RBK - Ref number	Author of comment(s) (i.e. Individual/organisation)	PAGE (where avaialable)	CHAPTER/SUB-CHAPTER (e.g. 2, 2.6, etc where available)	COMMENT	Action / Response
1		17	2.3 (Public Transport)	Any views on resilience of public transport to weather impacts? Understanding of relationship between weather (e.g., flooding, heat) and delays or blockages? Any impacts from the hot weather this summer? Any potential issues if we have a drought? Possible learning from Cape Town? And any longer-term investment must consider the risk of increasingly frequent and severe events.	While the LIP document must refer to, and contribute towards, the London-wide and borough-wide environmental and climate change objectives, it is not an environmental action plan in its own right. To reflect this, Borough Objective 4.6 has been added to state that 'To ensure biodiversity matters are considered for LIP projects, in line with the Council's overall environmental strategy'. This will incorporate Climate Emergency Response objectives as appropriate.
2		22	2.42 (Improving Street Environment)	Could this be linked with any tree planting initiatives for shading? Is there any knowledge of areas that are in need of cooling?	Light, shade and tree planting are all elements of the Healthy Streets process set out in 2.46 of the final LIP3, and which is referenced throughout the document when referring to infrastructure improvements and local transport/public realm. No changes
3		24	2.49 (Improving Walking Environment)	As above. Is heat an issue?	See 2 above
4	London Climate Change	34	2.90 (Outcome 5)	You mention 2041. Have you assessed risks to the transport network from flooding and heat, and how those might change by 2041? Or	See 1 above
5	Partnership	36	2.97 (Risks to accessibility)	potential changes in demand for services? What is the council's role in understanding or addressing risks to accessibility - from flooding or other weather-related disruption? Identifying resilient routes? Understanding potential knock-on effects of disruption - for council services as well as for other sectors like health, business supply chains, etc.?	See 1 above
6		38	2.108 (Outcome 7)	All above comments apply here - they go to the issue of reliability.	See 1 above
7		42	2.133 (Environment Strategy)	Climate change adaptation?	See 1 above
8		52	Annual Programmes of Schemes and Initiatives	Could schemes have resilience built into them? through SuDS, or consideration of heat or flood risk?	See 1 above
9	Met Police	-	-	There is no current reference in the consultation document to Designing out crime or SBD, therefore the document does not show sufficient commitment to the existing and future residents of the borough.	Para 2.123 to Para 2.128 reflect MP comments and commitment to 'Designing Out Crime' and 'Secured by Design' principles
10	Surbiton Councillor - Hilary Gander	·	-	1) There are several comments about walking routes - could you let me know more? 2) Portsmouth Road is mentioned as a completed Go Cycle route but there are others. Please check with Tony Antoniou. 3) 50% of journeys under 5km are made by car. Is this Kingston or London-wide? 4) 2.58 increase in cyclist casualties 'due to increase in cyclists' begs the question what is the increase so that we can see hopefully that there is a large increase in numbers and a relatively small increase in casualties. Percentages and actual numbers would be useful. 5) 2.72 school travel plans - are they really a success story? 6) 2.78 'manage car parking to reduce the attractiveness of car travel' - generally, I like this idea but it possibly doesn't belong in this document until it has been scoped / defined (Stephen?) 7) contrasts with suitable and adequate car parking for residents. Which anyway is possibly counter to the MTS? 8) 2.88 50K electric vehicles but Kingston's numbers more relevant? 9) 2.90 14-15M trips - but what are Kingston's? 10) Soß buses and bus routes where large new developments need a big boost 11) 2.98 Can we assume Crossrail 2 will happen? 12) 2.110 as above 13) Non-radial routes needed (bus and train) 14) 2.126 demand management - probably is what's needed but possibly not for this report (Stephen, again?)	
11	Highways England	-	-	For Royal Borough of Kingston our interests lie in the M25. We fully support the objective to increase levels of sustainable travel in the coming years and Highways England take a view to promote this as much as possible when consulted on specific developments. Having examined the LIP3, we do not offer any further comment on its contents.	no action required
12	Environment Agency	-	-	We welcome the overriding theme of the plan and there is nothing that would demonstrate significant concern from a fluvial flood risk perspective. However, we feel there are opportunities for improvement in both flood risk management and water quality that are being missed in its current form. We feel that the work towards the healthy streets initiative should incorporate Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) features to reduce the risk of surface water flooding, improve water quality and slow the rate at which water drains to watercourses and rivers. Any plan to redesign a street should examine the opportunity to incorporate SuDS such as filter strips, rain gardens or permeable paving as part of the proposal. The inclusion of these features would contribute to the delivery of healthy streets. The London Plan Policy 5.13 states that development should take a hierarchical approach to the management of surface water, encouraging the use of infiltration and attenuation. The redevelopment of many of Kingston's streets offers an opportunity to implement this approach and deliver multiple sustainability benefits.	While the LIP document must refer to, and contribute towards, the London-wide and borough-wide environmental and climate change objectives, including flooding, it is not an environmental action plan in its own right. To reflect this, Borough Objective 4.6 has been added to state that 'To ensure biodiversity matters are considered for LIP projects, in line with the Council's overall environmental strategy'. This will incorporate Climate Emergency Response objectives as appropriate.

2. There appear to be statistics missing such as commitments to the Mayors Transport strategy objectives with figures for the current mode shares and tragets for cycling mode shares and tragets for cycling mode shares. 4. The collision and causaly data on page (25) as immost impossible to read and should be given more space. 5. Data on recent ESI (Rilled and Serious injuries) would be useful as the Vision 200 target freities to SISs, not total casalites. 6. There is to membro of tow Traffic Mephroumhood or School streets. We would like these to be included as 1 tox for freiling to achieve the shares objectives. 7. The shares are a bett or programment of the strategic cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 there are be brought as 100 strategy and strategy cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 there are bett or programment of the strategic cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 the more time and a 150% do not mean anything to people received the strategic cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 the membrane preventage, Helphighed ordures on SCA. 8. Table STO read and included in final document to the strategic cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 the membrane and programment of the strategic cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 the membrane and programment of the strategic cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 the membrane and programment of the strategic cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 the membrane and programment of the strategic cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 the membrane and programment of the strategic cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 the membrane and programment of the strategic cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 the membrane and programment of the strategic cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 the membrane and programment of the strategic cycle network. On page 35 finals 61307 the strategy as a strategy a				1. We endorse the 2.27 road hierarchy and would like to see this used in the design of every scheme.	1. Acknowledged
shares and targets for cycling mode shares in 2025 and 2021 3. The LPB bit should include the planeling received with the borough including' gooyde/ mini-folland routes. 4. The collision and casually data on page 27 (2.58) is almost impossible to read and should be given more space. 5. Data on recent (\$10(led and seriously) data on page 27 (2.58) is almost impossible to read and should be given more space. 6. There is no mention of Low Traffic Neighborulmods or \$5 chool streets. We would like these to be included as tools for helping to achieve the Healthy Street objectives. 7. There appears to be no baseline figure of what percentage of people in Kingston live within 400m of the strategic cycle network. On page 55 fable \$100 there are boroping hispaneline but no reference to the current percentage, Highlighted routes on SCA? 8. Table 1702 on Page 65 indicates that all the LPP projects and programmes selever on all the MTS outcomes 1.0 7 with the expectage of the expenditure of the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA? 8. Table 1702 on Page 65 indicates that all the LPP projects and programmes solve on all the MTS outcomes 1.0 7 with the expendent of the expenditure of the current percentage of the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA? 9. The second of the current percentage of the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA? 1 the LPP. We necessary the proposed of more than 100 the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA? 1 the LPP. We necessary the proposed of more than 100 the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA? 1 the LPP. We necessary the proposed of more than 100 the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA? 2 the LPP. We necessary the second of the current percentage of the current p				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2. Table ST07 sets out MTS mode share targets. There is no specific cycle mode share
3. The LP bid should enclude the planned cycle network for the brough including 'gocycle' mini-infolland routes. 4. The collisions and assaulty sits an open adsaulty sits an open adsaulty sits an open adsaulty sits an open support of the plant of the p				1 1 1	target for the MTS
S. Data on recent SS (Dilled and Serious liquides) would be useful as the Vision Area target relaters to XSS, not total casualities. 6. There is no mention of Low The legibourhoods or School streets. We would like these to be included as tools for helping to achieve the Healthy Streets objectives. 7. There appears to be no baseline figure of what percentage of people in Kingston live within 400m of the strategic cycle network. On page 5 for fable ST07 there are brorough targets but no reference to the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA? 8. Table ST07 cher are brorough targets but no reference to the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA? 8. Table ST07 cher are later than 10 ment of the scheme shall be proposed in order to understand whether these projects could deliver the objectives. For example "Neighbourhood in professional to the UP. We need to see more of actorization of what is proposed in order to understand whether these projects could deliver the objectives. For example "Neighbourhood improvements' tells us hardly anything," we not at a 221 its systat that 4 annual Programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma" at though we don't have that available, we have been told that this Proforma repeats the Isting at ST01. There is no indication of how much those Projects and Programmes at 221 its systat that Annual Programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma" at though we don't have that available, we have been told that this Proforma repeats the Isting at ST01. There is no indication of how much those Projects and Programmes at 221 its systath the Annual Programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma" at those when the program is a state of a minimal reports. 1.0 We suggest adding to the same to demonstrate a lack of ambition. This is then contradicted by the paragraph at 31.4 No explanation is given for not submitting a lad for Education of Notice and Programmes of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma" at 11. To support the					Subject to annual LIP bidding round, not recorded in the LIP3 itself.
5. Data on recent LSI (filled and Serious injuries) would be useful as the Vision Zero target relates to KSIs, not total casualities. 6. There is no mention of Low relapious tooks between two would like these to be included as tools for helping to achieve the Healthy Streets objectives. 7. There appears to be no baseline figure of what percentage of people in Kingston live within 400m of the strategic cycle network. On page 5 for Table STD7 there are borough targets but no reference to the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA? 8. Table STD1 on Page 45 incident all the LIP projects and programmes of stortems 1 to 7 with the exception of one schemes and one outcome. This appears to be implicable. Furthermore the schemes listed at STD1 do not mean anything to people reading the LIP. We need to see more of exception of what is proposed in order to understand whether these projects could deliver the objectives. For example "Neighbourhood improvements tells us hardly anything," We noted at a 32 21 says that at 32 21 says that the Annual Programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma" at though we don't have that a valiable, we have been told that this Proforma repeats the listing at 5101. There is no indication of how much these Projects and Programmes of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma" at though we don't have that a valiable, we have been told that this Proformar repeats the listing at 5101. There is no indication of how much these Projects and Programmes of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma" at though we don't have that a valiable, we have been told that this Proformar repeats the listing at 5101. There is no indication of how much these projects and programmes of schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma" at the programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma" at 11. Noted and inclined an advantage of the programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma" and the				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	4. and 5. noted
6. There is no mention for two Traffic Neighbourhoods or School streets. We would like these to be included as tools for helping to achieve the Healthy Streets objectives. 7. There appears to be no baseline figure of what percentage of people in Kingston live within 400m of the strategic cycle network. On page 55 Table 5701 here are broughted to the source to the current precentage. Highlighted routes on SCA? 8. Table 5701 on Page As indicates that all the LIP projects and programmes deliver on all the MTS outcomes to 7 with the exception of on schemes and one outcome. The schemes listed at 7010 do not mean anything to people ranking to specify anything to reposler anyth					6. See para 2.122
the Healthy Streets objectives. 7. There appears to be no baseline figure of what percentage of people in Kingston live within 400m of the strategic cycle network. On page 56 Table 5170 there are borough targets but no reference to the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA? 8. Table 5100 na Page 45 not projects and programmes deliver on all the MTS outcomes 1 to 7 with the exception of one schemes and one outcome. This appears to be implausible. Furthermore the schemes listed at 5101 do not mean anything to people reading the U.P. We need to see wheth at 3 2.21 (says that the Annual Programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Profords and included in final document" though we don't have that available; we have been told that this Proforma repeats the listing at S101. There is no indication of how much these Projects and Programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Profords and included in Infrastructure as per Outcome 6.2" 9. We note that at 5104 RBK is not bidding (there is no budget for any "Liveable heighbourhood" funding in 2019/20, 210 or 21/22. We have to ask why this is the surpose source. 9. We note that at 5104 RBK is not bidding (there is no budget for any "Liveable heighbourhood" funding in 2019/20, 210 or 21/22. We have to ask why this is the surpose source. 10. We suggest adding to 152 steems to demonstrate a lack of ambition. This is then contradicted by the paragraph at 3.14. No explanation is given for not submitting a bid for 2019/20. It would be helpful to see an explanation. 10. We suggest adding to 153 that "Poor Tentradicted by the paragraph at 3.14. No support the Outcomes 3 & 4 (pages 30 & 32) we would like to see a commitment to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential roads by filling shallowing and 2.35 that "Poor Tentradicted by the paragraph at 3.14. No support the Outcomes 3 & 4 (pages 30 & 32) we would like to see a commitment to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential roads should be included. 12. KCC suggests revising softion and Hooka					7. Table ST07 reports that no baseline data available.
7. There appears to be no baseline figure of what percentage of people in Kingston live within 400m of the strategic cycle network. On page 56 Table 5170 there are borough targets but no reference to the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA2 8. Table 5710 on Page 45 indicates that all the LIP projects and programmes deliver on all the ATS outcomes 1 to 7 with the exception of one schemes and one outcome. This appears to be implausible. Furthermore the schemes listed at 5T01 do not mean anything to people reading the LIP. We need to see more of a description of what is proposed in order to understand whether these projects can direct and stream of the standard programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as? Proforma A* though we don't have that at 3124 says that the Annual Programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as? Proforma A* though we don't have that at which these Projects and Programmes cost. 9. We note that at STO4 RRK is not blidding! there is no budget for any "Liveable Neighbourhood" funding in 2019/20, 20/21 or 21/22. We have to ask why this is the case? It seems to demonstrate all ack of ambition. This is then contradicted by the paragraph at 31. No explanation is given for not submitting a bid for 2019/20. Liveable helpful to see an explanation. 10. We suggest adding as 22 we would like to see acminiment to reducing private carp enteration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) pike its manual programme of these routes being upgraded as part of the go cycler /minifolland works' 11. To support the Outcome \$4. A (pages 30 as 22 we would like to see an explanation. 10. We suggest adding as \$4 (pages 30 as \$2.0 we would like to see acminiment to reducing private carp enteration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) pike its manual programme of Street parks give the enter the enter the numbers of pecklets on residential roads by lifering. Also we would like to see commitment to resuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden not Worth as a				, ° , ,	8. Final table updated with correct links
8. Table ST01 on Page 45 indicates that all the LIP projects and programmers deliver on all the MTS outcomes 1 to 7 with the exception of one schemes and one outcome. This appears to be implausible. Furthermore the schemes listed at ST01 do not mean anything to people reading the LIP. We need to see more of a description of what is proposed in order to understand whether these projects could deliver the objectives. For example "Neighbourhood Improvements' tells us hardly anything a whom that as 12.61 as yet that the Annual Programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma A" though we don't have that a variable, we have been told that this Proform a repeats the listing at ST01. There is no indication of how much these Projects and Programmes cost. 9. We note that at ST04 R8 k is not bidding/ there is no budget for any "Liveable Neighbourhood" funding in 2019/20, 20/21 or 21/22. We have to ask why this exage? It seems to demonstrate lack of ambition. This is then contradicted by the paragraph at 3.14. No explanation is given for not submitting abid for 2019/20. It would be helpful to see an explanation. 10. We suggest addings at 2.35 that "Too traffic conditions for cycling on many roads which deteres people from travelling by bike, with only a portion of these routes being upgraded as part of the go cycle/ miniboliand works" 11. To support the Outset is named as 3.4 (pages 30 as 3.2) we would like to see mention of the need to reduce the numbers of people when humber of pedestrain injurier serviting from being his by private evidence and Road, Commet Lance West, Lincon Street June Street, ruces into an drivingly for best part by the violet on the service and Road, Commet Lance West, Lincon Street June Street, ruces into an drivingly for besiden the borough attractive e.g. Richmord Road, Commet Lance West, Lincon Street June Street, Lincon Street, June Street, June Street, Lincon Street					9. £550k allocated for Liveable Neighbourhoods in 2020/21, and £750k in 2021/22 -
schemes and one outcome. This appears to be impliausible. Furthermore the schemes listed at STDI do not mean anything to people reading the LIP. We need to see more of a description of what is proposed in order to understand whether these projects could deliver the objectives. For example "Neighbourhood Improvements' tells us hardyn anything. We note that at 3.22 it says that the Annual Programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma A" though we don't hat a valiable; we have been told that this Proforms a repeats the listing at STDI. There is no indication of how much these Projects and Programmes cost. 9. We note that at the available; we have been told that this Proforms a repeats the listing at STDI. There is no indication of how much these Projects and Programmes cost. 9. We note that at a valiable; we have been told that this Proforms a repeats the listing at STDI. There is no indication of how much these Projects and Programmes cost. 9. We note that at a valiable; we have been told that this Proforms a repeats the listing at STDI. There is no indication of how much these Projects and Programmes cost. 9. We note that at a valiable; we have been told that this Proforms a Programmes of the paragraph at 3.14. No explanation is given to root submitting a list of co. 2019/20. It would be helpful to see an explanation. 10. We suggest adding to the summary of the borough's challenges at 2.35 that: "Poor traffic conditions for cycling on many roads which deter people from travelling by bike, with only a portion of these routes being upgraded as part of the go cycle/minibilation. 11. To support the Outcomes 3.8.4 (pages 30.8.32) we would like to see mention of the need to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential roads should be included. 12. KCS suggests revising the much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughbout the borough structive. Exp. Richmond Road, Commet Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden not Workester Park a				56 Table ST07 there are borough targets but no reference to the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA?	table ST04 updated as further information became available
the LIP. We need to see more of a description of what is proposed in order to understand whether these projects could deliver the objectives. For example "Neighbourhood Improvements' tells us hardly anything. We note that at 3.21 asys that the Annual Programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma A" though we don't have that available; we have been told that this Proforma repeats the listing at ST01. There is no indication of how much these Projects and Programmes cost. 9. We note that at ST04 RBK is not bidding/ there is no budget for any "Liveable Neighbourhood" funding in 2019/20, 20/21 or 21/22. We have to ask why this is the case? It seems to demonstrate a lack of ambition. This is then contradicted by the paragraph at 3.14. No explanation is given for not submitting a bid for 2019/20. It would be helpful to see an explanation. 10. We suggest adding to the summary of the borough's challenges at 2.35 that: "Foor traffic conditions for cycling on many roads which dever specify filtering. Also we would like to see mention of the need to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential roads which devers proper filtering. Also we would like to see a commitment to reducing private are pneutation of kingston Town Center (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that "go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Maiden to Worcester Park as well as many connector route. 13. At 2.51, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. At 10 support Curver of the seemic place of the support of the support of the support of the sub				8. Table ST01 on Page 45 indicates that all the LIP projects and programmes deliver on all the MTS outcomes 1 to 7 with the exception of one	10. Noted and included in final document
of what is proposed in order to understand whether these projects could deliver the objectives. For example "Neighbourhood Improvements' tells us hardly anything. We note that at 3.2.1 k asys that the Annual Programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma A" though we don't have that available; we have been to led that this Proforma repeats the listing at \$101. There is no indication of how much these Projects and Programmes cost. 9. We note that \$150 ABK is not bidding/ there is no budden for any "Liveable Neighbourhood" funding in 2019/20, 20/21 or 21/22. We have to ask why this is the case? It seems to demonstrate a lack of ambition. This is then contradicted by the paragraph at 3.14. No explanation. 10. We suggest adding to the summary of the borough's challenges at 2.35 that: "Poor traffic conditions for cycling on many roads which deters people from travelling by bid, with only a portion of these routes being upgraded as part of the go cycled minhold works." 11. To support the Outcomes 3 & 4 (pages 30 & 3.2) we would like to see a commitment to reducing private car penetration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Linion) street given the number of pedestrian injuriesr resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that there was not been to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential still be much work to do to improve conditions for make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Combe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle pa				schemes and one outcome. This appears to be implausible. Furthermore the schemes listed at ST01 do not mean anything to people reading	11. Noted. Measures in Kingston Town Centre and Eden Stree/Union Street being
tells us hardly anything. We note that at 3.22 it says that the Annual Programme of Schemes and initiatives is submitted as "Proforma A" though we don't have that available, we have been told that this Proforma repeats the listing at STDI. There is no indication of how much these Proforms and Programmes cost. 9. We note that at STO4 RBK is not bidding/ there is no budget for any "Liveable Neighbourhood" funding in 2019/20, 20/21 or 21/22. We have to ask think this sit cases? It seems to demonstrate a lack of ambition. This is then contradicted by the paragraph at 3.14. No explanation is given for not submitting a bid for 2019/20. It would be helpful to see an explanation. 10. We suggest adding to the summary of the borough's challenges at 2.35 that: "Poor traffic conditions for cycling on many roads which deters people from travelling by bike, with only a portion of these routes being upgraded as part of the go cycle/ minibolland works." 11. To support the Outcomes 3.8.4 (pages 30.8.32) we would like to see a commitment to reducing private car penetration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that "go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that the will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support the Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbition, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the stati	13	Kingston Cycling Campaign	_	the cir. We need to see more of a description	
though we don't have that available; we have been told that this Proforma repeats the listing at ST01. There is no indication of how much these Projects and Programmes cost. 9. We note that at ST04 R&Is is not bidding/ there is no budget for any "Liveable Neighbourhood" funding in 2019/20, 20/21 or 21/22. We have to ask why this is the case? It seems to demonstrate a lack of ambition. This is then contradicted by the paragraph at 3.14. No explanation is given for not submitting a bid for 2019/20. It would be helpful to see an explanation. 10. We suggest adding to the summary of the borough's challenges at 2.35 that: "Poor traffic conditions for cycling on many roads which deters people from travelling by bike, with only a portion of these routes being upgraded as part of the go cycle/ miniholland works." 11. To support the Outcomes 3.4 (lageas 30.8.2) we would like to see mention of the need to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential roads by filtering. Also we would like to see a commitment to reducing private car penetration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Combe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the stations. 15. Table ST04 does				for what is proposed in order to diluci stand whether these projects could deliver the objectives, not example integribuation improvements i	
these Projects and Programmes cost. 9. We note that at 5T04 RBK is not bidding/ there is no budget for any "Liveable Neighbourhood" funding in 2019/20, 20/21 or 21/22. We have to ask why this is the case? It seems to demonstrate a lack of ambition. This is then contradicted by the paragraph at 3.14. No explanation is given for not submitting a bid for 2019/20. It would be helpful to see an explanation. 10. We suggest adding to the summary of the borough's challenges at 2.35 that: "Poor traffic conditions for cycling on many roads which deters people from travelling by bike, with only a portion of these routes being upgraded as part of the go cycle/ miniholland works" 11. To support the Outcomes 3 & 4 (pages 30 & 32) we would like to see ention of the need to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential roads by filtering. Also we would like to see a commitment to reducing private car penetration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbition, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the stations. 15. Table STO4 does not appear to make sense. Sub-totals figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" f				telis as hardly anything. We note that at 5.22 it says that the Annual Frogramme of schemes and initiatives is submitted as 1 following A	13. Commitment in para 2.74 to deliver 20mph on residential roads that are not already
9. We note that at \$704 RBK is not bidding/ there is no budget for any "Liveable Neighbourhood" funding in 2019/20, 20/21 or 21/22. We have to ask why this is the case? It seems to demonstrate a lack of ambition. This is then contradicted by the paragraph at 3.14. No explanation is given for not submitting a bid for 2019/20. It would be helpful to see an explanation. 10. We suggest adding to the summary of the borough's challenges at 2.35 that: "Poor traffic conditions for cycling on many roads which deters people from travelling by bike, with only a portion of these routes being upgraded as part of the go cycle/ miniholland works" 11. To support the Outcomes 3 & 4 (pages 30 & 8.3) we would like to see mention of the need to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential roads by filtering. Also we would like to see a commitment to reducing private car penetration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that "go cycle" will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Commbe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the stations. 15. Table STO4 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the number above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All Tit. borough funding" figures do not equate to the sum of th				though we don't have that available, we have been told that this i forming repeats the listing at 5101. There is no indication of now much	·
have to ask why this is the case? It seems to demonstrate a lack of ambition. This is then contradicted by the paragraph at 3.14. No explanation is given for not submitting a bid for 2019/20. It would be helpful to see an explanation. 10. We suggest adding to the summary of the borough's challenges at 2.35 that: "Poor traffic conditions for cycling on many roads which deters people from travelling by bike, with only a portion of these routes being upgraded as part of the go cycle/ miniholland works" 11. To support the Outcomes 3 & 4 (pages 30 & 32) we would like to see mention of the need to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential roads by filtering. Also we would like to see a commitment to reducing private car penetration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the stations. 15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sum of the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				these i rojects and i rogrammes cost.	,
explanation is given for not submitting a bid for 2019/20. It would be helpful to see an explanation. 10. We suggest adding to the summary of the borough's challenges at 2.35 that: "Poor traffic conditions for cycling on many roads which deters people from travelling by bike, with only a portion of these routes being upgraded as part of the go cycle/ miniholland works" 11. To support the Outcomes 3 & 4 (pages 30 & 32) we would like to see mention of the need to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential roads by filtering. Also we would like to see a commitment to reducing private car penetration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Combe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the station, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the station in the 10 file. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sum of the sub-total figures do not equate to the sum of the sub-total figures do not equate to the sum of the sub-total figures do not equate to				9. We note that at ST04 RBK is not bidding/ there is no budget for any "Liveable Neighbourhood" funding in 2019/20, 20/21 or 21/22. We	15. Totals amended in final document
10. We suggest adding to the summary of the borough's challenges at 2.35 that: "Poor traffic conditions for cycling on many roads which deters people from travelling by bike, with only a portion of these routes being upgraded as part of the go cycle/ miniholland works" 11. To support the Outcomes 3 & 4 (pages 30 & 32) we would like to see another of the need to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential roads by filtering. Also we would like to see a commitment to reducing private car penetration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive there have been. 13. At 2.61 the council still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling rhoughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce ar journeys to the stations. 15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the number sabove them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				have to ask why this is the case? It seems to demonstrate a lack of ambition. This is then contradicted by the paragraph at 3.14. No	
deters people from travelling by bike, with only a portion of these routes being upgraded as part of the go cycle/ miniholland works" 11. To support the Outcomes 3 & 4 (pages 30 & 32) we would like to see mention of the need to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential roads by filtering. Also we would like to see a commitment to reducing private car penetration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the stations. 15. Table STO4 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sum of the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				explanation is given for not submitting a bid for 2019/20. It would be helpful to see an explanation.	
11. To support the Outcomes 3 & 4 (pages 30 & 32) we would like to see mention of the need to reduce the numbers of vehicles on residential roads by filtering. Also we would like to see a commitment to reducing private car penetration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce a journeys to the stations. 15. Table STO4 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				10. We suggest adding to the summary of the borough's challenges at 2.35 that: "Poor traffic conditions for cycling on many roads which	
residential roads by filtering. Also we would like to see a commitment to reducing private car penetration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce a journeys to the stations. 15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown					
Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been. 12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce a journeys to the stations. 15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				11. To support the Outcomes 3 & 4 (pages 30 & 32) we would like to see mention of the need to reduce the numbers of vehicles on	
12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce to the stations. 15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				residential roads by filtering. Also we would like to see a commitment to reducing private car penetration of Kingston Town Centre (e.g. Eden	
and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road, Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the stations. 15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				Street, Union Street) given the number of pedestrian injuries resulting from being hit by private vehicles there have been.	
Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the stations. 15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sum of the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				12. KCC suggests revising the wording of 2.51 to reflect that 'go cycle' will not deliver a comprehensive network of routes across the borough	
connector routes. 13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the stations. 15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				and that there will still be much work to do to improve conditions to make cycling throughout the borough attractive e.g. Richmond Road,	
13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included. 14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce at journeys to the stations. 15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				Coombe Lane West, routes into and through Chessington and Hook and connections from New Malden to Worcester Park as well as many	
14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the stations. 15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				connector routes.	
secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the stations. 15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included.	
15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL borough funding" figures do not equate to the sum of the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				14. To support Outcome 6 we would like to see commitment to ensuring that at railway stations e.g. New Malden and Surbiton, good quality	
borough funding" figures do not equate to the sum of the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown				secure cycle parking is provided in order to reduce demand for car parking and to reduce car journeys to the stations.	
				15. Table ST04 does not appear to make sense. Sub-total figures do not equate to the numbers above them (i.e. 879+330 = 1209) and "All TfL	
as £120k whereas in the previous two years it was £1209k. It's year confusing				borough funding" figures do not equate to the sum of the sub-totals. On the DISTRECTIONARY FUNDING line the funding in 2021/22 is shown	
as 1120% which cas in the previous two years it was 1120%. It's very containing.				as £120k whereas in the previous two years it was £1209k. It's very confusing.	