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Executive Summary
Executive Summary

Consultation Process

This consultation update gives an account of, and the findings from, Stage 2 of the consultation process for Kingston Ancient Market Area. Throughout Stage 2 there has been a continued effort to reach new consultees as well as keep all existing contacts informed of developments and consultation events. This culminated in a number of exhibitions of the Concept Proposals to gather informed and detailed area-by-area feedback that can be clearly analysed to guide the detailed development of the proposals.

During Stage 2 of the consultation process three public consultation events have been held, attracting approximately 200 people. Newsletter and letters distributed to over 3000 people. Stakeholder and market trader workshops have attracted a further 44 consultees and other methods to engage (including emails / letters / meetings / telephone conversations / website) have attracted at minimum another 20 consultees.

In total, approximately 260 people have been engaged or informed through events. Feedback has come from over 125 sources, which has directly represented 164 people (including approximately 121 individuals and 43 organisation representatives). All feedback has been broken down into singular comments, which has totalled over 1200 comments on the Ancient Market Area.

The Concept Proposals

The Concept Proposals have been informed by Stage 1 of the consultation process. This aimed to understand what is important to local people and stakeholders for the Ancient Market Area, what is valued about it, and where it could be improved.

The resulting Concept Proposals are the first ideas of what the Ancient Market Area could become. They are outline concepts that would be feasible functionally and technically, and also consider the financial implications. Responses gathered through Stage 2 of the consultation process provide detailed steer for the design progression.

Response Summary

Of the (approx) 1200 comments received the significant majority of comments have been in relation to the Market Place. This has been the case throughout the consultation process and one would assume this is because it is the natural centre of the Ancient Market Area and a place that is valued highly by many.

An 'out of 5' rating for each project area revealed a range of support between 72% and 80% for each area. This suggests there is broad support for the Concept Proposals, however there are remaining issues to resolve across all areas and more detailed development is needed to understand resolution of some issues.

There is significant interest in the project, at least 81 people have indicated an interest in becoming involved in an ongoing liaison group and/or any arising cultural collaborations. In contrast there are a number of groups, such as young people, who currently have comparatively little interest in the area. Encouraging early involvement to help develop interest and ownership towards the area would be of benefit.
General response to the proposals has been welcoming, with an anticipation that they could help the Ancient Market Area to fulfill its potential, which many feel is needed. This is also mixed with a significant fear that inappropriate change may ruin an Ancient Market Area that is valued by many for its historical and existing qualities. There are also a small number of concerns that borough funds and priorities should focus on key services for residents, and that an explanation project funding would be welcomed.

Consultation Findings Overview

The table below gives an overview of the main areas of support and concern for each of the project areas. More comprehensive area-by-area points of support, concern and other comments, plus detailed findings can be found in the ‘Consultation Findings’ section of this report, starting on page 16. Including a summary of the overarching issues on page 31.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Area</th>
<th>Areas of Support</th>
<th>Areas of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Place</td>
<td>• Creating a ‘destination’ and increased opportunity for use, both in the daytime</td>
<td>• Unclear identity for the Market Place – too many activities without a clear focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and evening</td>
<td>• Possible over provision of cafes and related clutter and litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating a ‘destination’ and increased opportunity for use, both in the daytime</td>
<td>• Banded paving appears dark and busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and evening</td>
<td>• Enforcement of evening activity, drinking and potential disruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consistent, kerb-free paving treatment with pedestrian priority and clear movement</td>
<td>• Cycling strategy unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>routes through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highlighted gateways and connections to the Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Stalls</td>
<td>• Removal of waste refuse area behind the market stalls – increasing permeability</td>
<td>• Back-to-back stall design is a concern with regards to retaining equivalent and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to an active Market Hall</td>
<td>successful pitch locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retaining, at minimum, the existing number of stalls and stallholders</td>
<td>• Waste management and services / facilities need to be resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evening use of market stalls</td>
<td>• Stall size and layout may obstruct pedestrian access and/or east/west Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Place thoroughfares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Hall</td>
<td>• Opening up access to the Market Hall and increased activities</td>
<td>• Unclear identity and balance of Market Hall uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increasing visibility of the Market Hall and highlighting its architecture</td>
<td>• Fully accessible public toilets in both the day and evening requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>• Mini Piers - increased seating and opportunity to enjoy the riverside – creating</td>
<td>• Seating should face towards the river and not block views of river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a destination</td>
<td>• Seating may encourage night-time gathering and increase disturbance for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tree planting on the riverside</td>
<td>• Desire to see visitor mooring proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Saints Church</td>
<td>• Opening up visual links towards All Saints Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retaining cherry trees / Memorial Gate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• With better connections, ensure a peaceful garden is retained and enhanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Desire to see both sets of proposals for All Saints Church connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildhall</td>
<td>• Opening up the Guildhall frontage for general use by the public and removal of</td>
<td>• Concentric seating / paving may be too busy / dark / uncomfortable to sit on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>barriers</td>
<td>• Connection with Market Place could be stronger and large trees may block view of the Guildhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating a fitting frontage to the Guildhall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased pedestrian priority and ease of access across High Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creation of a green environment – trees, grass and uncovering the Hogsmill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways and Connections</td>
<td>• Improved connections and stepping-stones between the Market Place and Riverside</td>
<td>• Potential to encourage nighttime disturbance for riverside residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved appearance / safety / lighting of alleyways</td>
<td>• Landownership issues and management / maintenance are key to resolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Naming the alleyways and highlighting their existing individual charm / history</td>
<td>• Audio installations are not seen as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Removal of cars and clutter in Memorial Square</td>
<td>• Signage / wayfinding elements are quite subtle and may not get noticed, eye-level markers and wider signage strategy suggested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soundings would like to thank all participants who have been part of the consultation process to date and given their valuable input, ideas and time. We look forward to continuing dialogue with you during stage 3 of this consultation process.
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Stage 2 Consultation Process

The second stage of consultation took place between late August and early October 2011. Initial activities focused on informing as many people as possible about the Stage 1 consultation findings, the progression of the Concept Proposal and about upcoming ways to get involved. Following initial outreach, there have been a number of events and ways to view, discuss and feed back upon the Concept Proposals.

This section describes the methodology of the second stage of consultation for the Ancient Market Area.

A. Diary of Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 August</td>
<td>Door drop and distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 August</td>
<td>General publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 September</td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 September</td>
<td>Community Market Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 September</td>
<td>Drop-in Exhibition 1 and Review Workshop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 October</td>
<td>Drop-in Exhibition 2 and Review Workshop 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Canvass Card

The main aim of this stage of consultation has been to gather an understanding of responses to the Concept Proposals and identify with the community, at an early stage, where the proposals are working well, where the designs can be improved and where clarification is needed.

The Canvass Card has been the primary way to feed back throughout this stage of consultation and, where appropriate, each consultee has been asked to contribute using this form.

Questions have been kept deliberately simple to allow for clear understanding, ensure people aren’t presented with too much information in addition to the Concept Proposals and also to allow free response that is not unduly guided by the question.

The Ancient Market Area is split into five major project areas including:

- The Market Place
- Riverside
- Guildhall
- All Saints Church
- Alleyways and Connections

The following questions were asked with regards to each of the project areas:

- What’s good?
- What needs improvement?
- Any suggestions or questions?
- Your rating? (1= dislike, 5= like)
The Canvass Card also asked:

- Any other comments?
- Would you like to be kept informed about the project?
- Would you be interested in being involved in an ongoing liaison group?
- Would you be interested in being involved in any cultural collaborations?
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C. Newsletter 2

Newsletter 2 has been developed to provide an overview of the emerging themes from Stage 1 consultation. It also outlines the design team's aims and approaches for the project in light of this information.

This serves as an introduction to the next stage of consultation and the newsletter crucially lets people know about the public events at which they can view, discuss and feedback on the full Concept Proposals.

The newsletter has retained the same project identity to the first stage, helping to ensure project continuity and public recognition.
D. Publicity 2a – door drop and distribution

Door drop

Information packs have been distributed to every door within the previously agreed distribution boundary. This covers an estimated 3000+ businesses, residences and organisations.

The distribution boundary is based on an approximate 10 minute walk from the site, using natural breaking points (such as the railway line and perceived area boundaries), whilst ensuring both the nearest retail and residential areas are covered.

The information pack included:
- Introductory cover letter (targeted)
- Newsletter 2
- Project postcard advertising the upcoming events

Targeted distribution

In addition to the door drop we have issued 578 information packs to previously identified representatives / stakeholders and all consultees from Stage 1 consultation. A variation of the information pack was sent to each group by post or email. Broadly, groups included:
- Local interest groups, organisations, businesses and representatives (included an invite to the Stakeholder Workshops)
- Market Traders (included invitation to Market Traders’ drop-in session)
- Previous consultees and wider interest groups
- Statutory consultees and national / London wide organisations, authorities, utilities, and associations

Throughout Stage 2, this list has grown to over 640.

E. Publicity 2b – general publicity and press release

General publicity

To further raise the profile of the project in the public realm, additional publicity has been undertaken. This has comprised of:

- Town centre shops and local destinations in Kingston asked to display a project poster and postcards
- Display boards and information to pick up available at the Guildhall reception
- Posters in all town centre car park notice boards
- Posters on 200 Town Centre lampposts
- Large scale posters in Kingston train station
- Posters put in three town centre notice boards
- Posters put in advertising space on bins throughout the town centre
- Posters put in all neighbourhood notice boards
- Poster put up in the Market Hall

...
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F. Market Trader Drop-in Session

A dedicated half-day drop-in exhibition was held for the specific purpose of understanding the views of the market traders. The full Concept Proposal exhibition was on display and Quarterbridge were present to offer market expertise and help facilitate discussions with the Market Traders. Also present were Soundings, the design team and Kingston Council to discuss any issues and gather feedback.

The event was held on Tuesday 13th September from 12pm to 5pm. This was understood to be a time that a high number of traders would be present, but not too busy to attend. As a market trader only session, it was focused and allowed clear understanding of market trader needs, views and feedback.

Each trader was sent an invitation (by email or letter) approximately two weeks before the event. On the day each stall was visited two or three times to remind them about the event. The stalls of all traders who did not attend for any reason were visited on Saturday 17th September at the Community Market Event and asked if they would like to attend.

G. Community Market Event

Held on Saturday 17th September, the Community Market Event was the major public launch of the Concept Proposals. A large set-up in the Market place allowed for high exposure and attracted over 100 people throughout the day. Not all visitors left comments, however everyone was informed about the proposals and encouraged to leave feedback.

The full Concept Proposal exhibition was on display, as well as current and previous newsletters, website links and information about all upcoming events. The Canvass Card and team record notes were widely used to capture feedback.

The event attracted passers-by, regular users of the area and market traders who could not attend the market trader session. The event was also a useful platform for meetings with a number of consultees throughout the day.

H. Exhibitions

Two additional drop-in public exhibitions were held on Tuesday 27th September from 12pm to 5pm and also Saturday 1st October from 9am to 2pm. In contrast to the Community Market Event they were held in the Market Hall, which provided a focused and comfortable setting that would not be affected by the weather.

All previous consultees were informed about the exhibitions and all general publicity promoted the events. Additional posters were displayed in the Market Hall and in the surroundings area on exhibition days. Approximately 100 people attended the exhibitions.

Again, the full Concept Proposal exhibition was on display, as was all project literature. Canvass Card and team record notes were used to record feedback.
I. Stakeholder Review Workshops

Attended by local representatives and key stakeholders, the Stakeholder Review Workshops included a presentation of the Concept Proposals by the design team, facilitated discussions around tables to develop feedback and a plenary session to exchange views between groups of participants.

Two workshops were held, on differing times and days to encourage maximum attendance. These were Tuesday 27th September from 6 to 8pm and Saturday 1st October from 3pm to 5pm. More than 170 representatives from local community and stakeholder groups on the project database were invited and 32 attended.

The full Concept Proposal exhibition and project literature was on display. Participants were encouraged to arrive early to view the exhibition and the exhibition boards were sent via email beforehand.

Feedback was collected through group worksheets, team record notes and individual canvass cards. The structured format and wide range of people allowed for an exchange of both shared and conflicting views, sharing ideas, broadening perspectives and developing an understanding of the range of issues pertinent to the project.

J. Making links through the community

Building on links made in the first stage of consultation, much appreciated help from the community to help spread the word has enabled us to significantly increase awareness of the project. Below follows a summary of the people / groups that were informed as a result of this:

- All Chamber of Commerce members
- Information and special workshop invitations circulated to Kingston Youth Council
- Design students at Kingston University
- Kingston Learning Disability Parliament completed a second study tour with 15 adults with learning disabilities who have been elected to speak up, speak up for people with learning disabilities in Kingston. A summary report was sent through to Soundings.
- The Access Checker group developed group feedback that was sent to Soundings.
- Information on the Charter Quay Website
- Information on the CARA website
- Vital Kingston representative tweeted to 142 followers and 133 email recipients, about 20% of whom are the same people.
- All Saints Church staff and volunteers
- Visually impaired groups through Talking Newspaper contacts
- Chair and committee of Canbury and Riverside Association and Vice-Chair of Tudor Area Residents Association, N Kingston, for them to forward.
- (Consultee’s) community choir, around 80 members on email, who live in and around Kingston and meet weekly in Kingston
- Transition Town Kingston’s Yahoo group of about 500 Kingston Philosophy Cafe, who meet in central Kingston, e-list of about 200 individuals.
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Market Place

What you said... headline findings

Market Place

Connected, full of character, showcasing Kingston
- Create a high profile fantastic offering a range of activities for the community
- Improve physical connections with !town
- Enhance existing character, heritage
- Don’t change too much
- An evening culture of vibrant activity.
- Kingston more accessible coffee and end of town
- More seating that is comfortable
- Interaction, consultation and diversity
- Potential to attract people
- There are issues around cycling in the town

Market hall

A meeting place
- A focal meeting place
- Fun area
- Creativity
- Art

Concepts

- Reaching the
- Building
- High profile
- Flip book
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Data and analysis

Feedback sources
The consultation findings have been informed by every comment received throughout this stage of consultation. A wide range of ways to engage has resulted in feedback through a number of methods, this includes:

- 65 Canvass Cards
- 21 Feedback record notes
- 19 Completed worksheets from two stakeholder workshops
- 15 Emails
- 2 Records of additional stakeholder meetings
- 2 Telephone conversations
- 1 Letter

Totaling 125 feedback sources, representing 164 people (121 individuals and 43 representatives).

Questions asked
The Canvass Card has been the primary way to feedback. This asked four simple questions with regards to the proposals:

- What’s good?
- What needs improvement?
- Any suggestions or questions?
- Any other comments?

These simple and open questions aim to allow participants’ comments to generate the themes of discussion and areas of interest. Equally, it was important to encourage participants to look at both the positive and negative aspects of the proposals to aid constructive and considered feedback that can effectively help guide further development of the proposals.

Comment classification
Whether received through Canvass Card or another means, all feedback received has been separated into over 1200 singular comments. This allows each point of feedback to be clearly recorded and classified as appropriate.

Each comment is classified by topic (e.g. lighting, maintenance, signage etc) and by its type of interest (support / concern / suggestion / clarification). This allows for clear and transparent analysis of the information into areas of interest generated by consultee feedback.

Analysis
The analysis looks at all comments received to reveal those areas most discussed. Areas of agreement and conflict are looked at in the in-depth findings and from these, the headline areas of support and concern, plus other comments, are derived.

For the purpose of this report, the Market Area has been divided into three areas of analysis: the Market Place (including overarching issues and public realm); the Market Hall; and the Market Stalls. This allows a more focused and clear analysis of the three distinct areas of the Market Place.

The majority of feedback received has been in direct response to proposals, however a number of comments were made in relation to areas outside of the scope of this project. All comments have been included in analysis to draw out a holistic understanding of issues surrounding the Ancient Market Area.

Any Canvass Cards submitted post-deadline will be cross-checked with the findings to ensure there are no new issues arising.

Frequently asked questions
A number of questions have been raised, either through direct feedback to us or as part of the wider consultation. Included in this report is an area-by-area list of these questions.

Previous consultation
These consultation findings should be understood in conjunction with the Stage 1 consultation findings, which focus on the opinion, hopes and issues for each project area. These have provided the foundation of the Concept Proposals, but also provide a detailed understanding of the area and wider issues, which is still very relevant.
Consultation rating

The canvass card contained a question asking each participant to rate the project area out of five. One being 'Dislike', five being 'Like'. This allows for a quantifiable guide to clearly reveal attitudes towards the proposals for each project area.

43 people gave ratings for some or all of the project areas, although this rating has not been received from each participant, it is significant enough to give a good guide to the general opinion on each topic area.

The area ratings are relatively constant across each of the areas, from the Riverside, which received the lowest rating at 3.61 out of 5, to the Alleyways and Connections, which has received the highest rating of 4.03.

All ratings are well into the top half of the scale, and equate to a range of support between 72% and 80%. Suggesting there is an overall support for the Concept Proposals, but there are issues to resolve across all areas and more detailed development to understand these.

Details of the specific areas of support and concern can be found in the area by area consultation findings starting on page 16.

Comments by area

The graph below shows the total number of comments in relation to each topic area.

In total there have been over 1200 singular comments across all areas of the consultation. This is a lower number of comments than in the first stage of consultation, however this is not entirely unexpected. The nature of this stage of consultation means that more time is required to firstly understand the proposals (whether it be attending an event or downloading exhibition boards at home) and then to respond. Whereas the previous stage of consultation was about personal opinion and ideas, taking less time to complete. Ensuring that feedback is properly informed is very important to gather reliable and representative data.

The Market Place has received by far the most comments, as the focal point of the Ancient Market Area and the next stage to be further developed. This high level of response has been the case throughout the consultation.

The alleyways and connections have generated the second highest number of comments and also the highest rating. Together suggesting that there is enthusiasm for the potential improvements to this area.

The riverside and Guildhall sit in the middle. The riverside receiving a higher number of comments than the Guildhall, possibly because there are more concerns regarding the proposals for this area, plus it is more frequently used by people at the moment.

Due to the limited scope, there have been fewer proposals for All Saints Church as compared to the other areas. This has naturally led to a lower number of comments in response, and in this instance the number of comments does not reflect the level of interest in the area.

This stage of consultation has been focused on area-by-area response, hence there have only been a small number of comments on the whole Ancient Market Area and wider Kingston.
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Geographical distribution of comments

Diagram 1 locates identified project contacts to date. This includes all stakeholders identified at the outset of this project, plus all new contacts who have fed back to us and/or wish to remain involved in the project. At time of writing there are over 650 direct project contacts.

Diagram 2 locates where feedback has come from during Stage 2 of this consultation. It should be noted that we have received a number of group responses and this diagram is a guide to geographical distribution of responses, and does not represent every single person who has fed back to us.

In total there have been at least an estimated 3800 people directly informed about the project, plus those who have been forwarded on information through the local community.
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Market Place: Overview

Consultation rating… “3.64 out of 5”

Participants who completed a canvass card were asked to rate the Concept Proposals for each area out of 5. The above figure is the average rating across all Market Place proposals (inclusive of the Market Place, Market Hall and Market Stalls).

Summary

Out of a total 482 comments received across all Market Place proposals, 263 comments directly related to the Market Place public realm and general principles. This does not cover comments that relate to the specifics of the Market Hall and Market Stalls, which have been analysed separately.

There have been significantly more comments on the Market Place than any other project area. This demonstrates the significant interest and attachment felt by many towards the Market Place, which is at the heart of the Ancient Market Area.

A 3.64 consultation rating, suggests the proposals are generally welcome, however it is felt that key aspects of the proposals need clarification or resolution to be understood as a workable and successful solutions.

Headline findings

The headline findings summarise the most discussed areas of support, concern and other comments that have become apparent through the consultation. Taken together this gives an understanding of the most important topics surrounding the Market Place Concept Proposals and whether they are positively or negatively considered, or have simply attracted further suggestions and ideas.

Areas of Support

- Creating a ‘destination’ and increasing opportunity for different types of use
- Subtly highlighting the existing heritage and architecture
- Consistent, kerb-free paving treatment and pedestrian priority
- Majority support for retaining the fountain, but mixed views
- Early evening activity for a wide age range
- Additional public seating
- Clear pedestrian movement routes through the Market Place
- Highlighted gateways and connections to the Market Place
- Lighting strategy

Areas of Concern

- Unclear identity for the Market Place – too many activities without a clear focus
- Overprovision of daytime cafes in Kingston
- Banded paving appears too dark and ‘busy’
- Enforcement of evening activity, drinking and potential disruption
- Cycling strategy is unclear
- Seating may encourage night time gathering and disturbance
- Worries that cafeseating may dominate the Market Place, causing clutter and litter
- A management and maintenance strategy is key to the success of area
- Signage is not indicated, but is needed.
- Consider links to a wider signage strategy

Other Comments

- Ensure ‘market’ remains a the heart of the area’s identity
- Consider all servicing and infrastructure before surface is laid
- More trees and greenery
- More cycle parking
Market Place: In-Depth Findings

The in-depth findings look at the areas of agreement or conflicting opinion that have given rise to the different areas of discussion. The topics that have generated the most dialogue are listed first. Indicating the percentage of all Market Place comments that specific topic received and also, in brackets, the number of formal comments received. Separate and specific consultation findings have been gathered for the Market Hall and the Market Stalls.

1. Market Place Use and Identity (81/263) - 31%

The proposals are seen by many as an improvement to the existing Market Place. Elements that have been well received include the increased opportunity for a variety of uses in the Market Place and the perception that these changes would be successful in encouraging footfall to create a more successful and fulfilled destination. Retaining a design focus that highlights the heritage of the Market Place is widely supported, as is the subtlety of design rather than imposing big changes.

There are concerns with regards to the balance of uses in the Market Place. An increased variety of activities is appreciated, however there are worries that it is “trying to be everything to everybody” and in doing so potentially losing a clear identity and ‘selling point’. Using the market and heritage as the linchpin has been suggested on several occasions. There have also been some comments that Kingston is already well-served with cafes and outdoor eating and the Market place should not over-saturate this.

Additional comments include:

- A focus on the market traders’ needs is key
- The market place should be viewed as a central destination to access surrounding areas
- Approval of suggestions for a quality restaurant
- Suggestions for a high percentage of healthy food / non-alcoholic drinks to be available
- Muybridge reference possibly not appropriate or understood

2. Surfacing (37/263) - 14%

The consistent paving treatment throughout the Market Place has been very well received, given that the material used is robust, adaptable and can be easily maintained or replaced. Consideration for pedestrian priority and access for all was high, with respect to this there is strong support for an even and kerb-free surface.

The diagrams shown in the Concept Proposals illustrated a dark grey surface colour. Although this was for diagrammatic purposes only and did not reflect any potential material choices, it provoked a clear response that this is too dark. There has been general support for the banded surface pattern, however a significant number have aired concern that this appears too ‘busy’ and a more subtle solution suggested.

Other suggestions that have made are to:

- Use the banded surface pattern to further highlight the alleyways
- Fully consider all servicing prior to construction, ensuring resources are not wasted digging up any new surface.

3. Fountain (24/263) - 9%

There is very mixed opinion regarding the fountain and a desire for clarity on the future of it. The table below illustrates the percentage of varying opinions amongst those who commented on the fountain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>View</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See the fountain as an asset to the area, attracting young people and families, adding activity and enjoyment.</td>
<td>Keep</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like a fountain that is more formal and appropriate to the historical nature of the area.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View the fountain as a waste of money and not appropriate to the area.</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Movement and connections (24/263) - 9%

Pedestrian priority, clear links and highlighted gateways to adjacent areas are supported. As is the perceived appearance of more space. Tighter restrictions on vehicular access would be appreciated and there are questions regarding what the predominant evening pedestrian connections will be and what impact this will have.

5. Evening activity (23/263) - 9%

There is support for evening activity in the Market Place and the atmosphere and added activities this could provide for families and a wide range of generations who are not part of the ‘under 30s’ drinking culture that is prevalent in Kingston. An approximate 10 to 11pm ‘finishing time’ was the most frequently suggested.

There are some concerns that the reality of enforcement could not be enough to prevent the Market Place becoming another area dominated by people drinking late into the night, potentially causing disturbance to residents and increased littering.

6. Cycling (19/263) - 7%

Opinion regarding cycling in the Market Place is mixed. Pedestrian opinion would like to see a defined (and enforced) cycle route in the Market Place or a cycle ban. Whereas the western side of the market place is a key route for cyclists and they would like to ensure that this area is not congested and a clear route for cyclists maintained. Opening up the riverside path for cyclists was occasionally suggested as an alternative, but discussions regarding the Riverside have concluded that it is not sufficient to accommodate this.

More cycle parking would be considered beneficial.

7. Seating (14/263) - 5%

Additional daytime public seating in the Market Place is supported, however there are significant concerns regarding the potential for this to encourage gathering and antisocial behaviour at night; consideration of these implications would be considered crucial by some.
There is a desire for seating to be more comfortable than the existing cold stone seating and that seating shouldn’t clutter the area, allowing clear movement routes. It has also been noted that plinths or seating the same colour as the background surface, or with overhanging corners are difficult for the visually impaired to negotiate. There is also concern that more cafe seating could dominate and clutter the Market Place.

8. Trees and greening (9/263) - 3%
More trees and greenery in the Market Place would be considered beneficial.

9. Management and maintenance (9/263) - 3%
Amongst those who commented formally and through informal conversations, management and maintenance is considered a key aspect to maintaining high quality successful environments - which most would like the Market Place to be. Elements mentioned include regular cleaning, access and timing of deliveries / services and litter management. Early discussions on this would be welcome. It has also been commented that cleaning the Queen Anne statue would benefit the area.

10. Signage and wayfinding (9/263) - 3%
Although mentioned only 9 times with specific regard to the Market Place, signage and wayfinding has been a strong theme throughout the whole project consultation. It is considered key to realising the success of the Market Place, which is felt to be at the heart of the Ancient Market Area. Suggestions take several forms:

- Signage to clearly indicate the Market Place within the rest of Kingston Town Centre
- Highlighting the history of the area
- Regularly updated signage to let people know what activities are happening

11. Public art (8/263) - 3%
There is a desire to see opportunity for public art in the Market Place, including performances, installations and visual artworks. There have been a number of suggestions to link this with local talent. There were a small number of comments both for and against moving the Shrubsole statue.

12. Lighting (6/263) - 2%
Lighting suggestions for the evening have been well received, especially the subtle highlighting of historic facades and features. Consideration of energy efficient lighting and that it does not have a negative impact on wildlife has been stressed. There have also been suggestions to increase lighting to the alleyway entrances.
Market Stalls: Overview

Consultation rating... “3.64 out of 5”

Participants who completed a canvass card were asked to rate the Concept Proposals for each area out of 5. The above figure is the average rating across all Market Place proposals (inclusive of the Market Place, Market Hall and Market Stalls).

Summary

Out of a total 482 comments received across all Market Place proposals, 135 comments directly relate to the Market Stalls.

Isolating the Market Stall comments allows for un-diluted analysis of this key part of the Market Place. Market Trader comments have formed a significant part of the consultation feedback for the Market Stalls. In order to gain an understanding into this particular and crucial perspective, a summary of Market Trader feedback is included below.

The headline and in-depth findings consolidate both Market Trader and wider consultation feedback to provide balanced and holistic summaries.

Market Trader feedback

The Market Place proposals were met with a mixture of concern, suggestion and support from Market Traders, however the overall response was of a positive tone. The majority of traders we spoke to were welcoming of an improvement to the Market Place and the overall proposals for this. A small number feared that change will have a negative effect on their business (particularly those who are successful at the moment) and did not want to see change to their part of the market.

Location, pitch and orientation have been the main points of interest for the traders and it is in relation to this that the proposals raised concern. The traders have suggested ideas and alternatives to these areas of concern which include:

- Maintaining pitch location
- Double sided stalls giving rise to good and bad pitch locations
- Prominence of trading frontage

Aspects of the proposals that were well received include:

- Market stalls at the northern gateways to the Market Place
- Evening use of the market stalls (that does not affect daytime use)
- Cafes / restaurant in the Market Hall - creating more activity / people spending time near the market

There were some aspects that were accepted by most in principal, but gave rise to debate and an awareness that further resolution will be needed:

- Internal stall layout
- Waste management

Headline findings

The headline findings summarise the most discussed areas of support, concern and other comments that have become apparent through the consultation. Taken together this gives an understanding of the most important topics surrounding the Market Stall Concept Proposals and whether they are positively or negatively considered, or have simply attracted further suggestions and ideas.

Areas of Support

- Permeability in between stalls allowing access to Market Hall
- Increased activity at the centre of the market stalls (Market Hall)
- Removal of waste refuse area behind the market stalls
- New market stall design (with some concerns about the indicated appearance)
- Retaining at minimum the existing number of stalls and stallholders
- Evening use of market stalls

Areas of Concern

- Back-to-back stall design
- Retention of pitch location
- Stall layout may decrease the width of east / west thoroughfares and hinder cycle or emergency vehicle access
- A workable solution to waste management is needed
- Pedestrian access around and between stalls still needs to be resolved - balancing stall size, layout and enforcement of ‘stall expansion’
- The impact that the construction process will have on trade

Other Comments

- View market stalls in conjunction with all Market Place proposals
- Possible expansion of the market, that supports existing traders?
- Services / facilities that meet current traders’ needs and also support change of use
- Consider requirements for out of hours use
Market Stalls: In-Depth Findings

The in-depth findings look at the areas of agreement or conflicting opinion that have given rise to the different areas of discussion. The topic areas that have generated the most debate are listed first. Indicating the percentage of all Market Stall comments that specific topic received and also, in brackets, the number of formal comments received. Separate and specific consultation findings have been gathered for the Market Hall and the Market Place.

1. Stall layout and pitch location (43/135) - 32%

The overriding issue for most Market Traders is to ensure retention of their existing pitch location. There are fears that a change in location would result in a drop in trade. This is especially true for the ‘most successful’ pitches, which are considered to be on the eastern side of the Market Place and towards the center of the Market Place. Maintaining regular custom in their recognised location is considered important.

As it stands, the design principles aim to keep trade types in the same general area and pitch location to reflect the existing as much as possible. This was generally accepted by the Market Traders and detailed design development should allow for this discussion to continue in more depth.

There is strong opinion from the Market Traders that the back-to-back design of the market stalls would make the stalls harder to navigate and put all ‘inner stalls’ at a disadvantage, resulting in a drop in trade and less successful market. These thoughts were generally echoed in the wider consultation. The idea of stalls facing in on a busy caf’/community area is liked in principle, but the reality of achieving this in conjunction with a suitable, and successful, market stall layout needs resolution. One trader suggested a reduction in rent for the ‘inner stalls’.

Permeability between stalls and increasing access to the Market Hall was very well received, noting that access between should be generous and not hinder access through, or to, the Market Stalls. It was also noted that the stalls should not restrict pedestrian/cycle/emergency vehicle access on either side of the market.

A number of Traders suggested that the front of the market stalls should align and retain a consistent frontage that is simple to navigate, ensuring no stalls get ‘missed’. Where as a number of Traders welcomed as many active trading sides as possible.

It is apparent that the success of the Market Stalls, which are at the heart of the Market Place, has an intrinsic link with the development of other aspects of the Market Place proposals and cannot be seen in isolation.

2. Waste management (25/135) - 19%

There was significant support that removal of the rubbish bins behind the market stalls, paired with opening up access would be an improvement to the area. They are currently viewed by most as rendering a significant portion of the Market Place useless, a health hazard and de-valuing the Market Hall.

It has become clear that the fruit and vegetable stalls require more waste refuse than most other stalls. However a solution is required that meets the needs of all, is technically feasible and supports change of use. There are some concerns among Market Traders that this may result in inconvenience during the working day, however the majority of feedback (from Traders and wider consultation) felt that it is the Market Traders responsibility to ensure the area is kept tidy and adhere to waste management regulations.

Resolution for waste management will be developed in the next stage of design, suggestions and feedback in this stage has included:

- Subject to details, internal (market stall) bins could be sufficient if there is regular collection
- Use of compactor/compressor
- Possibility of underground storage
- Ensure that waste is recycled as much as possible

3. Use and number of stalls (25/135) - 9%

Ensuring vitality of the day time market stalls is seen as critical to the success and character of the Market Place. There is agreement that the existing number of stalls should remain, with some suggestions that trader numbers should increase, taking care not to clutter or obstruct access.

There is general agreement that the existing stallholders are the priority and all activity should enhance their trade. With this in mind, there have been a number of suggestions for possible additional uses of the market:

- A farmers market / emphasis on fresh produce
- Introduction of a free ‘community stall’
- Increasing quality of the type of products sold
- Look at the waiting list for stalls
- Ensure it does not become gentrified – a key aspect of a traditional market is that it can grow and contract organically

It is viewed by some that there needs to be better management of the market stalls. Also that consideration should be given to a market area that may need to be adaptable in unstable economic climates.

4. Market stall appearance (15/135) - 11%

There is mixed opinion on the indicated appearance of the market stalls.
Some like the proposed design and feel that the appearance is an improvement on the existing stalls. However there is a degree of caution about changing the appearance of the market stalls too much and a number of concerns have been raised. These include:

- The shape of the stalls
- Flat roofs are out of character, there are none in the nearby area
- Appearance too modern
- Take care not to make the stalls look like the produce is too expensive

5. Size requirements (9/135) - 7%
Storage for stalls is a consideration for Market Traders. Again, this is very dependant upon the type of business, however there were calls for any new stall design to be flexible and support change of use. The fruit and vegetable stalls are amongst those that require the most storage space. Further information in the next stage of development will help to resolve this issue.

There have been some requests for larger stalls, however there have been many comments from users of the area that the ‘constantly expanding’ stalls are having a negative effect on the appearance of the area and a balance between stall provision and enforcement of stall expansion would be beneficial.

6. Services and facilities (9/135) - 7%
There have been requests for water and electrics to be made available to each stall and that services should support change of use. Also that all services should be fully considered before landscaping of the Market Place happens.

Good lighting has been requested to support evening activity of the Market Stalls, as has sufficient weather-protection to ensure maximum use. Also consideration of existing traders who use the market out of hours (e.g. an existing arts market would need to hang artwork from the stalls).

7. Security (4/135) - 3%
Security was one of the less discussed issues as there is little reported theft / vandalism. One point considered that the majority of stalls want as many open sides as possible and there are a number of people working each stall. However for stalls with more valuable / desirable items (e.g. DVDs) or stalls with only one person working, a degree of ‘protection’ would be needed.

Other feedback was to actively discourage climbing, and better lighting to help avoid urination on the stalls.

8. Evening use (3/135) - 2%
Evening activity in the Market Place is generally supported. Comments with specific regard to the Market Stalls echoed this and evening / dual use of the stalls was supported, providing it doesn’t negatively impact on daytime use. Consideration for the needs of existing and potential evening market-uses has been commented.

9. Construction and trade (2/135) - 1%
There are questions regarding the construction process of the Market Place / Stalls / Hall and how this will affect traders' business – will they be able to carry on trading through the construction works and where? Although mentioned infrequently through formal comments, this is a key issue linked to the success of Market Stalls / Place and necessary to consider.
Market Hall: Overview

Consultation rating... “3.64 out of 5”

Participants who completed a canvass card were asked to rate the Concept Proposals for each area out of 5. The above figure is the average rating across all Market Place proposals (inclusive of the Market Place, Market Hall and Market Stalls).

Summary

Out of a total 482 comments received across all Market Place proposals, 84 comments directly related to the Market Hall.

Isolating the Market Hall comments allows for un-diluted analysis of this key part of the Market Place. Within this report, the ‘Market Place’ analysis covers all general aspects of the feedback received on the Market Place, plus all comments that relate to its public realm, and has therefore received the lion’s share of comments.

General principles for use of the Market Hall and design changes were mostly welcomed. The use of the Market Hall is key to stitching together all the aspects of the Market Place proposals and further development is needed for the identity of this area to be better understood.

Headline findings

The headline findings summarise the most discussed areas of support, concern and other comments that have become apparent through the consultation. Taken together this gives an understanding of the most important topics surrounding the Market Hall Concept Proposals and whether they are positively or negatively considered, or have simply attracted further suggestions and ideas.

Areas of Support

- Increased use of the Market Hall
- Opening up access to ground floor
- Increasing visibility and highlighting architecture of the Market Hall

Areas of Concern

- Unclear identity and balance of Market Hall uses
- Repair and restoration required

Other Comments

- A fully accessible Market Hall with ‘Changing Places’ toilet
- Public toilets accessible day and evening
Market Hall: In-Depth Findings

The in-depth findings look at the areas of agreement or conflicting opinion that have given rise to the different areas of discussion. The topic areas that have generated the most dialogue are listed first. Indicating the percentage of all Market Hall comments that specific topic received and also, in brackets, the number of formal comments received. Separate and specific consultation findings have been gathered for the Market Place and the Market Stalls.

1. A balanced use and clear identity (42/84) - 50%

A better and a wider variety of uses for the Market Hall has been strongly supported, as is evening use of the Market Hall. However it was felt that a clear identity for the Market Hall and its connection to Market Place is still to be resolved.

Through consultation, the three emerging uses for the market hall are a market, food and drink, and community use. There is a call for all three, each contributing in its own way to the area, the correct balance would help provide a clear identity and draw to the Market Hall. The viewpoints on different uses are outlined below:

- **Food and drink**
  Provides lingering time which is beneficial to the market, however there are concerns it may become another Apple Market / Castle Street

- **Community use**
  Provides a real heart of the area, community ownership and a needed meeting place, however in light of All Saints Church's proposed new community building, be careful not to over-provide this type of use. (Also, some groups cannot afford Market Hall hire as it stands)

- **Extended market**
  Builds on the character and unique asset of the Market Place, however be careful not to create another retail-only area of Kingston

Comments relating to specific uses of the Market Hall are as follows:

- The Tourist Information Centre is valued by many who see the Market Hall as a good location for this. It is seen as a draw to the area and linked to the desire for a recognised hub to find out what's happening in Kingston.
- The cookery school was welcomed in principle, and a restaurant suggested. However concerns that this should not become the sole use of the upstairs and exclude wider community use.
- Suggestions for special events to draw a wide range of people in (volunteer recruitment, youth employment, social enterprises, talks etc)
- Suggestions for a community stall to be located in the Market Hall.

2. Building changes (23/84) - 27%

Opening up the Market Hall at ground level to provide accessible, undercover, useable space is seen as an improvement by many. However there are a small number of concerns that this may not be appropriate as it is a listed building.

Retaining the historic identity and highlighting the architecture has been well received. As is increasing the visibility and access to this cherished building.

3. Restoration and repair (9/84) - 11%

There is concern that the Market Hall is in need of repair and restoration and that this is not addressed in the proposals. Understanding of this process would be valued as many would like to be sure of the building's structural integrity, any project implications and see the building restored to its optimum.

4. Accessibility (6/84) - 7%

At present disabled access upstairs in the Market Hall is restricted and is seen as a valuable community facility that should be available, and easily accessible, to all.

There have also been suggestions for a fully accessible 'Changing Places' toilet in the Market Hall. As it stands there is a changing facility in the Bentalls Centre, but its facilities do not provide for all disabled requirements.

5. Public toilets (4/84) 5%

Although mentioned infrequently through formal comments, throughout the wider project consultation there has been significant call for public toilets in Kingston. The Market Hall is seen as the 'hub' of the Market Place and the most appropriate location for this. Suggestions have been for improved facilities that are accessible in the daytime and evening, especially considering proposed increased evening activity in the Market Place.
Riverside: Overview

Consultation rating... “3.61 out of 5”

Participants who completed a canvass card were asked to rate the Concept Proposals for each area out of 5. The above figure is the average rating for the Riverside proposals.

Summary

There have been 176 comments on the Riverside proposals.

Receiving a 3.61 consultation rating, the response towards the Riverside proposals is on the whole positive, however it is has the lowest rating of all the project areas. Although the design aims and ideas are liked in principle, there is an overall feeling that resolution of some of the key design aspects is needed to achieve a workable and successful solution.

Consideration of the impact that the proposals will have in the evening and nighttime is particularly pertinent for this area as it is in close proximity to residents at Charter Quay and residential moorings.

Headline findings

The headline findings summarise the most discussed areas of support, concern and other comments that have become apparent through the consultation. Taken together this gives an understanding of the most important topics surrounding the Riverside Concept Proposals and whether they are positively or negatively considered, or have simply attracted further suggestions and ideas.

Areas of Support

- Increased seating (daytime)
- Trees on mini-piers and all riverside planting
- Increased opportunity for use and enjoyment of the riverside – creating a ‘destination’
- Improved riverside lighting

Areas of Concern

- Seating is facing inwards, out to the river would be better
- Seating designs block the view of the river
- Seating may encourage night-time gathering and increase disturbance for residents
- Increase in litter

Other Comments

- Mini-piers and riverside should be fully accessible for all
- Desire to see visitor mooring proposals
Riverside: In-Depth Findings

The in-depth findings look at the areas of agreement or conflicting opinion that have given rise to the different areas of discussion. The topic areas that have generated the most dialogue are listed first. Indicating the percentage of all Riverside comments that specific topic received and also, in brackets, the number of formal comments received.

1. Mini-piers and seating (65/176) - 37%
The increased seating that is available to all (not attached to a cafe / bar) has been very well received by most. It is seen to provide opportunity to make the most of the riverside, to enjoy the area and relax, which many feel isn’t present at the moment. There are some concerns regarding the potential use of seating areas in the evening (please see section 4 below, ‘Night time disturbance and anti-social behaviour’ for further details).

There are a high number of comments suggesting that the seating should face out onto the river, not inwards. Also, that the seating designs block the view of the river and this should be much less obtrusive / more ‘transparent’.

2. Better links with Kingston (29/176) - 16%
Highlighting the entrance to each of the alleyways and increasing awareness of the connection with Kingston Town Centre was well received, with the exception of night time concerns (please see above). There were also a small number of suggestions that resurfacing the riverside could be of benefit.

Although not within the scope of this project, it was often suggested that the riverside needs improvement further north and south:
- South - the area from Townend Pier to Eagle Brewery wharf is too narrow and is struggling to cope with the existing (and potentially increasing) number of users.
- North - the riverside path by John Lewis needs attention

3. Night time disturbance and antisocial behaviour (24/176) - 14%
This stage of consultation has brought to light the night-time disturbance and antisocial behaviour experienced by residents along the Charter Quay area of the Riverside and Eagle Brewery Wharf. It is reported that this is linked to groups of people gathering on the riverside late at night, drinking and displaying loud / abusive behaviour. There is concern that encouraging movement to and from the riverside in the evening / nighttime and increasing seating areas along the riverside will exacerbate this strongly felt issue.

A number of approaches have been suggested to help address this problem:
- Better enforcement of antisocial behaviour along the riverside
- Removal of all seating
- A seating layout that is not conducive to large groups
- Request to close of the residential section of the river at night time
- Railings along the riverside were requested with regards to safety and protecting moored residents. However there have also been comments that railings would contradict the attributes of the area and spoil the connection to the river.

Although these existing problems cannot be totally resolved within the confines of this project, there is opportunity to help the existing situation, or to at least ensure that it is not exacerbated.

4. Trees and nature (23/176) - 13%
Proposals for trees by the riverside have been supported. Comments are that they complement the opposite side of the river, increase connection to nature by the river and there are some suggestions for even more greenery and planting. There have also been a small number of concerns that the trees may block the view to the river.

It has been raised that the mini-piers should be fully accessible for all to enjoy and that the trees do not obstruct access along the riverside.

5. Identity and character (14/176) - 8%
The design proposals and character were generally supported, feedback suggesting that they will help improve the Riverside, which is not seen to be fully utilised at the moment. Also, that improving the riverside will help Kingston become recognised as a river town.

Other comments include:
- It was commented that the commercial aspect of the riverside should not be extended
- There have been some concerns that the designs are too modern / sterile and would add to clutter
- Informal seating, i.e. ‘dangling legs over river’, has its charm don’t remove opportunity for this
- Requests to see information about the history and nature of the riverside.
Riverside: In-Depth Findings

6. Litter (6/176) - 3%
There have been comments highlighting that there is too much litter along the riverside, and in the river. With more use this may increase and there were some suggestions for bins and better maintenance.

7. Cycling (6/176) - 3%
There have been some suggestions to open up the Riverside as an official and separate cycle-path. However the general agreement was that there is not enough space and the connection through the Market Place should be maintained (see Market Place consultation findings for further details).

8. Mooring (6/176) - 3%
There are suggestions for mooring proposals on the riverside. It was felt that encouraging visitor mooring would be a good opportunity to increase movement through the Ancient Market Area and benefit the whole Town Centre, as frequently mentioned in wider project consultation. As little of this is currently known, it was noted that more information would be appreciated and the designs should enhance riverside use, not impede it.

9. Lighting (3/176) - 2%
Improved lighting along the riverside was well received, with some suggestions to increase this further. It was noted that care should be taken to ensure the lighting does not negatively impact wildlife.
Consultation rating... “3.88 out of 5”

Participants who completed a canvass card were asked to rate the Concept Proposals for each area out of 5. The above figure is the average rating for the Guildhall proposals.

Summary

In total there have been 144 comments relating to the Guildhall proposals.

Response has been generally positive and this area has received the second highest consultation rating of 3.88 out of 5. The overarching design principles have been generally welcomed, with the concerns focused upon the details of these.

Headline findings

The headline findings summarise the most discussed areas of support, concern and other comments that have become apparent through the consultation. Taken together this gives an understanding of the most important topics surrounding the Guildhall Concept Proposals and whether they are positively or negatively considered, or have simply attracted further suggestions and ideas.

Areas of Support

- Opening up the Guildhall frontage for general use by the public and removal of barriers
- Opportunity to sit, relax and enjoy a ‘green’ environment
- Increased pedestrian priority and ease of access across High Street
- Increased planting and trees at the Guildhall
- Removal of platform over the Hogsmill River
- Lighting the Guildhall and Hogsmill River, with consideration to environmental impact

Areas of Concern

- Concentric seating / paving may be too ‘busy’ and dark
- Seating may be uncomfortable and cold
- Large trees may block view of Guildhall
- Connection between the Guildhall and Market Place could be stronger

Other Comments

- A ‘Plan B’ to celebrate the Coronation stone at the Guildhall, should plans fail to move it to All Saints
The in-depth findings look at the areas of agreement or conflicting opinion that have given rise to the different areas of discussion. The topic areas that have generated the most dialogue are listed first. Indicating the percentage of all Guildhall comments that specific topic received and also, in brackets, the number of formal comments received.

1. Increased access to the Guildhall (51/144) - 35%
   Proposals to make the Guildhall area a more public and useable space have received strong support. Also supported are the proposals to ease pedestrian movement between the Guildhall, Market Place and Rose Theatre. This includes increased pedestrian priority on High Street (in front of the Guildhall), removal of physical barriers to pedestrian movement and improved pedestrian crossings. There were some concerns that the Market Place – Guildhall link is still not strong enough to draw people down and would like to see this further enhanced.

2. Paving / seating design (26/144) - 18%
   Response was generally supportive of the overall plans, in favour of changing the Guildhall area from an asphalt road to a more useable and attractive space.
   
   There are some concerns regarding the particular design, of the concentric paving / seating rings. Comments indicated it may look too ‘busy’, “like a running track” and that the paving appears too dark. Suggestions are that it could be more subtle. This feedback may be linked to the diagrams shown in the Concept Proposals, which illustrated a dark grey surface colour. This was for diagrammatic purposes only and did not reflect any potential material choices, however may have contributed to the above perceptions of the proposals.

   There are also a number of concerns that plinth seating may be uncomfortable to sit on, and that the stone may be cold.

3. Greening the Guildhall (21/144) - 15%
   Proposals to add significant, planting, grass and trees at the Guildhall were supported, for a number of reasons, including aesthetics, adding ‘green’ to a relatively ‘grey’ Town Centre and for the associated environmental benefits.
   
   The Guildhall is appreciated as a unique building in Kingston and that should be celebrated. There are a small number of concerns that too many, or too big, trees would block the view of the Guildhall. There are also a few concerns regarding the robustness and maintenance of grass in the winter months and that it may deteriorate and look worn.

4. Uncovering the Hogsmill River (20/144) - 14%
   Removal of the platform over the Hogsmill River was very well received (including positive response through informal conversations). There have been a number of suggestions that the river bank could slope down to the Hogsmill edge, rather than a straight drop. Reasons for this are that it would increase the ‘meadow like feeling’, provide a better connection to the river and reduce risk should anyone fall in.

5. Lighting (7/144) - 5%
   Responses have been supportive of lighting the Guildhall and Hogsmill River, ensuring that the lighting is low-energy and does not negatively affect wild life.

6. Coronation Stone (7/144) - 5%
   Although part of a separate proposal (giving rise to the low number of comments), moving the Coronation Stone to All Saints Church has been generally approved and is seen to give the Coronation Stone more prominence. However it was also suggested that the Guildhall proposals should incorporate a ‘Plan B’ to highlight the Coronation stone, should the plans to move it to All Saints Church fail.

7. Other (12/144) - total 8%
   There have been a small number of other comments made with regards to the Guildhall proposals, these are outlined below:
   
   - Suggestions for increased signage to Guildhall
   - There are a small number who do not like the name ‘Gilded Forest’
   - Some concern the gold by the riverside would look tired over time
   - Requests to ensure it is fully accessible
   - Some concerns about what will happen at night
   - Consider micro electricity generation from Hogsmill
   - Suggested uses for the Guildhall include retaining the option to accommodate ceremonial/civic events, guided tours of the Guildhall, fishing and adding outdoor sculpture.
All Saints Church: Overview

Consultation rating... “3.82 out of 5”

Participants who completed a canvass card were asked to rate the Concept Proposals for each area out of 5. The above figure is the average rating for the All Saints Church proposals.

Summary

In total there were 92 comments received with regards to All Saints Church.

The church is currently developing plans in collaboration with a separate landscape architect. This broadly includes improvements to the existing church building, a new community building and improvements to the church grounds.

The design team are speaking with the church, with the aim to ensure that both sets of proposals work well together and can benefit from each other. As these discussions are still ongoing, we have only been able to show proposals for the All Saints Church gateways. This limited scope, would suggest why this is the least discussed of the 5 major project areas.

38% of feedback received was in direct response to the Concept Proposals shown and 62% in response to other aspects of All Saints Church grounds. Suggesting the link between the two proposals is of great interest. The overview below relates directly to the remit of the Concept Proposals. However a holistic understanding is important and all feedback has been included in the in-depth findings (overleaf).

Headline findings

The headline findings summarise the most discussed areas of support, concern and other comments that have become apparent through the consultation. Taken together this gives an understanding of the most important topics surrounding the All Saints Concept Proposals and whether they are positively or negatively considered, or have simply attracted further suggestions and ideas.

Areas of Support

- Opening up visual links towards All Saints Church
- Retaining cherry trees and Memorial Gate

Areas of Concern

- With better connections, ensure a peaceful garden is retained and enhanced

Other Comments

- General agreement that working with All Saints Church to bring the two sets of plans and consultation together would be beneficial
All Saints Church: In-Depth Findings

The in-depth findings look at the areas of agreement or conflicting opinion that have given rise to the different areas of discussion. The topic areas that have generated the most dialogue are listed first. Indicating the percentage of the All Saints comments that specific topic received and also, in brackets, the number of formal comments received.

1. Well connected, but still a ‘get-away’ (35/92) - 38%

There is strong support for opening up visual links from All Saints Church to the Market Place and Memorial Square. Linked with the desire to increase awareness of All Saints Church and promote it as an historical asset and destination in Kingston.

Response to the proposals supportive that the ambience of the gardens should enhance its peaceful ‘get-away’ nature and a balance needs to be achieved, taking care that improved links do not detract from the tranquility of the grounds.

Other comments included that there could also be improvements to the western approach to the church, as well as general support for retaining the cherry trees and Memorial Gate, and for the church featuring as part of an historical trail in Kingston.

2. Comments outside of project remit (57/92) - total 62%

There have been a significant number of comments concerning All Saints Church that fall outside of this project’s remit. However these are very relevant to the overall changes happening at All Saints Church. Please see these outlined below, in order of level of consultee interest.

1. Support for widening the paths that surround All Saints Church and increasing accessibility.
2. Relocation of the Coronation Stone is generally supported
3. There have been suggestions to increase the greenery and planting in All Saints Church Grounds, increasing the biodiversity and one suggestion for a sensory garden
4. The existing concerts and activities in All Saints Church are appreciated by many. However the promotional and commercial activities in the northern grounds are not liked by some, but there is an understanding that the church needs to generate income
5. Reduction of litter in the church grounds would be appreciated
6. There have been suggestions to improve the lighting in the church grounds
7. Some people would like to see more seating that is comfortable
8. A small number of concerns that any changes should not encourage the existing problem of drinking in church grounds
Alleyways and Connections: Overview

Consultation rating... “4.03 out of 5”

Participants who completed a canvass card were asked to rate the Concept Proposals for each area out of 5. The above figure is the average rating for the alleyways and connections.

Summary

In total there were 180 comments received on the alleyways and connections and an additional 25 comments specifically relating to Memorial Square. Totaling 205.

This project area has generated a lot of interest and received the highest area rating’ of 4.03. Together suggesting that there is a recognised opportunity for positive change here and a sense of excitement about what these characterful alleys could be.

Most interest was generated with regards to the riverside links and it was generally agreed that the far north river alleys are most in need of improvement. These proposals are very much link with the Riverside proposals for mini-piers and tree markers at the end of each alleyway. Please see the Riverside consultation summary for more details.

Headline findings

The headline findings summarise the most discussed areas of support, concern and other comments that have become apparent through the consultation. Taken together this gives an understanding of the most important topics surrounding the alleyways and connections Concept Proposals and whether they are positively or negatively considered, or have simply attracted further suggestions and ideas.

Areas of Support

- Better connections between Market Place and riverside
- Lighting the alleyways
- Naming the alleyways and highlighting their individual character / history
- Stepping-stones
- Removal of cars and clutter in Memorial Square
- Improved perception of safety

Areas of Concern

- Signage / wayfinding elements are quite subtle and may not get noticed
- Increased night time disturbance for residents
- Steppingstones alone may not be enough, eye-level and other signage suggested
- Effective management and maintenance necessary for improved alleyways
- Landownership issues may prevent a successful design
- Audio installations not seen as appropriate

Other Comments

- Should be part of a wider wayfinding / signage strategy
- Retain the alleys’ ‘secret charm’ and don’t over commercialise them
- Increase the connection between Memorial Square and Memorial Gardens
- The alleyways are an appropriate opportunity for art installations
Alleyways and Connections: In-Depth Findings

The in-depth findings look at the areas of agreement or conflicting opinion that have given rise to the different areas of discussion. The topic areas that have generated the most dialogue are listed first. Indicating the percentage of all Alleyway and Connection comments that specific topic received and also, in brackets, the number of formal comments received.

1. Stepping stones / signage / wayfinding (40/205) - 20%

The idea of stepping-stones is generally supported and seen as a simple way to enhance the alleyway connections. It is also seen as an opportunity to express the alleyway’s individual character / history.

It should be noted that there are a small number of concerns regarding the stepping-stones. These include:

- Are they sufficient to draw enough interest to guide people along the alleyways?
- There are suggestions for eye-level markers in addition to paving stones
- Not appropriate for the area, would like something more classic and simple

2. Lighting (32/205) - 16%

There is significant support for better lighting of the alleyways, however responses suggest the proposals are not clear at this stage how this would happen and what form it might take. Some suggestions were for lighting in the ground, however more information is needed.

There is mixed opinion about the idea of coloured lighting and there were comments that all lighting should be low energy and not negatively affect local wildlife.

3. Connections to the riverside (27/205) - 13%

There is good support to better connect the Market Place to the riverside and back, through improvements to the Alleyways and increasing the awareness of this connection. However there are concerns that creating a truly successful link would need more signage and wayfinding elements than the proposals show at the moment. It is also commented that the riverside and alleys would benefit from being incorporated as part of a wider signage strategy. Indicating how close the riverside is, but also highlighting what the activities and destinations it holds.

In contrast, there is a concern that an increased and evening / night time connection to the riverside will in turn increase disturbance for residents and that an appropriate balance needs to be achieved with regards to this.

4. Memorial Square (25/205) - 12%

Proposals to remove vehicles in Memorial Square and increase the visual connection between the Market Place, All Saints Church and Clarence Street, are supported. It is clear that disabled parking near the Town Centre still needs to be provided. De-cluttering of street furniture is supported and there have been some suggestions to remove the food vendor van(s).

In addition to proposals to set back the Memorial Garden railings, there have been further suggestions that the railings could be removed and increase openness, access and connection between Memorial Square and Memorial Gardens.

Other comments are that the simple and clean surfacing of Memorial Square is appreciated and a good precedence. Also that Cloisters Mall is in need of improvement.

5. Littering and cleanliness (20/205) - 10%

Litter and urination in the alleyways is a certain issue at the moment, the proposals have been welcomed as they are seen to increase activity, lighting and an upgraded appearance to help prevent this. However there are questions about how this will be achieved and concerns that the management and maintenance should be carefully looked at.

It is generally agreed that the northern river alleys are most in need of improvement. There have also been suggestions to de-clutter street furniture in the alleyways.

6. Identity and character (18/205) - 9%

As it stands, many people refer to the alleyways by the name of the shop at their end. Naming the alleyways and building on each alley’s unique character or history was widely suggested and supported. The stepping-stones were seen as one opportunity to highlight this.

There is some opinion that suggests the detailed development should keep the changes simple and tease out the natural character of each alleyway. Not becoming too commercialised as their ‘secret charm’ is a part of their attraction.

7. General improvements and landownership (16/205) - 8%

There is appeal for making the alleyways more attractive - ‘sprucing them up’. However there have been some concerns and questions surrounding landownership and what will be possible in light of this. Suggestions for improving the alleyways that may be affected by landownership issues include:
• Suggestions to clean / paint / improve appearance of the walls, add artwork
• Wall mounted lighting
• Management and maintenance

8. Perception of safety (9/205) - 4%
There is an awareness that the alleys appear unsafe and intimidating at night and support for improving this. Some suggestions include cameras, patrols and lighting along the full length of the alleyways.

9. Arts / installations (7/205) - 3%
There have been comments suggesting that the alleyways are a great opportunity for art works and/or historical information to be displayed. Reference has been made to the skills of local groups (including Save the World Club) with regards to this.

There is concern that the idea of audio installations would not work and those who commented are not convinced that it would benefit the alleyways or add to the natural charm of them.

10. Other (11/205) - total 5%
There have been a small number of other comments made with regards to the Alleyway proposals, these are outlined below:

• The term Riverside Pier is misleading and would confuse legibility of the riverside if this were to be used as an official term
• Some suggestions for crafts / stalls along the alleyways, but also a concern that this would not be economically viable
• A suggestion that QR codes could be an interesting way to link to digital information about the area.
• Signage links with the rest of Kingston
Overarching Issues: Ancient Market Area and Wider Kingston

The primary aim of this stage of feedback was to gather detailed response to each specific area of the Concept Proposals. However there are a number of comments and themes raised that apply across all areas. For ease of reading, these headline summaries are listed below alongside issues that apply to wider Kingston. The issues listed may also be covered in specific area summaries where it is particularly pertinent to that area.

Some elements of this feedback fall outside of the remit of the Ancient Market Area project, however it is vital to gather a holistic understanding to ensure the project responds to wider issues, does not exacerbate any problems and helps to address issues where possible.

Please also see the consultation findings for Stage 1 of this project, which focus upon, and provide more detail of background local opinion and context.

A signage strategy

Increasing awareness and footfall to the Ancient Market Area is understood to be key to its success. This is seen to include both creating a recognisable destination and linking the Ancient Market Area to a wider signage / wayfinding strategy.

A borough priority?

Overall there is support for the proposals, however a number of residents feel that borough resources should be spent on improving more essential services such as rubbish collection, employment and training. An explanation of borough priorities and project funding would be welcomed.

Highlight existing character

Site-specific design considerations that carefully enhance the assets of each area is a preferred approach, rather than inappropriate design impositions. There are strong concerns that this should not become a commercial or gentrified area, but become a unique offer in Kingston.

Clear sustainability principles

Although a detailed sustainability approach cannot be developed at Concept Proposal stage, comments would suggest developing a series of clear sustainability principles that will underlie further development of Ancient Market Area proposals.

Suggested sustainability considerations include: sustainably sourced materials, encouraging public transport / walking / cycling, fruit and nut trees for community harvest, low energy lighting, lighting that does not negatively impact wildlife, renewable energy generation, encouraging biodiversity.

Retail in the Ancient Market Area?

There is a general encouragement of the area as an alternative to High Street retail, with an acceptance that some retail will be part of creating a destination and economically viable area. Smaller, more independent traders are encouraged and are seen to add character and aid a clear identity of the area, linking with market. However there are concerns over the viability of this type of business, and if it would, or could, be successful in Kingston.

Increase cycle parking

There have been significant calls for more cycle parking throughout the Ancient Market Area and wider Kingston.

Consider maintenance and management early

This is considered critical to maintaining a high quality, successful environment. Early discussions on this would be welcome.

Address night time activity

The night time economy in Kingston is currently dominated by ‘under 30s’ and late night drinking. This and the resultant antisocial behaviour is something that many would like to see addressed within the borough and feel that this project should not encourage this. Seating in the Ancient Market Area is widely requested, but with consideration to the potential gatherings and disturbance that this may attract at night time.

Raise awareness of activities

A regular and widespread newsletter or prominent ‘live’ signage have been suggested to increase awareness of activities that are happening in the Ancient Market Area and Kingston Town Centre. At present this is seen to be lacking and at detriment to the success and diversity of the Town Centre.
Frequently Asked Questions
Frequently Asked Questions

Throughout the consultation process there have been a number of questions raised. Either for clarification with regards to the existing proposals, or queries about the design development and implementation. Below follows a list of the questions derived from the feedback.

**Market Place**
1. What activities will there be (daytime and nighttime) and how will they attract a wide range of people?
2. Will there still be foreign markets?
3. What is the identity (the ‘selling point’) of the Market Place?
4. What will happen to the fountain?
5. How will the ‘closing time’ of evening activity be enforced?
6. How will you ensure this doesn’t become another place appropriated by the under 30s in the evening?
7. Will cyclists be allowed?
8. What is the cycling strategy for the Market Place?
9. Will there be more cycle parking, and where?
10. How will cafe seating be prevented from dominating?
11. Has there been a footfall survey of the Market Place?
12. How will servicing in the market place happen? (Deliveries / waste collection / vehicular access etc.)
13. How is wider signage being linked into this project?
14. Will there be opportunities for public art?
15. When will built work start?

**Market Stalls**
16. Will all the existing traders be staying?
17. Will there be scope for any more traders?
18. Will traders remain in the same location?
19. Will rents go up for the market traders as a result of this project?
20. How easy will it be to expand the number of stalls should demand increase?
21. Is there a strategy for continuing trade throughout construction?

**Market Hall**
22. How realistic is a cookery school? How will this be set-up?
23. Will the cookery school prelude community groups’ use of the Market Hall?
24. Are there any plans to make the hall available for local groups to rent in the evening?
25. How do the proposals tie-in with the history of the Market Hall?
26. Don’t you need a historic buildings report to grant permission before removing the arches can be agreed?
27. If the Market House is opened up, how will it be closed in bad weather or for evening events?
28. Will the public toilets stay in the Market Hall?

**Riverside**
29. Will the cantilevered structure for the mini-pier be sufficient?
30. Won’t the roots of the new trees eventually ruin the riverside path?
31. Can the surfacing be improved?
32. How will antisocial behaviour on the riverside at night be prevented or enforced?
33. Can the study area be enlarged to include the areas to the north and south that need improvements?

**Guildhall**
34. Why can’t High Street be pedestrianised?
35. What’s a playful crossing?
36. Could the two High Street pedestrian crossings not be merged into one?
37. Where will the bus stop be located?
38. Are you removing car access to the front door of the Guildhall?
39. What will the impact on highways be?
40. Can these proposals be extended to the rear of the Guildhall?
41. How realistic is removing the platform over the Hogsmill
42. What will happen at the Guildhall at night?
43. Can you clarify what is happening with the Coronation Stone?

All Saints Church
44. What are the Church proposing? How does it fit in?

Alleyways and Connections
45. How will the lighting be improved?
46. Where will the disabled parking at Memorial Square be re-located to?
47. Will the alleys be kept clean, and by who?
48. Will buildings be upgraded along the alleyways?
49. Who owns the alleyways? How will this affect the proposals?
50. Exactly how many alleyways and which will be included?

General
51. How will the project be funded?
52. How viable is the scheme?
53. Will these proposals actually happen?
54. When will works happen at each area?
55. How are you addressing sustainability issues?

56. How can small, independent retailers be encouraged?
57. Why is this happening? Couldn’t the money be better spent elsewhere?
58. Will lighting be energy efficient?
59. Have you considered changed movement patterns at night and the impact of these?
Demographics

The analysis of demographic response for this project gives an indication of who we have been speaking to so far. All results are compared with the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Borough Profile 2010/11 and Borough Population Projections to monitor how representative the consultee group is and to identify any gaps.

It should be noted that the demographic data collected gives a snapshot of the consultee group, not a record of all people we have spoken with.

All participants who completed a Canvass Card (in both stages 1 and 2) were asked to complete a demographics form. We have received approximately 200 Canvass Cards to date and including all other methods of engagement we have received feedback from approximately 400 people so far. This indicates that the demographic response represents approximately 12% of consultees.

Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed W&amp;B Caribbean</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed W&amp;B African</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed W&amp;B Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamils</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Say</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

94% of people who completed a demographics form were of a white ethnic origin, 2% of Chinese origin and 4% chose not to say.

The Borough Profile indicates that 23% of Kingston’s population is from a Black or Minority ethnicity (BME). However, more specific to this project, Kingston Town Neighbourhood has 13% BME and Grove Ward 11% BME.

Although there is a predominantly white population in Kingston Town Neighbourhood, the demographics sample is very low on BME groups. It is clear that specific and accessible consultation needs to take place to ensure BME representation. Specifically noting the Tamil and Korean population in Kingston, as they are the largest minority ethnic groups. However, it should be understood that additional people from a wider range of ethnic origins have been engaged, but no demographics form completed in these instances.

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Say</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At 54%, the majority of people who completed the demographics form were male, 44% female and 2% chose not to say.

Male representation is slightly higher than the 2011 borough population projections, which indicate 49% male and 51% female.

Disability and Health

85% of people who completed the demographics form have no form of disability, 11% have some form of disability and 4% chose not to say. Of the 11% who are living with disability, the nature of this varies:

- 7% physical / mobility
- 1% sensory
- 1% learning
- 2% chose not to say

The Kingston Borough Profile indicates that 12.9% of people living in the Borough have a limiting long term illness. This would suggest that the 11% of the demographics sample living with a disability is broadly representative.

In addition to the figures indicated above, it should be noted that the Learning Disability Parliament and Access Checker Group have conducted study tours and submitted group feedback where no demographic form has been completed.
*Please note, there has been specific consultation with Kingston Youth Parliament. This comprised of 6 youth representatives aged 11 to 18. Demographic forms were not completed, but it is a key group to note and represent in this analysis.

Sample percentage including Kingston Youth Parliament:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>U16</th>
<th>16-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-65</th>
<th>66+</th>
<th>Not Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison with the Borough Profile, demonstrates that the demographic sample is significantly under represented by young people under 25 and to a lesser extent by 26 to 35 year olds. In contrast, over represented by people aged 56 and over.

This is a very typical representation of the interest in built-environment consultation between the different age groups. Also, we have understand that young people's interest is currently more focused on activities that happen outside of the Ancient Market Area (high street shopping, bars etc). Despite a number of attempts to further engage Kingston's young people and University students, this age group is still under represented and further, targeted, consultation would help address this imbalance.

Sample percentage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion / Belief</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Buddhist</th>
<th>Hindu</th>
<th>Sikh</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Atheist</th>
<th>Agnostic</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Borough percentage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion / Belief</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Buddhist</th>
<th>Hindu</th>
<th>Sikh</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Atheist</th>
<th>Agnostic</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Borough Profile refers to the 2001 Census for Kingston Borough, which is indicated above.

The most significant difference is an under-representation of Christian faith. However, the existing Grove Ward figure is lower than the borough, at 60%, also the British Social Attitudes survey (latest version published in 2010) shows a sharp National decline in religious faith in Britain. This may account for a reduction in the predominant faith and increase in ‘other’ and agnostic.

The figures also show an under representation of Hindu, Sikh and Muslim. These are minority religions borough-wide and may be linked with the under representation of BME groups.

Sample percentage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Hetrosexual</th>
<th>Lesbian</th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Bisexual</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Borough percentage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Hetrosexual</th>
<th>Lesbian</th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Bisexual</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Borough Profile refers to national estimates that lesbian, gay and bisexual people constitute 5-7% of the total adult population. The introduction of civil partnership registrations means that understanding of these figures is becoming clearer.

At 4% representation of lesbian, gay and bisexual people, the sample percentage is only slightly lower than the national average. However there was a large percentage (16%) who chose not to comment.
Soundings Recommendations
Soundings Recommendations

A clear response: Questions still remain around issues raised during Stage 2 of the consultation and there is a need to see plans and clear explanation of detail design choices for community buy-in.

Development of an ongoing liaison group and cultural collaborations group to:

- act as a sounding board throughout detailed development of the designs.
- explore the option of a community panel, working with Kingston First and other partners to drive local involvement and representation in the Ancient Market Area. Establishing a community involvement strategy and legacy.
- ensure local residents and interest groups have a forum for updates, discussion and queries.

Continued project updates: regularly update the wider community and stakeholders throughout the detailed development of all areas.

Ongoing market trader consultation: develop a clear strategy for market trader consultation and assessment of needs, with Kingston First. Some identified issues include: space requirements, waste facilities, management, storage facilities, services, security, layout, links to Market Place activities, pitch allocation and construction strategy.

Build links with young people: develop a dedicated programme with youth groups, schools and the University to input into the project and begin to generate interest, ownership and understanding of the Ancient Market Area at an early stage.

Targeted consultation with minority groups: ensure inclusion of hard to reach groups and understanding of their needs. Korean and Tamil are the largest minority groups in Kingston.

Ongoing discussions with All Saints Church: aim to develop a shared vision and give the community a clear understanding and opportunity to respond to the areas as a whole.

Continue a joined-up approach: to developing all Ancient Market Area proposals, especially the Market Place, Hall and Stalls.

Engagement with landowners and local business: (particularly pertinent to the riverside alleyways) generate landowner buy-in to achieve maximum potential of scheme improvements and benefit to local business.

Long-term marketing strategy for the AMA: a clear identity and linking in with signage and wayfinding strategies.