

Chapter 10 CONSULTATION RESULTS

Introduction

10.1 To satisfy himself that each Borough has undertaken adequate consultation in accordance with the requirements set down under section 145 of the GLA Act, the Mayor has stipulated that Boroughs are required to consult on their draft LIP with:-

- The Metropolitan Police
- Transport for London (TfL)
- Representative disabled persons organisations
- Each other London borough whose area is likely to be affected by the plan.

10.2 In addition, to ensure co-ordination and coherency between LIPs, TfL have recommended that Boroughs also consult:-

- Representatives of the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority and London Ambulance Service
- The Highways Agency
- Network Rail and the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) where appropriate
- Local Mobility Forums, or their equivalent and other equality target groups
- Representatives of business, local environment, transport and community groups
- Neighbouring Local Authorities (for outer London boroughs).

Consultation Practices in RBK

10.3 The Council believes that consultation helps it to make better informed decisions. Feedback from residents is needed to maintain a clear focus on Council performance and ensure that public services continue to meet local needs.

10.4 The Community Plan produced in 2004 for the period 2004-09 sets out a vision for Kingston across six themes, one being Transport, which reflects what local people and businesses have told the Council they are most concerned about. The Plan provides a framework through which issues can be raised and public sector “delivery” bodies, including the Council, can co-operate to ensure the community’s aspirations are embodied in their respective strategies and action plans.

10.5 To open up the Council and improve the decision making process the Borough is divided into four Neighbourhoods, each covering a different part of the Borough. Decisions are made by local councillors who know the area. Local people are able to get involved by asking questions at the meetings held in local venues,

presenting petitions and giving their views on issues the committee is looking at. This decentralised form of decision making allows local people to influence the decisions that directly affect them.

Existing liaison channels

- 10.6 Regular quarterly Traffic Management Liaison Meetings (TMLM) are held and constitute a useful forum for the exchange of views on traffic issues, consideration of ideas/proposals and making all participants aware of the aspirations and programmes of each others organisations. They are supplemented by frequent meetings by the Traffic Response Group in the run-up to the Christmas period.
- 10.7 TMLM meetings are attended by RBK officers, the emergency services (police, fire and ambulance), local bus operators, TFL and representatives of a local cycling campaign. The format allows discussions on temporary traffic issues and forthcoming schemes/initiatives. These may originate from any of the participants. The meeting also covers joint initiative opportunities, communications issues/ improvements and contact updates. Public Transport Liaison Meetings are also held quarterly and any issues with traffic management implications are brought to that group's attention and vice versa.
- 10.8 Kingston Town Centre Management has established a Transport and Access Liaison Group with the Council that meets approximately quarterly. It concentrates on issues affecting the town centre.

The Local Implementation Plan Consultation Process

- 10.9 In accordance with LIP guidance both electronic and hard copies of the draft LIP and accompanying Environmental Report were submitted to TfL. The majority of the remaining statutory and recommended consultees were advised electronically but offered the choice of a hard copy if they so wished.
- 10.10 Recognising that it is difficult to consult effectively on a large document (the draft LIP exceeded 400 pages), and in expectation of low response rates in connection with broad policy consultations of this kind, it was not considered appropriate to deliver a summary leaflet to all Borough residents. Consequently using the lists of consultees produced during UDP and K+20 consultations as a starting point, summary leaflets were distributed to in excess of 80 local stakeholders. A press release was issued drawing attention to the consultation draft LIP and publicising how to access or request all or parts of it. This led to extensive coverage in local papers at the end of March with the web address for the LIP documents shown, and it's presence in libraries noted. The draft Local Implementation Plan,

the summary and the accompanying Environmental Report were also posted on the RBK website, deposited in RBK libraries and helpdesks and in the Guildhall Planning Reception area.

- 10.11 A list of all consultees, including statutory and recommended TfL consultees and local stakeholders identified by the Council such as residents associations, civic societies, businesses and other significant organisations is attached as Appendix 1. Members of the public who requested hard copies are not listed.
- 10.12 In addition a Kingston Citizens' panel of 1,500 Borough residents were asked for their views on nine LIP related questions. All fieldwork and analysis was conducted by MORI. Results from the 936 responses are attached as Appendix 2. The data has been weighted by age, gender and work status to the population profile of the Borough and is considered by the Council to be a genuinely representative picture of general public views in RBK.

Analysis of Comments

- 10.13 Around 35 written comments were received. Those from statutory consultees, adjacent boroughs and from Surrey County Council (SCC) are summarised below. Comments from other sources are summarised in Appendix 3.
- 10.14 SCC sent a combined response covering the County Council and the District Councils that RBK consulted. The Surrey response is supportive on almost all the numbered policies identified in chapter 3. SCC offered to share information or work with RBK in a number of areas, notably on policies 1, 4, 6, 16, 19, 23 and 26. They noted that policy 3 on mode shift and traffic reduction "is an ambitious policy and, as pointed out, will require a substantial increase in public transport capacity and quality. There needs to be a reasonable degree of certainty that such investment will be forthcoming."
- 10.15 Policy 13 seeks "a further transfer of cross-border services from Surrey operators to TfL in the next five years." SCC noted that "The great majority of cross boundary bus services from Surrey into Kingston are already operated by TfL, with only a limited number of exceptions. There are, effectively, no commercial bus services operating across the boundary, thus all services are operated under contract to either TfL or Surrey County Council. Increased frequencies are primarily a financial issue, and a matter of priorities for the organisations concerned. Whilst fully supporting a policy of enhanced frequency services, Surrey County Council has seen its bus support budget double in cost in the last four years, and is unlikely to be in a position to fund such improvements in this area in the foreseeable future."

- 10.16 In relation to policy 15 SCC say that "With regard to the aspirations for improved park and ride services, the County Council understands the attraction of Kempton Park in Surrey as a potential site, but has reservations regarding the access impacts. The roundabout at Sunbury Cross suffers from extensive congestion and is an air quality hotspot within a Borough, which has declared its area as an Air Quality Management Area. The County Council would need to be convinced that the operation of park and ride at Kempton Park would not contribute to worsening local congestion and air quality before being prepared to endorse the concept. The views of Spelthorne Borough Council, as planning authority, would also be critical in this regard."
- 10.17 The London Borough of Richmond agreed with the desire in principle to make more use of waterborne freight. However they felt any significant increase in use of the Thames should only be considered where suitable and where the impact on adjoining land is acceptable. Richmond expressed support for the concept of Park and Ride from Kempton Park to Kingston detailed in paragraphs 5.42 to 5.44. They gave a succinct view of the Parking and Enforcement Plan, saying it was an excellent document.
- 10.18 The London Borough of Wandsworth suggested adding more explicit reference to consulting neighbouring authorities on proposals that could impact on them. They sought reassurance in the final LIP that RBK's traffic reduction targets will not be achieved by reassigning traffic into Wandsworth. They would like to be kept informed of RBK's timetable and plans for measures on A roads and busy bus routes that might have a corridor impact on Wandsworth. They are keen to work with RBK and noted in particular a desire to increase levels of accessibility between the Roehampton area and surrounding areas. Finally they want to continue liaison and to be made aware of any new policies in the final LIP that would have a significant impact on surrounding Boroughs.
- 10.19 Kingston Metropolitan Police offered views on HGVs in bus lanes, expressing safety concerns about a mismatch between average HGV and cycle speeds in these lanes, leading to more overtaking than would occur with buses. They also felt that HGV drivers have more blind spots than bus drivers, posing another risk to cyclists. They suggested some clarification of the distinction between 20 mph zones and limits and offered comments on use of zebra crossings by disabled people.
- 10.20 TfL Borough partnerships have provided overview comments which are best summed up in the following quote from their response - "Overall, TfL has assessed the LIP as likely to meet the requirements of the Mayor's Transport

Strategy (MTS) with a few additions and/or adjustments.” The response also says “Kingston’s LIP and proposals are generally clear and well supported by estimates of relevant resources.” All the relevant TfL business units have also provided detailed and constructive comments on their areas of interest, which have been used to strengthen the corresponding parts of the final LIP. At 93 pages the entire TfL response is too detailed to summarise in this chapter but the identified shortcomings relative to the Mayors Transport Strategy have been taken full account of in preparing the final LIP.

Consultation since closure date for responses

10.21 A LIP seminar was held on 13th May 2005 at the Guildhall, Kingston. About 40 attendees including Members, local stakeholders and residents and RBK officers listened to presentations on:

- Kingston Citizens’ Panel results
- Transport for London feedback
- Other consultee’s feedback
- Spending priorities for the final LIP

There were question and answer sessions following each presentation and a general discussion on the draft document and its contents. The seminar was a useful opportunity to hear further views on the consultation draft, which were generally favourable, and for TfL to see the consultation process taking place at the local level. Specific suggestions coming from the floor for additions to the final LIP are included in notes of the seminar which are available on request.

10.22 Between 18th May and 15th June each Neighbourhood Committee considered a report on the consultation results which also afforded them an opportunity to express a considered view on what was in the draft LIP and what changes they wished to see in the final LIP. The responses are detailed in the closing section of Appendix 3.

10.23 On 9th of June the Transport and Infrastructure Overview Panel considered a more extensive report on the consultation results. The views of the Panel are also detailed in the closing section of Appendix 3.

Key Issues and Actions Arising from Consultation

10.24 The balance of views from written responses, and from the Kingston Citizen’s Panel, supported the sustainable transport strategy and the importance of demand restraint and modal shift. Some concern was expressed about whether the LIP strategy could deliver the traffic reduction targets set for the Borough and

for Kingston town centre. Among consultees other than TfL attention focussed on whether and how to make more of the road network 20 mph speed limited, potential use of bus lanes by other priority vehicles and how the economic vitality of Kingston town centre would be affected by the LIP strategy. In addition, interest groups offered views on how to best advance the transport prospects of those they represented. The following paragraphs cover significant changes between the draft and final LIP.

10.25 The traffic reduction targets in the final LIP have been trimmed; the Borough wide level from a 5% reduction to a 3% reduction and the KTC target from a 7% reduction to a 5% reduction. This was done for two reasons. First, the Council received data which showed the downward trend to 2002 had been reversed by a small rise in 2003 (Boroughwide) and 2004 (KTC). This meant that the most recent annual counts were back at the 2001 baseline levels. Second, the concern from TfL that the majority of spending proposals were highway based and might not be sufficient to deliver the targets has been taken seriously. The balance of spending in the final LIP is less highway based than in the draft. Paragraphs 9.13 and 9.14 explain more about the various factors which will influence traffic levels and how these justify the targets set.

10.26 The 20 mph issue is resolved by clarifying and expanding coverage of what is sought and how best to move towards that. Paragraphs 3.64-3.65 and 5.27-5.28 provide the detailed policy and proposals which in abstract are:

- The benefits of 20 mph limits in residential and shopping streets are widely accepted
- Road humps are the most effective measure to cut speeds but can create fresh problems
- The Council need to use a 'horses for courses' approach to enforcement, dependent on the nature of the road and its function
- 20 mph limits around schools are the highest implementation priority.

10.27 Concerns expressed about the safety implications and possible delay to buses of permitting HGVs to use bus lanes outweighed the benefit of assisting businesses to reduce congestion costs. Paragraph 3.36 refers. PTW use of bus lanes was also questioned so the suggestion that this would be the norm in future is qualified as subject to further analysis of safety. Paragraph 3.78 refers.

10.28 The economic vitality of Kingston town centre is a key priority of the LIP. Large parts of the document are concerned with policies and proposed schemes intended to reduce existing and potential congestion in the centre.

However, fears have been expressed by the Kingston Town Centre Management (KTCM) body that some actions “will not only fail to reduce congestion but will also substantially damage our local economy and help competing centres.” The Council recognise this as a fairly standard response from commercial interests but is reassured by its partnership agreement with Hammersons which may lead to the largest redevelopment of the town centre for nearly two decades. The K+20 area action plan and the proposals of this major developer both entail a vision of a town centre less dominated by moving and parked cars, made possible by a higher proportion of workers, shoppers and visitors arriving and leaving by non-car means of transport. The LIP is consistent with this vision and the proposed measures will deliver it by improving public transport and facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. Essential car trips and freight journeys will be made in the less congested conditions that follow a 5% reduction in KTC traffic levels by 2010.

10.29 The Council consider that the least attractive features of the town centre actually stem from domination by traffic and the associated infrastructure. Consultation has borne this out. Although through traffic is a complicating factor the prime cause of congestion in the town centre and its outskirts is car borne traffic trying to access the town itself. It is no longer practical, and was never sustainable, to equate good access and parking capacity for car users with good access to the town centre as a whole. Redevelopment proposals which will boost residential and retail use of the centre, along with plans by Kingston University to increase student numbers by 5,000 can only be absorbed if the proportion of trips made by car continues on its downward path. The Council has a duty to pursue a sustainable transport strategy capable of accommodating growth and protecting and enhancing the environment for future residents and users of the town centre.

10.30 In line with the above it accepts a criticism put forward by KTCM that an undue amount of parking space in the town centre is reserved for use by public sector workers. The Kingston Town Centre Parking Strategy includes policies to alter this situation and the Council will ensure its Staff Travel Plan makes a full contribution to those policies.¹

10.31 KTCM referred in their LIP response to previous concerns they had expressed during development of the Kingston Town Centre Parking Strategy. These are noted but that strategy has been adopted and the Council look forward to working constructively with KTCM and constituent members on measures to

¹ Section 4.15 to 4.20 of the KTC Parking Strategy deals with this issue, especially paragraphs 4.18 and 4.19.

reduce parking problems and imbalances in the town. If any aspect of the strategy proves inadequate to cope with developments in the town centre there is an opportunity, through annual review of the K+20 Area Action Plan, to modify the strategy.

10.32 Many specific suggestions by consultees have been included in the LIP. Obviously that is not always possible; often two consultees offer diametrically opposed suggestions. However it is hoped that those who took the trouble to read the consultation draft will also read the final LIP and recognise the substantial changes made to be an improvement on the draft.

Conclusion

10.33 Consultation is never an easy process on a contentious matter like transport, especially so with a document of this size. Despite this the process has been very valuable and the Council thank all those who provided comment. The process has thrown up fresh suggestions for organisations that could have been consulted and these will be invited to send representatives to the Community Plan Transport Group. The Group will have an ongoing role in pressing for the Council's transport strategy, and the work of other Community Plan partners, to deliver the community's aspirations.

Appendix 1

Draft LIP Consultee List

Statutory Consultees

Transport for London (TfL)
The Metropolitan Police (Kingston)
London Borough of Merton
London Borough of Richmond
London Borough of Sutton
London Borough of Wandsworth
Kingston Centre for Independent Living (KCIL)

Recommended Consultees

Age Concern
Highways Agency
Kingston Borough Forum for Elderly People
Kingston Citizens Advice Bureau
Kingston Racial Equality Council
Kingston upon Thames Society for the Blind
London Ambulance Service
London Fire Service
Network Rail
Strategic Rail Authority
Elmbridge Borough Council
Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
Mole Valley District Council
Spelthorne Borough Council
Surrey County Council

Local Businesses Representatives

Kingston Town Centre Management
Chamber of Commerce
Chessington World of Adventures
Bentalls Centre
Eden Walk Centre (La Salle Management)
John Lewis Partnership
Kingston First
Kingston Rotunda
Marks and Spencer
Old London Traders Association
Sainsburys
Hammersons

Other Organisations

British Motorcyclists Federation
British Waterways

Environment Agency
 Friends of the Earth
 Greater London Motorcycle Action Group
 Kingston Cycling Campaign
 Kingston College
 Kingston Grammar School
 Kingston Hospital
 Kingston University
 Living Streets
 London Buses
 London Transport Users Committee
 Save the World Club
 SWELTRAC
 Thames Water

Residents Associations & similar groups

Name	Area of Borough Represented
Agar House Residents Association	Kingston
Alexandra Neighbours Association	Surbiton
Alric to Cambridge Residents Association	New Malden
Anglers Reach Residents Association	Surbiton
Barnsbury Crescent Residents Association	Tolworth/Surbiton
Bittoms Court Residents Association	Kingston
Blenheim Gardens Residents Association	Kingston
Cambridge Road Estate Residents Association	Kingston
Cambridge Road Residents Association	Kingston
Canbury Court Owners Association	Kingston
Canburt Court Residents Association	Kingston
CARA Residents Association	Kingston
Charter Quay Residents Association	Kingston
Chessington Court Residents Association	Chessington
Chessington District Residents Association	Chessington
Chessington and Hook Residents Association	Chessington
Church Road Residents Association	Chessington
Coombe House Estates Residents Association	
Coombe Park Residents Association	
Coombe Ridings Residents Association	
Coombe Road Residents Association	New Malden
Coombe Wood Conservation Area Association	
Dale Court Residents Association	Kingston
Dysart Avenue Residents Association	Kingston
Elgar Avenue Residents Association	Surbiton
Federation of Residents' Associations	
Greenwood Park Association	Kingston
Kingston Area Travellers Association (KATA)	

Name	Area of Borough Represented
Kingston Gate (Conservation Area) Residents Association Kingston Town and Royal Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC)	Kingston
Kingston Vale Residents Association	Kingston Vale
Knights Gate Residents Association	Kingston
Knights Park Residents Association	Kingston
London House Residents Association	Kingston
Long Ditton Residents Association	Long Ditton
Maeldune Residents Association	Old Malden
Malden and Coombe Civic Society	
Malden and Coombe Society	
Malden and Coombe Residents Association Ltd	New Malden
Malden Rushett Residents Association	Chessington
Maldens and Surbiton Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC)	
Maple Court Residents Association	New Malden
Marlow House Ltd	Kingston
Melbourne Court Residents Association	Surbiton
Melford Close Residents Association	Chessington
Mill Street Residents Association	
New Malden Residents Association (Beverley Ward)	New Malden
Old Kingston Road Residents Association Park	Tolworth/Worcester
Oregon Close Residents Association	New Malden
Presburg Association	New Malden
Queens Road Association	Kingston
Ravens View Court Association	Surbiton
Residents of Apsley Road	New Malden
Riverside Residents Association	Kingston
Roebuck Court Residents Association Committee	New Malden
St Matthews Residents Association	Surbiton
Sherwood (Ditton Hill) Residents Association Ltd	Long Ditton
Spring Grove Residents Association	
Surbiton and Tolworth Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC)	
Thames Haven Management Co.	Surbiton
Thames Riverside Residents Association	Surbiton
The Crescent Residents Association	Chessington
The Grange Residents Association	New Malden
Tolworth South Residents Association	Tolworth/Surbiton
Victoria, Albert and Church Road Residents Association	Kingston
Wessex Close Home Owners Association	Kingston
Windsor Court Residents Association	Kingston
Wolverton Avenue Residents Association	Kingston

Appendix 2

Kingston Citizens' Panel: Questions, Answers and Analysis

Q.1 What level of traffic in Kingston should we be aiming for by 2011?

Please tick <u>one</u> box only	%
Around the same as 2001	37
Around 5% less than in 2001	40
Other	12
Don't know	10
Not stated	1

In this case a reduction was a little more popular than a freeze though the view of the 12% answering other could affect that depending on how they split between those wanting more traffic and those wanting a larger fall than 5%.

Q.2 It is expected that there will be an increase in journeys in the borough between now and 2011. How do you feel this should be dealt with?

Please tick <u>one</u> box only	%
Increasing the number of journeys people make by foot, bike and public transport	78
Increasing road capacity so that the number of journeys by car can remain the same	12
Other	5
Don't know	3
No answer	1

This provides a strong endorsement of the Local Implementation Plan's sustainable transport strategy.

Q.3 From your experience of the borough's roads and pavements, which one of the following is most in need of improvement?

Please tick <u>one</u> box only	%
The main roads	12
The minor roads	36
Pavements	42
Don't know	8
Not stated	1

Pavements and minor roads are the clear priorities, attracting almost 80% of the vote.

Q.4 Which one of these options, if any, do you think is most important on cycling safety?

Please tick <u>one</u> box only	%
Creating off-road cycle routes, where this is possible	45
Ensuring the road network is made safer for cyclists	30
Cycle training for children and adults	22
Don't know	2
No answer	1

All three of the options feature within the Borough's cycle strategy and will be pursued during the period of the LIP. The answers suggest that where sections of off-road cycle route can be identified as feasible the public would expect schemes to attract funding. Question 7 shows that half the Panel never cycle and analysis of their answers to question 4 will show whether they differ from cyclist's answers. To achieve the LIP target of doubling the cycling mode share we need to encourage occasional cyclists to cycle more often, and encourage a proportion of those who never cycle to start doing so.

Q.5 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Please tick <u>one</u> box for <u>each</u> statement	%Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither/ nor	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	No answer
a) The Council should prioritise its road safety funds on those road users who have higher casualty rates e.g. children	34	41	13	5	2	3	2
b) Residential roads and shopping streets should have a 20mph speed limit	36	28	7	16	10	1	2
c) The Council should invest more heavily in community transport such as Dial-a-Ride, taxi vouchers and Shopmobility	16	28	30	13	6	6	1
d) Bus lanes should be created where necessary	23	41	12	11	10	1	2
e) There should be parking controls to prevent parked cars from obstructing buses	51	35	7	3	2	1	2
f) There should be cameras to identify motorists using bus lanes	41	32	13	7	5	1	1
g) Council money should be invested in a new motorcycle safety campaign to combat the rising number of accidents involving motorcyclists	16	32	21	17	9	4	1

Each of these questions covers policy proposed or put up for consideration in the draft LIP. In every case the level of agreement (tend to plus strongly agree) exceed the 'tend to plus strongly disagree' totals. In the case of investing more heavily in community transport the large 'neither/nor' response means that caution is needed about the balance of agreement.

Q.6 How likely or unlikely would you be to use a frequent all-year-round park-and-ride express bus service from Chessington World of Adventures to Kingston town centre via Surbiton station?

Please tick <u>one</u> box only	%	% of possible users
Very likely	6	8.5
Fairly likely	7	10
Not very likely	13	18
Not at all likely	44	62
Don't know	1	1.5
Not applicable - Never travel in this area	29	
No answer	*	

As 29% never use the corridor the remaining answers should be factored up to reveal views among potential users. So for instance very likely becomes 6 over 71 = 8.5%. A new column has been added to show these results. The results suggest lukewarm support for the concept though it may not have been clear enough that it would provide a non-stop link between Surbiton station and Kingston town centre.

Q.7 How often, if at all, do you personally use each of the following means of transport?

Please tick <u>one</u> box only for <u>each</u> mode of transport		Once a week or more	1-3 times a month	6-11 times a year	Less often	Never	Don't know	No answer
a) Car driven by yourself	%	72	6	1	2	13	1	5
b) Car as a passenger	%	37	25	9	14	5	1	9
c) Buses	%	37	23	17	12	9	*	2
d) Coaches	%	*	1	4	21	62	2	9
e) Bike	%	17	6	7	12	48	1	7
f) Motorcycle	%	2	*	1	2	84	1	10
g) Trains (excluding the underground)	%	23	28	25	15	5	1	4

Row a) reconciles well with the 76% level of households in the Borough owning one or more cars since one would expect at least one person from these households to use a car once a week or more. While row a) illustrates relatively high car ownership and use

it is important to realise that many of these car owners are also using buses and trains extensively (rows c and g) and cycles to a lesser degree (row e). Motorcycling has a limited niche but the vehicles are used regularly whereas coaches are used only rarely but by a wider spectrum of people.

Q.8 Which of the following would most improve rail travel for you?

Please tick up to 3 boxes only

Base: All who travel by train at least once a month (477)	%
More frequent services	53
Less overcrowding	53
More reliable services	51
Better disabled access to and at stations	7
Lower fares	49
Better information about services and delays	20
More parking for cars, motorcycles & bicycles at stations	15
More freedom to take cycles on trains	11
None of these	2
Don't know	*
No answer	4

Question 8 reflects views of respondents who already use trains at least once a month. There is quite a wide scatter of responses but the three concerned with frequency, capacity and reliability stand out, as does the suggestion that fare levels are a significant concern to regular users.

Q.9 Which of the following would make you consider using trains more often?

Please tick up to 3 boxes only

Base: All who travel by train less than once a month (423)	%
More frequent services	22
Less overcrowding	25
More reliable services	24
Better disabled access to and at stations	10
Lower fares	34
Better information about services and delays	9
More parking for cars, motorcycles and bicycles at stations	26
More freedom to take cycles on trains	6
None of these	14
Don't know	2
No answer	20

Question 9 reflects views of respondents who rarely use trains. The answers are even more scattered but the importance of lower fares does stand out more strongly among

these respondents. Because the final three rows contain very high numbers compared to question 8 the answers in the earlier rows of this table could probably be factored up somewhat. In terms of action and bicycles at stations along with better disabled access are the most deliverable.

APPENDIX 3: Non-Statutory Consultation Responses Summarised

n.b. Comments received recorded in chronological order. Any paragraph or form numbers cited are from the draft LIP.

Respondent	Organisation	Summary of Comments
Jane Young	Maldens & Coombe Neighbourhood Committee	<p>Resolution that comments made by Committee on the Draft LIP report on 9th February 2005 should be considered as part of the consultation results reported back to Executive in July</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disparity between comments made in respect of private car use by the Mayor of London and LIP Policy Statement Acceptance of divergent views on car use between political Groups of the Council Practicalities and implications of implementation of LIP proposals particularly Freight Concern over overcrowding on specific routes at peak time as a result of free travel for children under 16 Comfort and safety concerns about public transport such as reliability of the Countdown system, lack of legroom and difficulties for those with prams and pushchairs should be addressed Lobbying for more low-fuel emission buses Concerns over the disparity between the amount of Council budget required to be raised in RBK against the London average and the effect on Council funding for transport and traffic priorities Complexities and problems associated with parking in Kingston in particular Kingston Hospital Recognition that the LIP was a working document that was under constant review and would develop over time
Ben Wheeldon	RBK Access Officer and member of Community Plan Transport Group Network Rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcomed proposals to improve access through modifications to RBK roads and footways for passengers using Borough stations - Chapter 3 paragraph 45 Reminder that works may need to comply with conditions for Outside Party projects Looking forward to receiving details in respect of policies and initiatives in Chapter 3 paragraphs 47 & 48
	Road Safety Advisory Committee	<p>Comments resulting from discussions held at Road Safety Advisory Committee 16th March 2005 concerning:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targets Sustainability

Respondent	Organisation	Summary of Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on the positives of Road Safety work • Education work (reaching wider groups) • Road Safety Initiatives
Borough Resident		<p>General comments in respect of transport budgets being trimmed in line with more worthy budgets and dissatisfaction with forests of street furniture, humps of tarmac and making the whole Borough a 20 mph zone</p>
Borough Resident		<p>Full support for Chapter 6, safety benefits of introduction of 20 mph speed limits and cameras to enforce traffic lights (certain reservations though over revenue raising from cameras).</p>
Bernard Brewer	Association of British Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleased to see a traffic manager is proposed to minimise congestion • Totally support encouraging cycling • Firmly in favour of the preferred transport mode i.e. the car (particularly important to take into account that people are living and driving longer and for less able drivers the car is essential) • Concerns over the extension of 20 mph zones until full explanation of results of DfT injury figures for 20 mph & 30 mph are available • Financial implications for businesses should be considered if a totally negative attitude to cars is to be pursued • Successful transport plans must integrate all forms of transport • Welcomes the opportunity to comment and hopes that views will not be ignored
Borough Resident		<p>Various views against introduction of 20 mph zones - submitted in response to item in local paper.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Particular concerns over enforcement, slowing down of emergency services, congestion, road accidents and pollution
Borough Resident		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Association of British Drivers response to 20 mph speed consultation provided for information • No further restrictions should be placed on motorists as have implications for visitors, shop trade and council income • Allow free parking outside shops - remove double red and yellow lines • Use of public transport to be encouraged through provision of free edge of Borough car parks with Park and Ride
Robert Mansfield	SWELTRAC Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that very little mention of SWELTRAC or working with partnerships which would be of particular benefit for:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HGV's in bus lanes (pilot study in Richmond)

Respondent	Organisation	Summary of Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Problems of bus services into Surrey (could be a good project for the whole area) • Queried location of Park and Ride sites and effect on other Boroughs • Suggested a short SWELTRAC statement should be included in the LIP • Specific comments re Freight and Enhanced Community Transport Form 1 bids
	Two borough residents	Support for implementation of a more comprehensive Park and Ride, similar to that in operation in Bath, rather than the provision of additional town centre parking.
Alan Byrne	English Heritage	General comments on the Scoping Report and advice in respect of useful guidance, policies, plans and data for inclusion in the Strategic Environmental Assessment
Justin Bennett	Metropolitan Police	<p>Comments on:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared use of bus lanes by HGV's • Distinction between 20 mph zones and 20 mph speed limits • Provision of facilities for disabled people and those with mobility impairments at pedestrian crossings
Laura Hones	Environment Agency	Covering letter and checklist of issues for consideration and inclusion in the Plan (general comments not specific and already provided as a response to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report)
	Borough Resident	Totally against the wider use of 20 mph zones
	Borough Resident	Strongly supports the introduction of 20 mph limits in residential roads and shopping streets with possible extension to cover "main" roads
Paul Robinson	Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed that the Highways Agency interest relates to the motorway and all purpose trunk road network which for RBK is indirectly the M25 and A3. • Noted the Transport Objectives and Land Use policies included in Chapter 3
	Borough Resident	Commented on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surbiton Station Access - approves of access improvements and added cycle parking facilities but concerned over the chaotic situation and condition of the borough road system outside the station forecourt • 20 mph limits outside Schools - inconsistency of approach • The Transport Hierarchy - relationship between taxis and powered two wheelers (PTW s)

Respondent	Organisation	Summary of Comments
	Borough Resident	<p>An interesting document containing useful information and explanations of existing policies and practices. Shows a great deal of thought on balancing conflicting interests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertainty about meaning or intention of “Integration” and “Sustainability” • Things ignored, biases and questionable issues, including home zones, speed limits, signs and access for Emergency vehicles • Controlled Parking Zones - vehicle lengths • Town Centre Residential Development • Parking charges - support for pay on foot, provision of Park and Ride
	Borough Resident	<p>Generally welcomes the initiatives, policies and proposals in the Draft LIP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly endorses introduction of 20 mph in residential areas • Provision of secure cycle parking essential • Reduction of school catchment areas to encourage walking to school, school places should be conditional on not using a car for the school-run and parking in the vicinity of schools should be strictly enforced
Cathy Phillipotts	British Motorcyclists Federation	<p>Welcomes opportunity to be involved in RBK’s LIP consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commented in detail on a number of issues in Chapter 3 to 8 relating to PTWs. • Suggested RBK take into account the Governments new Motorcycling Strategy and new IHIE guidance for improving road safety for motorcyclists through engineering and integration • Referred to earmarking of TfL funds for motorcycle bays
Agnes Saudrais	RoadPeace	<p>Welcomes the development of a Kingston Road Safety Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested use of neutral terminology (collisions rather than accidents) • Concerns over under-reporting of casualty figures (consideration to be given to adjustment factors and guidance on severity weighting) • Suggestions for presentation of road crash and casualty data • Welcomed RBK’s resistance to the concept of “motorists rights” • Road Safety Plan should link in with other Council programmes in respect of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy • Supports the focus on vulnerable road users stressing more emphasis need on disabled and elderly • Welcomes the focus on speed management but recommends that RBK encourage DfT to share camera revenue

Respondent	Organisation	Summary of Comments
Rob James	Borough Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes extension of 20 mph zones in residential areas but requires proper enforcement • Suggested change to RoadPeace description in table 6.3 Road Safety Plan Partners <p>Welcomes the opportunity to work with RBK on a range of awareness events and educational activities whenever possible such as:- Promotion of World Remembrance Day, the DfT's Against Aggressive Driving project, RoadPeace "Remember Me" signs and safety cameras and the "When lives collide" touring exhibition</p>
Kingston Cycling Campaign	Borough Resident	<p>Specific concern over proposed introduction of parking controls on a Sunday outside St Raphael's Church and the effect it would have on their parish community. Made particular reference to omission of places of worship from para 63 in the Parking and Enforcement Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomed recognition of cycling's part in allowing the expected increase in personal travel to take place without significantly impacting on congestion, pollution, health and degradation of the environment. • Although accepting the part cycling should play in journeys to town centres concerned that the Plan understates its use outside of these centres. Would like to see Policy 20 amended to reflect the Borough's cycling strategy quoted in para 3.58 that " the whole road network bar the A3 should be safe for use by cyclists" • Noted from the Community Plan that cycling is our most underused form of transport in comparison to other European countries such as Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands. Urged that to increase these low levels physical and mental barriers need to be overcome. • Welcomed the adoption of 20 mph as the standard speed limit in residential streets - safer for cyclists and simpler for motorists • Agreed that significant health improvements can be achieved from a move to more active forms of travel such as walking and cycling and that the advantages of cycling for journeys over a greater range of distances should be promoted. • Possible introduction of "express cycleways" from Surbiton station to reflect its role as the gateway to Kingston • Welcomed the recognition that perception of safety/danger plays a significant role in choosing a "vulnerable" mode of transport and that to encourage modal shift to these forms of travel to take place they must be perceived as safe rather than just recording low KSI figures. Asked for this to be taken into consideration in the planning process for new facilities • Welcomed the importance of structured positive interventions in influencing decisions on travel choice through both school and workplace travel plans

Respondent	Organisation	Summary of Comments
Graham McNally	Borough Resident Kingston Town Centre Management	<p data-bbox="188 465 256 1608">Appalled by Council's "hairbrained" schemes in respect of parking restrictions, road closures (Herne Road), New Malden Home Zone plus 92% increase in Council Tax since 1998</p> <p data-bbox="272 385 416 1608">There was much in the plan with which KTCM wholeheartedly agreed. However, they took issue with other elements, notably that policies on parking and road space reallocation meant that although traffic levels had dropped congestion had increased and traffic management policies were unfairly biased against those visiting, investing in or working in Kingston.</p> <p data-bbox="432 1160 456 1608">Other important points made were:</p> <ul data-bbox="464 385 1098 1608" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 385 608 1608">• If traffic originating in RBK could be removed from the A3 or the Kingston Town Centre relief road, vehicles from further afield would very quickly replace them and neither congestion nor pollution would have been reduced. If correct this would undermine the traffic and pollution benefits anticipated from reduced business parking in Kingston and Surbiton town centres. <li data-bbox="616 385 719 1608">• Surrey County Council and Royal Borough of Kingston provide an excessively generous amount of free parking for their staff in the town centre while the private sector supply is quite limited and mostly in competition with daytime visitors, students etc <li data-bbox="727 385 791 1608">• In that context the business community find it difficult to accept that parking policies in the LIP are fair and even handed <li data-bbox="799 385 863 1608">• There seems nothing in the LIP designed to promote increased use of bus services by those living in the Borough <li data-bbox="871 385 943 1608">• Traffic calming and the timing of traffic signals have led to more congestion on main roads and there seems no intention in the LIP to try to reduce congestion and delay. <li data-bbox="951 385 1023 1608">• Grave concerns remain about the Kingston Town Centre Car Parking Strategy and recommendations from a KTCM employed consultant were appended to the response <li data-bbox="1031 385 1098 1608">• In the absence of step change improvement in public transport capacity it is economically unsustainable for Kingston Council to continue with this series of damaging policies
Gerard Livett	Greater London Motorcycle Group	<p data-bbox="1114 385 1182 1608">Overall a well written and presented document with which he could find little fault. However, not a very positive document for motorcycles although not negative either.</p> <p data-bbox="1190 1115 1214 1608">General comments made in respect of:-</p> <ul data-bbox="1222 562 1367 1608" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1222 562 1254 1608">• Omissions from the Mayor's Transport Strategy and flaws in the Mayor's guidance <li data-bbox="1262 1025 1294 1608">• PTWs in bus lanes and Advanced Stop Lines <li data-bbox="1302 1272 1334 1608">• Parking and Congestion <li data-bbox="1342 1384 1367 1608">• Social Inclusion

Respondent	Organisation	Summary of Comments
		<p>Specific comments re RBK's LIP:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomed placement of motorcycles above private cars in hierarchy • Welcomed improvements to PTW parking provision, application of minimum standards in new developments and shared use of bus lanes • On the whole opposed to charging for PTW parking unless secure parking as mentioned in Form 60 and in the Parking and Enforcement Plan <p>Headteachers from six Borough schools were sent the School Travel Plan Strategy and invited to comment</p> <p>The four headteachers who responded were all strongly supportive of the strategy and the layout and level of detail provided. The RBK Directorate Head of Planning & Access - Learning & Children Services also confirmed full support for the strategy.</p>
Council Committee and Panel	<p>Surbiton Neighbourhood Committee of the Council on 18th May 2005</p> <p>Kingston Neighbourhood Committee of the Council on 25th May 2005</p>	<p>Views</p> <p>Consultation report endorsed. No additional comments.</p> <p>During the debate members commented on the process, which had not attracted a high level of response from Residents' Associations. The role of the Neighbourhood as a 'voice' for the whole of the Neighbourhood interests, including the commercial sector was also highlighted. In this context it was noted that whilst the response from the Kingston Town Centre Management Board had been summarised there were a range of points on which the full text would be appropriate, including the comments on the parking strategy.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the concerns identified in the consultation response from Kingston Town Centre Management be reiterated and endorsed and the full text of the letter be included in the report to the Executive.</p>
<p>South of the Borough Neighbourhood Committee of the Council on 8th June 2005</p>		<p>The draft Local Implementation Plan be noted and the following comments be recorded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comments received from Surrey County Council regarding the cross-border bus services were disappointing. It was therefore recognised that only Transport for London was likely to be in a position to improve these services. • Concern was expressed that the consultation did not reflect businesses in the South of the Borough and that the list of Residents Associations used appeared to be out of date. • The importance of including young people in the consultation process was also noted.

Council Committee and Panel

Maldens & Coombe Neighbourhood
Committee of the Council on
5th June 2005

Views

Concurring with a comment made by the Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee, the concerns identified in the consultation response from KTCM Board be reiterated and the full text of the Board letter be included in the report to the Executive.

Concurring with a comment made by the Transport and Infrastructure Overview Panel in relation to a borough-wide 20 mph policy, the Committee's position be reiterated that it only supports the introduction of 20 mph limits in residential roads where local residents clearly support this.

Transport & Infrastructure
Overview Panel on 9th of June 2005

The Panel AGREED to forward the following comments, made by individual Members of the Panel, to the Executive:

- Concern was raised as to the lack of feedback from residents of the Borough. The Panel noted that residents generally only participated if the issue directly had an impact on them.
- The Panel also noted that there had not been support from residents for a blanket 20mph in the Borough. (In fact there was a 50/50 split among the ten people who responded to the LIP itself and a clear majority in support of 20mph from the Kingston's Citizen's Panel). And referred to the individual neighbourhood committee decisions.
- Some Members were of the opinion that the proposed level of off-street parking in the town centre was too low and could impact on the future viability of the town. Whilst other Members believed that if the availability of parking facilities was increased, this would in turn increase traffic and congestion. The importance of achieving the right balance between car parking provision and the impact of associated traffic attraction was recognised. Reference was also made to the decision made by Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee on 25 May 2005 as stated below:
'that the concerns identified in the consultation response from KTCM Management be reiterated and endorsed and the full text of the letter included in the report to the Executive'.
- Draconian measures to enforce 20 mph will not work, i.e. the Police will not enforce 20 mph unless cameras are present. Instead, the Council needs to work in partnership with motorists and to consider each road separately, especially those roads where residents have raised concerns.
- It was confirmed that the final LIP would not propose the possibility of HGVs making use of bus lanes.