

RBK - Ref number	Author of comment(s) (i.e. Individual/organisation)	PAGE (where available)	CHAPTER/SUB-CHAPTER (e.g. 2, 2.6, etc. - where available)	COMMENT	Action / Response
1	London Climate Change Partnership	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.	1. 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, <b>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'.</b> 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?	2. 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. <b>No changes</b>
3		24	2.49 (Improving Walking Environment)	As above. Is heat an issue?	See 2 above
4		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 potential changes in demand for services?	See 1 above
5		36	2.97 (Risks to accessibility)	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?	<b>See 1 above</b>
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.
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) SoB 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. <b>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'.</b> This will incorporate Climate Emergency Response objectives as appropriate.

13	Kingston Cycling Campaign	-	-	<p>1. We endorse the 2.27 road hierarchy and would like to see this used in the design of every scheme.</p> <p>2. There appear to be statistics missing such as commitments to the Mayors Transport Strategy objectives with figures for the current mode shares and targets for cycling mode shares in 2025 and 2041</p> <p>3. The LIP bid should include the planned cycle network for the borough including 'gocycle'/ mini-Holland routes.</p> <p>4. The collision and casualty data on page 27 (2.58) is almost impossible to read and should be given more space.</p> <p>5. Data on recent KSI (Killed and Serious injuries) would be useful as the Vision Zero target relates to KSIs, not total casualties.</p> <p>6. There is no mention of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods or School streets. We would like these to be included as tools for helping to achieve the Healthy Streets objectives.</p> <p>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 ST07 there are borough targets but no reference to the current percentage. Highlighted routes on SCA?</p> <p>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 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. 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 ST01. There is no indication of how much these Projects and Programmes cost.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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"</p> <p>11. To support the Outcomes 3 &amp; 4 (pages 30 &amp; 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>13. At 2.61, the council's intention to consult on implementing 20mph speed limits on all residential roads should be included.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 as £120k whereas in the previous two years it was £1209k. It's very confusing.</p>	<p>1. Acknowledged</p> <p>2. Table ST07 sets out MTS mode share targets. There is no specific cycle mode share target for the MTS</p> <p>3. Subject to annual LIP bidding round, not recorded in the LIP3 itself.</p> <p>4. and 5. noted</p> <p>6. See para 2.122</p> <p>7. Table ST07 reports that no baseline data available.</p> <p>8. <a href="#">Final table updated with correct links</a></p> <p>9. <a href="#">£550k allocated for Liveable Neighbourhoods in 2020/21, and £750k in 2021/22 - table ST04 updated as further information became available</a></p> <p>10. <a href="#">Noted and included in final document</a></p> <p>11. Noted. Measures in Kingston Town Centre and Eden Stree/Union Street being considered as part of emerging Town Centre Vision</p> <p>12. Reflected in para 2.69 summary as a key challenge, 4th bulletpoint</p> <p>13. Commitment in para 2.74 to deliver 20mph on residential roads that are not already 20mph.</p> <p>14. Cycle parking is included in infrastructure as per Outcome 6.2</p> <p>15. Totals amended in final document</p>
----	---------------------------	---	---	--	--