted.	No change.
22	John Pitts (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	1. 9 or 12 storeys is too much. There are too many tall buildings in Kingston, spoiling the character of the town.	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	No change.
23	Samantha Murphy (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted.	No change.
24	J Langridge (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	1. I do have concerns on building height - 12 storeys is too tall and 9 storeys (where sited along Sury Basin) too high too. 4-7 storeys is hugely different, 4 storeys fine, 7 too much in some areas	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	No change.
25	Frances Noel (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose		Noted.	No change.
26	M Ellis (Local resident)	Neutral	1. Perhaps someone could view the proposed high buildings from further away. Will this be visible from across the river,	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning	Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

			Home Park, Richmond Park or just generally at the end of every road you turn down when walking through North Kingston? The new riverside development behind Canbury Gardens is visible from just about everywhere I walk and is therefore far too intrusive. The new development should not compete with this - it should be in keeping with the Victorian nature of this part of Kingston.	application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate. The Town Centre Area Action Plan identified a key view for protection from Thatched House Lodge towards Guildhall; this view is also identified in the Core Strategy as a key view. The Council has worked to assure itself that the heights indicated in 'Development form and massing' plan are appropriate. The wording of the Principles on page 19 has been amended to strengthen the awareness of and protection for key views.	Text deleted: 'Proposed buildings must seek to safeguard the panorama and strategic views as noted in the K+20'. Replaced with: <i>'Proposed buildings must positively contribute to the panorama and key views as noted in the K+20 and Core Strategy, and provide accurate visual representations alongside a robust assessment of the impact of these views'.</i>
27	Chris Parry (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	1. High rise is not appropriate for North Kingston. Sadly the new apartments overlooking the river on the old power station site can be seen from far afield, for example from Home Park a triple SI site, and from the Canbury conservation area. Developers are always pushing planning authorities. Be firm and reject ugly and inappropriate development.	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate. The wording of the Principles on page 19 has been amended to strengthen the awareness of and protection for key views. Individual development proposals will need to be tested against existing Core Strategy policies, including DM10, DM11 and CS8 which cover design approach and requirements for new developments.	Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles. Text deleted: 'Proposed buildings must seek to safeguard the panorama and strategic views as noted in the K+20'. Replaced with: <i>'Proposed buildings must positively contribute to the panorama and key views as noted in the K+20 and Core Strategy, and provide accurate visual representations alongside a robust assessment of the impact of these views'.</i>
28	C Parkins-Godwin (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
29	Pat Lally (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	1. Twelve storeys too high	1. Comment noted. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

				heights are appropriate.	
30	Anne (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. 12 storeys are too many, 9 are ample.	1. Comment noted. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	
31	Simon Pain (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. this map is meaningless - could be anywhere. 2. strongly support "buildings to be of high quality"	Comment 1 noted. 2. Individual development proposals will need to be tested against existing Core Strategy policies, including DM10, DM11 and CS8 which cover design approach and requirements for new developments. .	<p>Change. Page 5, plan title change from 'Figure Ground Plan showing large voids in the urban fabric highlighting the sites underutilisation' to 'Figure Ground Plan 2015: the large voids in the urban fabric <i>display</i> the sites underutilisation'. Slight amendment to Ground Plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 7, Plan showing current land ownership boundaries; Page 10, Movement and Access Plan; Page 12, Activity and Edges Plan; Page 14, Land Use Plan; Page 16, Public Realm & Public Open Space Plan; Page 18, Heights Plan; Page 21, Development Parcels; Page 22, Safeguarding Plan; Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 42, Lan Ownership Plan. Road names 'Sury Basin' and 'Sopwith Way' have been added to plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 8, Concept Plan: Wording of 'Proposed Quiet Route' changed to 'Proposed Cycle Route'.</p>

					<p>Change. Page 10, Movement and Access Plan: 'Potential Dedicated Cycle Route' has been removed from map. Wording of 'indicative Shared Space Route' has been changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>'. Wording of 'Indicative Quiet Route' has been changed to '<i>Indicative Cycle Route</i>'. Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 14, Land Use Plan Addition of wording '<i>(including A2/A3)</i>' after 'retail' on the 2nd and 5th points of the key.</p> <p>Change. Page 18, Heights Plan: Asterix removed from 'Up to maximum 12 storeys*' Note at bottom of page amended from '*Please note: 'Storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor' to 'Please note: <i>All 'storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor</i>'</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan: Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 26, Design Framework: Richmond Road; Page 28, Framework Plan: North South Linear Park; Page 30, Framework Plan: East West</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

					Linear Park; Page 34, Surrounding Infrastructure; Page 36, Humanise Surrounding Streets 1) 'Potential Cycle Only Route' removed from key 2) 'Potential Shared Space Car park Access' changed to 'Shared Space Car Park Access' on key. 3) 'Proposed Quiet Way' changed to 'Indicative Cycle Route' on key. 4) 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' changed to 'Indicative Pedestrian and Cycle Route Only' on key.
32	Marilyn Mason (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
33	Alison Pope (Local resident)	Neutral	1. Kingston has may high profile high -rise developments. I would not support a building of more than 4 storeys high as I believe that would be out of context of the wider residential area	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	No change.
34	J Sellars (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. More than four storeys would be oppressively high on the corner of Richmond Road and Sury basin.	1. The building heights contained in the Development Comment noted. Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	No change.
35	Denise Fraser (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted	No change.
36	Michael McGrail	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

	(Local resident)				
37	Robert Marshall (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	1. Not keen on 12 storey tower, too high for what is essentially two three or four storey housing and shops.	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	No change.
38	Duncan Combe (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted	No change.
39	Mary Graham (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.
40	Joanne Melbourne (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. This is a hideous plan - what are you thinking - "Welcome to the Jungle.....enjoy your existence in a concrete tower....if you don't like it you could always jump off one!"This is not in keeping with a dignified and worthwhile existence for any human being. Seeing too much of this in London and it will backfire - this is not a healthy living condition for anyone. Short term gain for long term PAIN!!!!!! You'll just ignore this and do it anyway.....	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate. The addition of high quality green open space and the upgrading of surrounding public realm, retail, commercial, educational and transport facilities are designed to improve liveability within the context of an increasing density.	No change.
41	Jonathan Rollason (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the north Kingston development plan. I am supportive but have two issues. 1. The first is the density and the effect this will have on the quality of life in the neighbourhood. The money developers provide never covers the whole cost of improvements needed and we have seen a	1. The appropriate density for new developments is set by the Greater London Authority (GLA) through the London Plan. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6.	No change.

			<p>serious erosion of services. As an example it now takes two weeks to see a Doctor for a routine appointment. It used to take 3 days. I would request the council adopts a target density of 215 units per hectare to protect the borough. 2. The second is connected and is the height of the tower on the council land. I understand the council wants to maximise the income from the site but surely not at any cost. The site is surrounded by much smaller buildings on all sides. A 12 storey building is simply too large and we know developers will suggest 15 storey's. This will be followed by a huge fight and they will eventually accept 12 storey's if that's is what the plan says. The maximum height should not exceed 9 storey's which would fit in with adjacent buildings. Please amend the plan.</p>	<p>Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The infrastructure needs of the Borough are significantly greater than the funding likely to be realised through CIL or planning obligations or a combination of both. The Council will seek to prioritise CIL use as a match or gap funding source, linked to other infrastructure funding. As part of the production of the Council's new Local Plan for the Borough, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be reviewed. It is important to note that growth in the Borough is set to continue and the production of a new Local Plan and supporting evidence studies is intended to strengthen the Council's position to maximise opportunities for planned growth, including the provision of adequate infrastructure. Without this, the predicted growth will result in piecemeal development that is unable to secure maximum public benefits.</p> <p>2. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p>	
42	Richard Robinson (Local resident)	Neutral			No change.
43	Kingston Cycling Campaign (local organisation)	Somewhat oppose		Noted	No change.
44	Xxx xxx (unknown)	Strongly oppose	<p>1. High rise buildings are unpopular. They block much needed sunlight and based on recent new high rise builds in Kingston, they</p>	<p>1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning</p>	<p>Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles.</p>

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

			are anyways an eye sore. I am strongly opposed to any buildings over 4 stores high and have concerns about the styles of architecture you will allow. For example, the high rise buildings around the station cause people to avoid those areas unless necessary. They are not places people want to spend time.	application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	Text deleted: 'Proposed buildings must seek to safeguard the panorama and strategic views as noted in the K+20'. Replaced with: <i>'Proposed buildings must positively contribute to the panorama and key views as noted in the K+20 and Core Strategy, and provide accurate visual representations alongside a robust assessment of the impact of these views'</i> . Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles: 1) Text added: <i>'Outline applications for tall buildings will not be acceptable'</i> . 2) <i>'Including CABE/English Heritage joint guidance'</i> deleted and replaced with <i>'Including Historic England Advice Note 4 (2015)'</i>
45	Robert James (Local resident)				No change.
46	Des McRow (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	1. Although in favour of the majority of the objectives, I have some concern over the proposal to have in the Development Form and Massing Plan a maximum height of 12 storeys. This restriction presumably applies to the sites of the former Kingston Business Centre and the Canbury Car Park - thereby overshadowing the height of the Development at the southern end of the former Gas Holder site (Queenshurt). A limitation on height of up to 9 storeys would be more appropriate as it would then be in line with the height of that Development.	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

47	Sumit Thakur, Chairman (Royal Quarter Residents Association)	Somewhat oppose	<p>1. Although in favour of the majority of the objectives, we have some concern over the proposal to have in the Development Form and Massing Plan a maximum height of 12 storeys. This restriction presumably applies to the sites of the former Kingston Business Centre and the Canbury Car Park - thereby overshadowing the height of the Development at the southern end of the former Gas Holder site (Queenshurt). A limitation on height of up to 9 storeys would be more appropriate as it would then be in line with the height of that Development.</p>	<p>1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p>	No change.
48	Sumit Thakur (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	<p>1. I am in favour of the majority of the objectives, except for the height of the 12 storeys. I believe that all the tall structures in this area should not be more than 8-9 storeys and should be kept consistent. This will only provide a better view to the area but also ensure that no resident buildings are needlessly deprived of the sunshine or views.</p>	<p>1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p>	<p>Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles. Text deleted: 'Proposed buildings must seek to safeguard the panorama and strategic views as noted in the K+20'. Replaced with: <i>'Proposed buildings must positively contribute to the panorama and key views as noted in the K+20 and Core Strategy, and provide accurate visual representations alongside a robust assessment of the impact of these views'</i>.</p>
49	Shinjini Thakur (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	<p>1. I am in favour of the majority of the objectives, except for the height of the 12 storeys. I believe that all the tall structures in this area should not be more than 8-9 storeys and should be kept consistent. This will only provide a better view to the area but also ensure that no resident buildings are needlessly deprived of the sunshine or views.</p>	<p>1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p>	<p>Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles. Text deleted: 'Proposed buildings must seek to safeguard the panorama and strategic views as noted in the K+20'. Replaced with: <i>'Proposed buildings must positively contribute to the panorama and key views as noted in the K+20 and Core Strategy, and provide accurate visual'</i></p>

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

					<i>representations alongside a robust assessment of the impact of these views'.</i>
50	Iain Martin MSc CMILT	Strongly oppose	1. Too high!	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.	No change.
51	Beverley Tourle	Somewhat oppose	1. Development Massing An objection is raised to the Height Plan (pg.18). The north eastern parcel shows a P shaped area, at the junction of Sury Basin and Richmond Road, which has a height range of between 4-7 storeys. As set out previously the Council and land owners of this parcel of land have had extensive pre-application discussions. During these a building height of between 4 and 8 storeys was agreed. It is therefore requested that the height range be increased to 4-8 storeys as it would still ensure that future proposals respect their existing and future context and the buildings that are of townscape merit or listed. It is noted that the height range of the building that is next to a BTM (the College Building) is limited to between 4- 7 storeys but the building height range proposed closest to the statutory listed buildings (the Former Gala Bingo listed building and the Station Gateway) and modest two storey buildings is up to 9 storeys. The south eastern corner of the Development Brief area is far more sensitive than the north eastern corner and yet the height range, on this Council owned land, is up to 9 storeys. It is requested that the height range be increased from 4-8 storeys.	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate. The Council are looking at the site in a comprehensive manner in order to achieve the best outcome for the site.	No change.
52	Diane Watling (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. I am not at all in favour of a 12 story building. Is a 12 storey building necessary? And how was this height determined? It is very much appreciated that the NKDB states	1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and	Change. Page 19, 7th bullet point in Development Form and Massing Principles:

			<p>that the height should be a 'maximum' of 12 storeys, but I am certainly worried that this will set an even greater precedent for future increases in height. Other options could be considered that will still allow a similar number of units. 2. Without the certainty of a specific design to assess, or indeed a comprehensive urban design strategy, I do not believe that a building of such height can be justified, and would therefore request the council reduce the proposed height to 9 storeys. The Council's development brief should make it absolutely clear that "NO BUILDINGS OVER 9 STOREYS WILL BE PERMITTED", and in any event only a building of clear architectural merit will be considered. Enhanced frontages along the Richmond Road would be a real benefit. Most of the current shops look tired and drab. A new approach is required, but with consistency of form and respect for the surroundings. I understand that the expected density of the whole site as indicated by the GLA density Matrix for a Central location with a PTAL level of 6, would be 215-405 dwellings per Ha. As the whole site is approximately 3 Ha, the area would therefore be expected to support between 645-1215 dwellings. Densification can be seen positively if it brings with it vibrancy and diversity to the local area, and helping to support the local economy by increased footfall supporting the local centres. 3. However, how will sufficient services and infrastructure be financed? Developer CIL alone will not be sufficient.</p>	<p>Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p> <p>2. Individual development proposals will need to be tested against existing Core Strategy policies, including DM10, DM11 and CS8 which cover design approach and requirements for new developments.</p> <p>3. Community infrastructure is funded by a mix of CIL payments, S106 Agreements, and other revenue stream of the Council. The issues of developer contributions is addressed by the Developer Contributions section of the Development Brief. A review of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be made as part of the production of the Council's new Local Plan which will take into account the need of infrastructure and services in the Borough.</p>	<p>1) Text added: <i>'Outline applications for tall buildings will not be acceptable'</i>.</p> <p>2) <i>'*Including CABE/English Heritage joint guidance' deleted and replaced with 'Including Historic England Advice Note 4 (2015)'</i></p>
53	Sarah Olney (North Kingston Liberal Democrats)	Strongly oppose	<p>1. As per my opening comments, the proposed building heights are excessive and 2. there is insufficient commitment within this brief to provide affordable housing for the local community.</p>	<p>1. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p>	<p>Change. Page 33, para 5. Text added: <i>'The provision of affordable homes on site must comply with policies set out in the London Plan and the Local Plan'</i>.</p>

				<p>2. The delivery of affordable housing will be controlled on individual planning applications. The Council will ensure any proposed development's accordance with the Core Strategy (including DM15, and the Affordable Housing SPD).</p>	
54	Yasmene Davies (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	<p>1. This really needs to be a good looking, open area to encourage people to head north from the rail station rather than go south to Kingston town centre. It needs to look a lot better and more inviting than it currently does, the Bingo hall is hardly an attractive property. you have stated that you will use 'exemplary architecture' and do this in a comprehensive way architecturally - it is paramount that this is designed to be somewhere that people want to spend time. The Royal quarter residential flats are far too tall, and too imposing. The buildings are ugly, an eye sore, this should not be mimicked. 2. 9 stories is too tall for this plan. The open green space in the middle would feel totally enclosed and imposed on, it would be hardly 'open' surrounded by 9 story high buildings.</p>	<p>1. Individual development proposals will need to be tested against existing Core Strategy policies, including DM10, DM11 and CS8 which cover design approach and requirements for new developments.</p> <p>2. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p>	No change.

Question 6a & 6b - To what extent do you agree with the 'Design Frameworks and their Principles'?

ID Number	Respondent	Question 6a: To what extent do you agree with the 'Design Frameworks and their Principles'?	Question 6b: Do you have any comments in general or on specific frameworks?	RBK Response	Document Update
1	Yvette (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
2	Anthony Quinn (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
3	John De'Ath (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	1. Why is everything full of zig zags, the quiet way is more like a slalom course. All those redesigned crossings don't seem like a design, just a bodge as the scheme creates pedestrians and traffic conflicts around its edges, it's like you have tried to build in middle of a roundabout and as an afterthought wondered how anyone will access it	1. Comment noted.	No change.
4	Russell Pedley (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
5	K. Mayer (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. General objections under Question 1.	1. See response to question 1.	No change.
6	Maurice Bentley (Local resident)	Strongly favour	1. although not part of this framework, I do live in North Kingston, and we have a regular problem of flooding on the road at New Malden Station which causes the road to be closed and so far this has not been solved. I do hope the new framework will not be affected in this way as this would cause chaos in the area.	1. Comments noted. The issue of flood risk is due to be reviewed as part of the production of our new Local Plan.	No change.
7	E John (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

	resident)				
8	Chris Kent (Local resident)			Noted	No change.
9	G T KNIGHT (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
10	Carl Clarke (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
11	Steve Hollands (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.
12	S Watson (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted	No change.
13	Andrew Payne (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	<p>1. I feel that the framework is leading as it seems there has been a great deal of planning taken place already, it seems very detailed much more than just a framework. 2. The potential size and height of the development go totally against the air quality and noise principles and as a vision of the future to myself as a long time resident of Kingston, not at all appealing in the least.</p>	<p>1. The development brief has taken a number of years preparation and is intended as a framework to guide development only. If adopted, the brief will become a material consideration in the decision-making process of planning applications brought forward by individual developers. The Council will work with developers to ensure proposals contribute to the overall vision of the site is delivered.</p> <p>2. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p>	No change.
14	Matt Williams (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Support noted.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

15	Rachel Hapoienu (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. I don't understand the map/legends, as to what 'activity' refers to.	1. The National Planning Policy Framework defines primary and secondary frontages as follows: "Primary frontages are likely to include a high proportion of retail uses which may include food, drinks, clothing and household goods. Secondary frontages provide greater opportunities for a diversity of uses such as restaurants, cinemas and businesses."	No change.
16	Jessamy Oldfield (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.
17	Jonathan rollason (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	1. Real concerns about traffic volumes	1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.	No change.
18	John Roscoe (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.
19	Rupert Moor (Local resident)	Strongly oppose		Noted.	No change.
20	Neil Fulk (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.
21	Richard Williams	Neutral	1. As before, my main concerns about this are the potential impact on pedestrian and vehicle traffic along the whole length of Richmond	1. The plans for the area include the widening of Richmond Road to accommodate two way traffic at its southern end and the left turn from Sopwith Way into	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

	(Local resident)		Road between Sopwith Way and the King's Road.	<p>Richmond Road. The road will also be upgraded to accommodate the requirements of both pedestrians and cyclists in a safe manner, and ensure access to shops and other ground floor uses. The revised arrangements have been modelled to ensure their adequate operation.</p> <p>In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes. Transport for London's new Cycling Design Standards (Dec 2014) advises that cyclists and pedestrians should not be forced together where there is space to keep them apart, creating unnecessary conflict which can only increase as the number of cyclists rises. Where possible and appropriate the Council will introduce segregated cycle lanes.</p>	
22	John Pitts (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted	No change.
23	Samantha Murphy (Local resident)	Neutral	1. I am concerned about cyclists will get on to the 'pink' route shown on this plan and whether this will mean there is a need for more pelican crossings and therefore driver delay.	1. Comments noted. In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes. The 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' (coloured pink) exits onto Sury Basin where a new/improved crossing will allow cyclists to turn right to join the cycle lanes on Richmond Road or left to access quieter road that are more appropriate for cyclists such as Skerne Road.	No change.
24	J Langridge (Local resident)	Strongly favour	1. I think more consideration needs to be given for bikes arriving at Sury Basin from the new pedestrian and cycle only route (coloured pink), and especially being able to cross into it from the current Sainsburys car exit. Perhaps Sainsburys could construct a new	1. Comments noted. In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to	Wording has been amended to make clearer the intentions of the Council's movement strategy in this area and avoid confusion with

			<p>cycle/pedestrian entrance/exit opposite this new (pink) path. I do also hope the new "quietway" will be for bikes as well as pedestrians.</p>	<p>facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes. The 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' (coloured pink) exits onto Sury Basin where a new/improved crossing will allow cyclists to turn right to join the cycle lanes on Richmond Road or left to access quieter road that are more appropriate for cyclists such as Skerne Road.</p>	<p>Transport for London's official Quiet Way programme.</p> <p>Change. Page 8, Concept Plan: Wording of 'Proposed Quiet Route' changed to 'Proposed <i>Cycle Route</i>'.</p> <p>Change. Page 10, Movement and Access Plan: 'Potential Dedicated Cycle Route' has been removed from map. Wording of 'indicative Shared Space Route' has been changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>'. Wording of 'Indicative Quiet Route' has been changed to 'Indicative <i>Cycle Route</i>'. Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan: Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 26, Design Framework: Richmond Road; Page 28, Framework Plan: North South Linear Park; Page 30, Framework Plan: East West Linear Park; Page 34, Surrounding Infrastructure; Page 36, Humanise Surrounding Streets 1) 'Potential Cycle Only</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

					<p>Route' removed from key</p> <p>2) 'Potential Shared Space Car park Access' changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>' on key.</p> <p>3) 'Proposed Quiet Way' changed to '<i>Indicative Cycle Route</i>' on key.</p> <p>4) 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' changed to '<i>Indicative Pedestrian and Cycle Route Only</i>' on key.</p>
25	Frances Noel (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.
26	M Ellis (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted	No change.
27	Chris Parry (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Pedestrian and cycle routes are shown in the plan and are to be supported.	1. Support noted.	<p>Wording has been amended to make clearer the intentions of the Council's movement strategy in this area and avoid confusion with Transport for London's official Quiet Way programme.</p> <p>Change. Page 8, Concept Plan: Wording of 'Proposed Quiet Route' changed to 'Proposed <i>Cycle Route</i>'.</p> <p>Change. Page 10, Movement and Access Plan: 'Potential Dedicated Cycle Route' has been removed from map. Wording of 'indicative Shared Space Route' has</p>

					<p>been changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>'. Wording of 'Indicative Quiet Route' has been changed to 'Indicative Cycle Route'. Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan: Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 26, Design Framework: Richmond Road; Page 28, Framework Plan: North South Linear Park; Page 30, Framework Plan: East West Linear Park; Page 34, Surrounding Infrastructure; Page 36, Humanise Surrounding Streets</p> <p>1) 'Potential Cycle Only Route' removed from key 2) 'Potential Shared Space Car park Access' changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>' on key. 3) 'Proposed Quiet Way' changed to '<i>Indicative Cycle Route</i>' on key. 4) 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' changed to '<i>Indicative Pedestrian and Cycle Route Only</i>' on key.</p>
28	C Parkins-Godwin (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

29	Pat Lally (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	1. If Richmond Road has to be widened to take two way traffic and cycle route what will happen to the shops currently fronting Richmond Road?	1. The space to be used to facilitate the widening of the road will not come from the demolition of the Richmond Road shops.	No change.
30	Anne (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.
31	Simon Pain (Local resident)	Don't know		Noted	No change.
32	Marilyn Mason (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Public access to linear parks and routes through otherwise private developments must be ensured.	1. The ownership and maintenance of open space is critical to its long term success. This aspect of the scheme will be subject to agreement between the Council and landowners.	No change.
33	Alison Pope (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
34	J Sellars (Local resident)	Strongly favour		Support noted.	No change.
35	Denise Fraser (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. Kingsway Road should be the main traffic thoroughfare NOT Seven Kings Way, which passes through a high density housing area. It will bring 24hr noise and air pollution and will have a detrimental effect on the residents.	1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

				unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.	
36	Michael McGrail (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Seven Kings Road should not be widened or used as as part of the Kingston ring road.	1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.	No change.
37	Robert Marshall (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted	No change.
38	Duncan Combe (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose		Noted	No change.
39	Mary Graham (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted	No change.
40	Joanne Melbourne (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	1. Disagree with the design and your principles - it is all wrong. Scrap the plans and build more flats in Chessington - Kingsgate plan must not go ahead - more 15 storey buildingsNO!	1. Comments noted.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

	resident)		This is morally wrong and you know it		
41	Jonathan Rollason (Local resident)	Somewhat favour		Noted	No change.
42	Richard Robinson (Local resident)	Neutral		Noted	No change.
43	Kingston Cycling Campaign (local organisation)	Somewhat favour	1. Access to Sainsbury's by bicycle should be a priority and included in the Design Framework	1. Comment noted.	No change.
44	Xxx xxx (unknown)	Don't know		Noted.	No change.
45	Robert James (Local resident)			Noted.	No change.
46	Des McRow (Local resident)	Somewhat oppose	1. When responding to Questions 1a and 3a, I set out my objections to the proposed increase in traffic volumes as proposed for Seven Kings Way. I do acknowledge that there are circumstances where local issues might have to take second place to any overall benefit for the community: however in this particular case I do consider that the price to be paid by the residents of that road in terms of noise and air pollution is far too high to be in any way acceptable. It appears that little or no regard has been paid to the completion of the development on the former Gas Holder site (Queenshurst) - this meaning that Seven Kings Way is to become even more of a residential road with it having very high-rising apartment blocks on both of its sides. In November 2013 the first North Kingston Development Brief was put to the (then) Place and Sustainability	1. The Kingston Town Centre Movement Study looked at the remodelling of the North Kingston road network, including Seven Kings Way, with the intention of alleviating congestion and improving safety and efficiency of the network for all modes of transport. The traffic study has concluded and recommended that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area be taken forward to improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road is being pursued which will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond	No change.

			<p>Committee - this approved but subject to, inter alia, "a Stage 2 Brief containing detailed studies including traffic volumes and flows". Following this the Kingston Town Centre Movement Study was completed in 2014 and the Executive Summary of this Study recommended: "Closure of Kingsgate Road to traffic, and creation of a new cycling and walking link along this alignment New left-hand turn from Sopwith Way to Richmond Road New left-hand turn from Sury Basin to Seven Kings Way for access to the gas-holder development site (access only)" I have no major desire to see the recommended left-hand turn from Sury Basin into Seven Kings Way pursued (although it would be nice), but It is beyond understanding why the Sopwith Way/Richmond Road proposal is not being followed. This is particularly so when considering that a new lane (plus cycle lane) going north on Richmond Road is contained within the Draft Development Brief. The structure behind the Study's major recommendation is thereby to be put in place: so why the reluctance to use it?</p>	<p>Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	
47	Sumit Thakur, Chairman (Royal Quarter Residents Association)	Strongly oppose	<p>1. When responding to Questions 1a and 3a, we set out our objections to the proposed increase in traffic volumes as proposed for Seven Kings Way. We do acknowledge that there are circumstances where local issues might have to take second place to any overall benefit for the community: however in this particular case we do consider that the price to be paid by the residents of that road in terms of noise and air pollution is far too high to be in any way acceptable. It appears that little or no regard has been paid to the completion of the development on the former Gas Holder site (Queenshurst) - this meaning that Seven Kings Way is to become even more of a residential road with it having very high-rising apartment blocks on both of its sides. In November 2013 the first North Kingston Development Brief was put to the (then) Place and Sustainability Committee - this approved but subject to, inter</p>	<p>1. The Kingston Town Centre Movement Study looked at the remodelling of the North Kingston road network, including Seven Kings Way, with the intention of alleviating congestion and improving safety and efficiency of the network for all modes of transport.</p> <p>The traffic study has concluded and recommended that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area be taken forward to improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road is being pursued which will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the</p>	No change.

			<p>alia, "a Stage 2 Brief containing detailed studies including traffic volumes and flows". Following this the Kingston Town Centre Movement Study was completed in 2014 and the Executive Summary of this Study recommended: ¥ Closure of Kingsgate Road to traffic, and creation of a new cycling and walking link along this alignment ¥ New left-hand turn from Sopwith Way to Richmond Road ¥ New left-hand turn from Sury Basin to Seven Kings Way for access to the gas-holder development site (access only) We have no major desire to see the recommended left-hand turn from Sury Basin into Seven Kings Way pursued (although it would be nice), but It is beyond understanding why the Sopwith Way/Richmond Road proposal is not being followed. This is particularly so when considering that a new lane (plus cycle lane) going north on Richmond Road is contained within the Draft Development Brief. The structure behind the Study's major recommendation is thereby to be put in place: so why the reluctance to use it?</p>	<p>proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	
48	Sumit Thakur (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	<p>1. The price to be paid by the residents of Seven Kings Way in terms of noise and air pollution is far too high to be in any way acceptable.</p>	<p>1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p>	No change.
49	Shinjini Thakur (Local resident)	Strongly oppose	<p>1. The price to be paid by the residents of Seven Kings Way in terms of noise and air pollution is far too high to be in any way acceptable.</p>	<p>1. The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer</p>	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

				distance traffic diverting into residential streets.	
50	Iain Martin MSc CMILT	Somewhat oppose	1. Not fully thought out.	Comment noted	No change.
51	Beverley Tourle	Somewhat favour		Noted.	No change.
52	Diane Watling (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Signage will be essential to direct and give clear priority to pedestrians. This could be in the form of heritage design signposts for the area with maybe the Canbury/Sopwith Camel Propeller emblem incorporated in the design.	1. Comments noted.	No change.
53	Sarah Olney (North Kingston Liberal Democrats)	Strongly oppose	1. While greater provision of public green space is to be welcomed, it will not be well-used if it is located within a development of high rise buildings. It will feel intimidating and intrusive to walk through a space overlooked by people's homes.	1. It is envisaged that the new public park and spaces within the site will not only be used by residents of the site, but also by users of the additional retail/commercial/educational buildings at ground level as well as those who will use the space as a new pedestrian/cycle thoroughfare. It is the intention that this mix of uses will make the public spaces and park welcoming to residents of the whole North Kingston area. The quality of the open space and the microclimate are critical elements if the space is to be well used. These issues will need to be tested in detail as part of the development management process as part of the planning process when a planning application(s) are made.	No change.
54	Yasmene Davies (Local resident)	Somewhat favour	1. Richmond Road - This is predominantly retail (A1) and residential. please see my other comments in the next section about re-housing current businesses. A priority is to make an attractive high street frontage on Richmond road, with no parking/bins etc on view. 2. Apart from pedestrian footfall, there does need to be some parking facilities for this high street. The car park on this land will be demolished, but customers need to be able to park up and pop in to these shops in order to make full use of their potential and make it a bustling area. It is also not clear where residents will be able to park either?	Comment 1 noted. 2. All new development will be required to meet the Council's standards in terms of providing adequate servicing and parking facilities. The aim is to avoid any problems of overspill parking and unwarranted intrusion of larger vehicles and create a more pleasant environment and enhance business potential.	Change. Page 14, Land Use Plan: Addition of wording '(including A2/A3)' after 'retail' on the 2nd and 5th points of the key.

Question 7 - Do you have any comments?

ID Number	Respondent	Question 7: Do you have any comments?	RBK Response	Document Update
2	Anthony Quinn (Local resident)	1. The areas presented do not appear to impact existing important open space or the Blue Ribbon and so I have no objections	1. Support noted. The brief will increase access to green space in the area, addressing local deficiency and encouraging biodiversity to provide a high quality open space. The Council will seek to maximise opportunities to improve connections to Canbury Gardens and River Thames through incremental development proposals.	No change.
3	John De'Ath (Local resident)	1. Would anyone on planning committee choose to move there instead of where they now live, this should tell you what they think of the scheme	1. Comment noted.	No change.
4	Russell Pedley (Local resident)	1. Get on with it!	1. Comment noted.	No change.
5	K. Mayer (Local resident)	1. See comments under Question 1.	1. See response to Question 1	No change.
8	Chris Kent (Local resident)	1. Page 43 of the briefing document shows a Post Office being virtually opposite the site. This post office has been closed for about a year and the nearest one is to the north of the junction of Richmond Road and Kings Road.	1. Comment noted.	Change. Page 43, Community Infrastructure Plan: Post Office removed from Richmond Road and added to the corner of Richmond Road and Barfield Road.
11	Steve Hollands (Local resident)	1. Stop providing disabled parking that no one uses. Ground floor of Seven Kings is virtually empty each day as the majority are disabled bays, which disabled people do not use as it's too far away from the town centre.	1. Comment noted..	No change.
14	Matt Williams (Local resident)	1. If you are going to provide homes, please don't continue with flats. This largely attracts younger adults and Kingston already has enough young people living here. Houses (not flats) for families would fit in better with the residential provision in North Kingston and be lower rise. Thank you for consulting.	1. Any development in Kingston must be compliant with the Council's Core Strategy, including Policy DM13 which requires residential developments to include a mix of unit sizes and types. The Council will work with individual developers to ensure a mix of housing tenures for the site.	No change.

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

15	Rachel Hapoienu (Local resident)	1. I'm in favour of improving the area but only if it can be achieved with minimum impact on the neighborhood during the construction phase. I don't want to live in a construction site for 10 years.	1. While the Council appreciates that construction phases of projects of this nature can be frustrating, especially for Local residents, the Council will work with developers and partners to do all they can to minimise disruption while we pursue delivering long-term benefit to this area.	No change.
17	Jonathan rollason (Local resident)	1. Yes. Traffic will be a problem. That problem will increase should the supermarket close and residents have to drive into town for food shopping. I would like to see the plan say the current supermarket should remain in the same shape and size. If it was to be redeveloped it would be a huge loss of amenity to North Kingston residents.	1. The supermarket (Sainsbury's) is outside of the development brief and is not being considered for relocation/redevelopment at this time. Any future plans for this site will be explored through the Local Plan process, or through a planning application at which time a formal consultation would be undertaken.	No change.
18	John Roscoe (Local resident)	1. Please do not make our lovely area more crowded. There's an opportunity here to release more space and have acceptable, not oppressive, population density. Please don't ruin the area further by having thousands more people with very little extra space. Canbury Gardens and the river bank area are already dramatically changed for the worse due to having too many people in the area due to the excessive flat developments.	1. The density for new developments is set in n the London Plan prepared on behalf of the Mayor of London.. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6. Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare. The addition of high quality green open space and the upgrading of surrounding public realm, retail, commercial, educational and transport facilities are designed to improve liveability within the context of an increasing density.	No change.
19	Rupert Moor (Local resident)	1. If you are going to create a new model of socially affordable housing (i.e. council run, and tenants can only stay five 5 years during which time they pay low rent but must save money for a deposit on a separate property elsewhere), then fine, otherwise it's just going to become another rich housing estate.	1. The delivery of affordable housing will be controlled on individual planning applications. The Council will ensure any proposed development's accordance with the Core Strategy (including DM15, and the Affordable Housing SPD).	Change. Page 33, para 5. Text added: <i>'The provision of affordable homes on site must comply with policies set out in the London Plan and the Local Plan'</i> .
21	Richard Williams (Local resident)	1. Whilst I strongly support some elements of this plan, I believe that much more work is needed on the impact of the road realignment and changes to traffic flow affecting Richmond Road. This could make an already very busy and quite dangerous stretch of road worse, and increase the conflict between vehicle, cycle, and pedestrian traffic. The impact on pedestrians crossing Richmond Road is of particular concern. My reading of the plan suggests that this element of the proposals has not been properly thought through.	1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the	No change.

			<p>closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes. Transport for London's new Cycling Design Standards (Dec 2014) advises that cyclists and pedestrians should not be forced together where there is space to keep them apart, creating unnecessary conflict which can only increase as the number of cyclists rises. Where possible and appropriate the Council will introduce segregated cycle lanes.</p>	
25	Frances Noel (Local resident)	<p>1. Road plans are the main area I disagree on. Need more schools, GPs and public facilities and parking to cope with increased population.</p>	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>There is currently no envisaged need for a new primary school on the site. The responsibility for providing new schools now falls to the Education Funding Agency (EFA). The EFA have successfully gained planning consent for a new primary school in Norbiton, which will help address need locally.</p> <p>Other infrastructure requirements of the area are to be addressed by the preparation of the future Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	No change.
26	M Ellis (Local resident)	<p>1. There will be an increase in vehicle traffic, which has not been addressed adequately. Even if residents do not have their own cars, they will, no doubt be serviced by on line delivery vans, supermarket deliveries, pizza deliveries etc. Has this been considered? If they do own vehicles but do not</p>	<p>1. The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the</p>	No change.

		<p>have their own parking spaces, where will they park? North Kingston residential streets that don't have controlled parking? Sainsburys Car Park? Where else?</p>	<p>Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>The Council's policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts. Typical measures include traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. Alterations to the main road network in the North Kingston area will be tested against the need for this type of protection to surrounding areas. The overall traffic arrangements are being configured to allow for local access while minimising potential for longer distance traffic diverting into residential streets.</p> <p>All new development will be required to meet the Council's standards in terms of providing adequate servicing and parking facilities to avoid any problems of overspill parking and unwarranted intrusion of larger vehicles.</p>	
29	Pat Lally (Local resident)	<p>1. What happened to the plans for the proposed primary school? If more housing is planned there should also be plans for another doctor's surgery.</p>	<p>1. There is currently no envisaged need for a new primary school on the site. The responsibility for providing new schools now falls to the Education Funding Agency (EFA). The EFA have successfully gained planning consent for a new primary school in Norbiton, which will help address need locally.</p>	No change.
30	Anne (Local resident)	<p>1. When is the school for the older children going up in North Kingston ?</p>	<p>1. The responsibility for providing new schools now falls to the Education Funding Agency (EFA).</p>	No change.
31	Simon Pain (Local resident)	<p>1. most of this was meaningless - the maps could be anywhere. I can't tell where in Kingston they were talking about. 2. New buildings should be of the highest standard and we can lose this sentimental attachment to that old building in the marketplace and those ridiculous phone boxes. They are an embarrassment.</p>	<p>Comments 1-3 noted.</p>	<p>Change. Page 5, plan title change from 'Figure Ground Plan showing large voids in the urban fabric highlighting the sites underutilisation' to 'Figure Ground Plan 2015: the large voids in the urban fabric <i>display</i> the sites underutilisation'. Slight amendment to Ground Plan.</p>

				<p>Change. Page 7, Plan showing current land ownership boundaries; Page 10, Movement and Access Plan; Page 12, Activity and Edges Plan; Page 14, Land Use Plan; Page 16, Public Realm & Public Open Space Plan; Page 18, Heights Plan; Page 21, Development Parcels; Page 22, Safeguarding Plan; Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 42, Land Ownership Plan. Road names '<i>Sury Basin</i>' and '<i>Sopwith Way</i>' have been added to plan.</p> <p>Change. Page 8, Concept Plan: Wording of 'Proposed Quiet Route' changed to 'Proposed <i>Cycle Route</i>'.</p> <p>Change. Page 10, Movement and Access Plan: 'Potential Dedicated Cycle Route' has been removed from map. Wording of 'indicative Shared Space Route' has been changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>'. Wording of 'Indicative Quiet Route' has been changed to '<i>Indicative Cycle Route</i>'. Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 14, Land Use Plan</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>Addition of wording '<i>(including A2/A3)</i>' after 'retail' on the 2nd and 5th points of the key.</p> <p>Change. Page 18, Heights Plan: Asterix removed from 'Up to maximum 12 storeys*' Note at bottom of page amended from '*Please note: 'Storey' heights are inclusive of ground floor' to 'Please note: <i>All 'storey</i>' heights are inclusive of ground floor'</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan: Indicative Cycle Route has been aligned.</p> <p>Change. Page 24, Design Framework Plan; Page 26, Design Framework: Richmond Road; Page 28, Framework Plan: North South Linear Park; Page 30, Framework Plan: East West Linear Park; Page 34, Surrounding Infrastructure; Page 36, Humanise Surrounding Streets 1) 'Potential Cycle Only Route' removed from key 2) 'Potential Shared Space Car park Access' changed to '<i>Shared Space Car Park Access</i>' on key. 3) 'Proposed Quiet Way' changed to '<i>Indicative Cycle Route</i>' on key. 4) 'Pedestrian and Cycle Only Route' changed to</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Responses to the North Kingston Development Brief Consultation

				<i>'Indicative Pedestrian and Cycle Route Only' on key.</i>
33	Alison Pope (Local resident)	1. See question 1 comments on attracting retailers to the area	1. See response to Question 1	No change.
35	Denise Fraser (Local resident)	1. I can only reiterate that the residents of Royal Quarter should not have to bear the brunt of the 24hr traffic, noise and air pollution. This is a narrow access road to the current housing development and the new Queenshurst development and should not be considered suitable as a main thoroughfare for buses, lorries and all manner of other traffic.	1. Comment noted.	No change.
37	Robert Marshall (Local resident)	1. Smooth flow of traffic in both directions for traffic to/from town centre from Richmond Road. Better provision for cycling between Sury Basin and the station.	1. The plans for the area include the widening of Richmond Road to accommodate two way traffic at its southern end and the left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road. The road will also be upgraded to accommodate the requirements of both pedestrians and cyclists in a safe manner, and ensure access to shops and other ground floor uses. The revised arrangements have been modelled to ensure their adequate operation. In accordance with the London Plan and Council policies, the Council places significant emphasis on the role of walking and cycling in the future of movement in the Borough, and will therefore continue to promote and extend these uses in the North Kingston area and throughout the Borough in order to facilitate a connected network of safe walking and cycle routes.	No change.
39	Mary Graham (Local resident)	1. Please take into consideration the disruption and inconvenience that these plans will cause to an area which has already had major building work and is expecting further inconvenience due to the proposed development at the Fenwick site.	1. While the Council appreciates that construction phases of projects of this nature can be frustrating, especially for Local residents, the Council will work with developers and partners to do all they can to minimise disruption while we pursue delivering long-term benefit to this area.	No change.
40	Joanne Melbourne (Local resident)	1. I am appalled and saddened at what you are doing to Kingston upon Thames.....	1. Comment noted.	No change.
41	Jonathan Rollason (Local resident)	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the north Kingston development plan. I am supportive but have two issues. 1. The first is the density and the effect this will have on the quality of life in the neighbourhood. The money developers provide	1. The appropriate density for new developments is set by the the London Plan prepared on behalf of the Mayor of London. The North Kingston site is defined as being Central, by nature of its proximity to Kingston station and town centre (a metropolitan centre). The North Kingston site also benefits from PTAL (Public Transport	No change.

		<p>never covers the whole cost of improvements needed and we have seen a serious erosion of services. As an example it now takes two weeks to see a Doctor for a routine appointment. It used to take 3 days. I would request the council adopts a target density of 215 units per hectare to protect the borough. 2. The second is connected and is the height of the tower on the council land. I understand the council wants to maximise the income from the site but surely not at any cost. The site is surrounded by much smaller buildings on all sides. A 12 storey building is simply too large and we know developers will suggest 15 storey's. This will be followed by a huge fight and they will eventually accept 12 storey's if that's is what the plan says. The maximum height should not exceed 9 storey's which would fit in with adjacent buildings. Please amend the plan.</p>	<p>Accessibility Level) ranging from 6-4, with by far the majority of the site being 6. Using the GLA density matrix the expected density of development on the site would be 215-405 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The infrastructure needs of the Borough are significantly greater than the funding likely to be realised through CIL or planning obligations or a combination of both. The Council will seek to prioritise CIL use as a match or gap funding source, linked to other infrastructure funding. As part of the production of the Council's new Local Plan for the Borough, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be reviewed. It is important to note that growth in the Borough is set to continue and the production of a new Local Plan and supporting evidence studies is intended to strengthen the Council's position to maximise opportunities for planned growth, including the provision of adequate infrastructure. Without this, the predicted growth will result in piecemeal development that is unable to secure maximum public benefits.</p> <p>2. The building heights contained in the Development Brief are indicative, and will need to be tested at a more detailed level following the receipt of a planning application. The supporting commentary and Development Form and Massing Principles set out how the Council will assess any proposed development to ensure that the proposed heights are appropriate.</p>	
43	Kingston Cycling Campaign (local organisation)	<p>1. Developments here must provide convenient and actively managed bicycle parking so that residents, visitors and customers find it easy and convenient to park their bicycles at the development. There should be active management to discourage bicycle theft and to remove any abandoned bicycles.</p>	<p>1. Any development in the borough must be compliant with the Council's Core Strategy including Policy DM8 which requires new development to provide facilities on-site for cyclists as appropriate, including showers, lockers and secure, convenient cycle parking, to be negotiated as part of the planning process. The Council's Go Cycle programme will more generally improve access to cycle routes and secure bicycle parking in this area and across the borough.</p>	No change.
46	Des McRow (Local resident)	<p>1. As can be seen from my responses to Questions 1a, 3a and 6a, I am totally opposed to the intention of increasing the volume of traffic to use Seven Kings Way – which is in all respects a residential road and is to become more so once the development on the former Gas Holder site is completed. Here building work of the first two phases - these along Seven Kings Way - is to be completed in 2017 and occupied in mid-2018. It cannot be right that the quality of life for residents of this road, in so far as it relates to noise and quality of air</p>	<p>1. The Council is appreciative of your overall support for its intentions and vision for North Kingston, and understand your concerns regarding Seven Kings Way. The widening and realignment of Seven Kings Way is part of a larger traffic remodelling plan for the area to create an overall improvement in traffic flow for the entire area.</p> <p>The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety</p>	No change.

		<p>considerations, should not be as an important requirement as for residents elsewhere. Potential developers will have to consider these aspects when putting forward any plans that they may have, and it is absolutely unacceptable that existing residents should have a deterioration in their situations to achieve this. The road is already among the leading problem areas for consideration under the Air Quality Action Plan and it does seem perverse to increase the problems now facing it before looking at ways and means of reducing them! The Council is of course serious in its desire to improve the quality of life in its residential areas – this as illustrated by the improvements to the nearby Down Hall Road. Here the road has been downgraded to little more than a cul-de-sac, even though it has housing running along one side only (the other hosting a railway line). I cannot disagree with the Council’s decision making here, namely that this is “intended to create a street scene appropriate to what has become a mainly residential area”. Having said this I must ask why Seven Kings Way is not also regarded as mainly residential area – with this to become more so once Queenshurst has been delivered. If only what I regard as the unfair and unhealthy treatment of those living in Seven Kings Way could be disregarded, then I would be a real supporter of what is proposed for North Kingston. Although I do have some reservations about the 12 storey limitation on the possible developments on and around Canbury Car Park, I do appreciate that, here we are looking at Council owned land and that there is, within reason, a duty for the Council to maximize value of such property. So, please reconsider the impact of your plans for Seven Kings Way upon those who live there – and then I shall be a full supporter of your plans for North Kingston.</p>	<p>improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>As covered in Question 1, the Council’s policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts through the use of traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. New road layouts and crossing for pedestrians and cyclists are not only intended to increase efficiency of traffic flow but also improve safety in this increasingly residential area.</p>	
47	Sumit Thakur, Chairman (Royal Quarter Residents Association)	<p>1. As can be seen from my responses to Questions 1a, 3a and 6a, we are totally opposed to the intention of increasing the volume of traffic to use Seven Kings Way – which is in all respects a residential road and is to become more so once the development on the former Gas Holder site is completed. Here building work of the first two phases</p>	<p>1. The Council is appreciative of your overall support for its intentions and vision for North Kingston, and understand your concerns regarding Seven Kings Way. The widening and realignment of Seven Kings Way is part of a larger traffic remodelling plan for the area to create an overall improvement in traffic flow.</p> <p>The traffic study of the North Kingston Development Area has found</p>	No change.

		<p>- these along Seven Kings Way - is to be completed in 2017 and occupied in mid-2018. It cannot be right that the quality of life for residents of this road, in so far as it relates to noise and quality of air considerations, should not be as an important requirement as for residents elsewhere. Potential developers will have to consider these aspects when putting forward any plans that they may have, and it is absolutely unacceptable that existing residents should have a deterioration in their situations to achieve this. The road is already amount the leading problem areas for consideration under the Air Quality Action Plan and it does seem perverse to increase the problems now facing it before looking at ways and means of reducing them! The Council is of course serious in its desire to improve the quality of life in its residential areas – this as illustrated by the improvements to the nearby Down Hall Road. Here the road has been downgraded to little more than a cul-de-sac, even though it has housing running along one side only (the other hosting a railway line). We cannot disagree with the Council’s decision making here, namely that this is “intended to create a street scene appropriate to what has become a mainly residential area”. Having said this we must ask why Seven Kings Way is not also regarded as mainly residential area – with this to become more so once Queenshurst has been delivered. If only what we regard as the unfair and unhealthy treatment of those living in Seven Kings Way could be disregarded, then we would be real supporters of what is proposed for North Kingston. Although we do have some reservations about the 12 storey limitation on the possible developments on and around Canbury Car Park, we do appreciate that, here we are looking at Council owned land and that there is, within reason, a duty for the Council to maximize value of such property.</p>	<p>that the proposed changes to the road network in the North Kingston Development area will improve the movement of traffic and associated safety. The proposal to realign and widen Seven Kings Way will allow for additional vehicle capacity with associated safety improvements, and make it easier for residents to turn left into the Royal Quarter parking. A new left turn from Sopwith Way into Richmond Road will provide a resilience route for traffic moving northwards out of Kingston; it is also intended that buses and heavy goods vehicles will use this route to minimize disruption to Local residents. Richmond Road will be widened at its southern end to facilitate the proposed left turn. These proposals will mitigate the closure of Kingsgate Road onto Richmond Road and address wider movement and network capacity issues in the North Kingston area.</p> <p>As covered in Question 1, the Council’s policies seek to protect the residential and other sensitive areas of the borough from unwarranted traffic intrusion and associated noise and environmental impacts through the use of traffic calming, banned movements and restricted access to key areas. New road layouts and crossing for pedestrians and cyclists are in not only intended to increase efficiency of traffic flow but also improve safety in this increasingly residential area.</p>	
50	Iain Martin MSc CMILT	<p>1. I believe some of these proposals may impact unreasonably on Kingston’s unique history and heritage. Not enough emphasis is being placed on preserving and enhancing these existing assets which are already under threat. It should be recognised that these are some of the main reasons</p>	<p>1. Comments noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

		that make Kingston a desirable place to live, work and visit..		
51	Beverley Tourle	<p>1. Development Parcels We support the proposal to create 3 development parcels, with phased development where appropriate.</p> <p>2. Land Uses The combined land uses for the north eastern parcel are listed as retail and/or education and residential and education uses. Whilst the combination of land uses listed are acceptable the land use drawing appears to rigidly show the different land uses in certain parts of the parcel of land. This is not entirely consistent with the supporting text (pg.15) which states: 'Uses such as cafes or community space which encourages interaction with public spaces will be placed at the ground and lower floors frontages in salient locations with retail uses located to front onto Richmond Road to reinforce the activity in this important corridor. Education uses will be located in close proximity to the already successfully established Kingston College. The upper floor levels are identified for residential uses. This approach will create a mixed use environment that will be active at the appropriate time during the day and evening.' The Land Use Plan should reflect the fact that the land uses in the parcels do not rigidly need to be delivered as per the plan for that particular parcel. This is only problematic with the north eastern parcel which shows the education block separate to that of retail and/ education and residential uses. The entire parcel could be shown as the mix of uses listed for the corner part as this includes education but allows for combination of land uses within the parcel. The Land Use Plan fails to acknowledge the lengthy pre-application dialogue with the Council Planners which resulted in an agreed scheme that provides education land uses in the corner part of the parcel and an element of residential along the rear part of the 'education' land use block. The 'land swap' was agreed with the Council during pre-application discussions and it is therefore felt that the Land Use Map should reflect this ability for the land use combinations to be delivered in the north eastern</p>	<p>Comments 1-4 noted.</p> <p>2. The Land Use Plan reflects the Town Centre Area Action Plan, K+20. The north-eastern parcel is split between education use as identified in allocation 19a of K+20 (shown in brown) and the retail and/or education and residential use for site identified as 19e of K+20 (shown in blue). The site identified as 19e in K+20 is shown as education use as the education use on this site is already established with the construction of the Creative Industries Centre.</p>	No change.

		<p>parcel as a whole as is the case in the other two parcels.</p> <p>3. Development Parcels The proposed creation of 3 larger parcels, from the many previously proposed is supported, as is the acknowledgement that the delivery of two of the parcels could be phased. Richmond Road Plan (pg. 26) The aims of the plan and text on page 26 is supported, especially where it states that ‘A mixed use model with homes located above commercial, retail or leisure use is the preferred option.’</p> <p>4. North South Linear Park The aims of the plan and text on page 28 is supported, especially where it states that ‘The park will be addressed by residential frontages and accesses to provide a pleasant setting for homeowners and activity within the space. Ground floor units will be provided with private amenity space, and will have front-doors onto the park. Bin stores and other similar uses will not be considered as active frontage and should be located to minimise their negative impact on public space.’</p>		
52	Diane Watling (Local resident)	<p>1. An objective of the NKDB is to, Provide modern and flexible employment space that benefits from the close proximity to public transport and the highly accessible highway network. There are SMEs in North Kingston desperate to expand in Kingston who cannot find affordable units for this purpose. It seems only logical for the council to encourage and support local SMEs, with the effect of reducing the requirement for road and rail transportation. • It is essential that new employment space be created for this need, and be available at an affordable rate. A scheme should be investigated whereby reduced business rates could be offered for the first year to help and encourage entrepreneurialship, if not already considered. • It is also essential that the Council encourages developers to support independent traders rather than relying solely on chain stores. Independents are a key component of our high streets, and bring diversity and vibrancy along with their direct connection to local economies.</p> <p>2. Air quality in the area is a major issue for the</p>	<p>1. The development brief does not deal with issues of commercial operation of landlords. However, the brief will be fully compliant with the London Plan which supports SMEs.</p> <p>2. The installation of EV charging points, green wall/roof initiatives and smart parking will be dealt with in regard to specific development proposals, as and when they come forward.</p>	No change.

		<p>health of everyone. Traffic surveys to establish routes of least pollution potential need to be assessed. Implementation of pollution reducing measures need to be considered: Low emissions zones EV charging points installed in all new developments retrofitting developments with EV charging points schemes to encourage employers to install EV charge points and allow employees to charge during the day Green roof/walls initiatives Smart parking retrofit vehicles with exhaust filters 20mph speed limit EV car club</p>		
54	Yasmene Davies (Local resident)	<p>1. Yes. Your information on page 41 about the current site land uses is inaccurate and out of date. You refer to Kingston printers being there as a 2 storey office facing Kingsgate road, on the corner of Seven Kings Way. This is not the case. Kingston Printers has not occupied that building for at least 3 years. The building is a workshop (light industrial/warehouse) with studio offices used by a thriving, family run kitchen and furniture design/manufacturer, as well as an events company. The kitchen/furniture company are employers of Local residents and serve the local community in North Kingston. These companies will be directly affected by the development, however it is impossible to find nowadays similar mixed use buildings (commercial/industrial/office) in Kingston as so many have been developed into flats and houses. The kitchen/furniture workshop and studio is a creative business used directly by Local residents in home improvements. A combination of warehouse/light industrial/office spaces should be incorporated into the development plans to replace the ones being demolished and rehouse the current businesses on the site. 2. Also, the closure of Kingsgate road early on and the ongoing development works, must be done carefully and not cause too much disruption to these businesses.</p>	<p>Comments 1 and 2 noted.</p> <p>1. An Article 4 Direction was introduced in October 2015 to mitigate against the conversion of commercial land to residential use. It is the intention of the brief to house a mix of uses including education, retail, office, commercial, student accommodation and residential.</p> <p>2. The Council will work with it's partners to ensure disruption is minimised as much as feasibly possible. However the long-term vision to benefit the North kingston area must be kept in mind.</p>	<p>Change: Page 41, para 1: Text deleted: 'To the south of the former Gas Holders site is the former Kingsgate Business Centre, now demolished and Kingston Printers, a two storey 1950's building with office use facing onto kingsgate Road'. Replaced with: 'To the south of the former Gas Holders site is the former Kingsgate Business Centre, now demolished and 52 Kingsgate Road, a two-storey 1950s building with office <i>and light industrial</i> use facing onto Kingsgate Road'.</p>

The following consultees submitted a response but did not comment specifically on Question 7 of the survey.

ID	Name	ID	Name
1	Yvette (Local resident)	27	Chris Parry (Local resident)
6	Maurice Bentley (Local resident)	28	C Parkins-Godwin (Local resident)
7	E John (Local resident)	32	Marilyn Mason (Local resident)
9	G T KNIGHT (Local resident)	34	J Sellars (Local resident)
10	Carl Clarke (Local resident)	36	Michael McGrail (Local resident)
12	S Watson (Local resident)	38	Duncan Combe (Local resident)
13	Andrew Payne (Local resident)	42	Richard Robinson (Local resident)
16	Jessamy Oldfield (Local resident)	44	Xxx xxx (unknown)
20	Neil Fulk (Local resident)	45	Robert James (Local resident)
22	John Pitts (Local resident)	48	Sumit Thakur (Local resident)
23	Samantha Murphy (Local resident)	49	Shinjini Thakur (Local resident)
24	J Langridge (Local resident)	53	Sarah Olney (North Kingston Liberal Democrats)