

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

Number in document and page	Nature of comment, esp equalities, lack of consultation	For or Against	Respondee type ¹	Comment
3/ p3		F	Amenity group	Good quality design, excellent affordable housing offer, demonstrable resident support, end of useful life, public realm poor quality, provide homes and space to meet significant local housing need, particularly for affordable homes
21/ p48		A	CRE	“With this regeneration I will lose my house and will not be able to find anything similar in the same neighbourhood where the nursery of my daughter is and the school we want to take her and friends, childcare bubble and all our life in the last years. There is no convincing explanation for the demolition of these beautiful and very robust houses.”
77/ p274	Lost: access to outdoor space outside your front door; community feel. Meet with people in gardens and on balconies;	A	CRE	<p>I have lived on the CRE for years and whilst I am in agreement that the flats need to be modernised I do not agree to the planning of the new estate.</p> <p>Firstly, apart from the 4 tower blocks, each flat has a front door that takes them straight outside into fresh air and not internal doors where you will have to then go through another door.</p> <p>There has always been a community feel on the estate even though over the years this may have broken down due to changes in lives etc it does still continue somewhat. By putting people into blocks of flats that have internal front doors you take away a neighbourhood feeling, especially for anyone that is unable to leave their house on a regular basis.</p> <p>During the height of the pandemic when you were unable to meet with family and friends people were still able to communicate with neighbours by standing in gardens and on balconies, this was a major factor for people that have to deal with mental health issues which we know all know rose higher through the lockdown.</p> <p>The blocks are also far enough apart that there is privacy for each person without feeling isolated. Having internal front doors with a main entrance will not deter any</p>

¹ “Public” are almost entirely identifiable as Kingston residents

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				form of crime if anything it could raise it, having external front doors you will have the added security of people walking past. Internal front doors means that anyone wanting to break into a flat will only have to ensure that no one is around inside. I work in property management with high end private flats and this does happen. If CRE is still to be knocked down and rebuilt then I propose that as with other new builds there is a secure entrance into blocks but a main balcony and front doors leading straight to fresh air to be considered. For safety, crime and mental health If CRE is not to be knocked down then I propose that when modernising areas of the outside living spaces, tenants are involved and to make an old school neighbourhood again where people helped keep the estate clean and safe along with the council
39/ p104	Access during and post construction period; failure to respond	n/a	CRE 2nd Norbiton Scout Group	“Whilst we are supportive of the regeneration as a whole, we don't feel adequate consideration has been given to safe and suitable access to the Parish Rooms both during construction, and once it has finished” “We made contact during the pre-planning consultation period but our correspondence was not replied to.”
P132	Irrelevant to CRE	n/a	n/a	
9/ p14		A	Neighbour	Height and scale, privacy, light, sunlight, not in keeping with local area, large construction traffic from other developments already a problem, property shaking and cracks, fumes and noise effect on quality of life, traffic and parking, residents of surrounding roads being ignored
10/ p16	Lack of social infrastructure	A	Neighbour	Object to second phase. Too many people, noise, fumes, dust, parking, privacy, traffic, safety risk to children, loss of trees, increase in crime with increased population – 2 murders in 2017 and 2018 on the estate; scale, size, dominance, lack of social infrastructure – schools, GPs. Health; parking; tree loss; nature and conservation issues; littering
12/ p29	Physical and mental health implications	A	Neighbour	Scale and dominance esp. building F; loss of light/ sunlight – especially Buildings E and F; lack of integration design esp. given size; need for more public space; effect on nature in an “area of deficiency”; Kingston Cemetery to become the “local parks and gardens”; swapping some of the existing green space on the estate for small,

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				gated gardens which are accessible to fewer people - lack of open space a danger to physical and mental health; loss of 50 mature trees; Loss of ecological value; bats; failure to hold ecology focussed workshop with residents as promised by Countryside; lack of sustainability; sewage and current discharges to Hogsmill chalk stream; PlayStreets on Piper Road not sustainable – noise, dust and fumes from development; Annual street parties Piper Road, Rowlls Road and Linden Crescent; parking; no proper consultation; workshops promised never happened
13/ p30		A	Neighbour	Manhattan Style Project Tower Block cannot reflect design of Edwardian villa; parking, ecology, density, loss of light/ privacy; noise, dust fumes; sustainability, trees
14/ p34		A	Neighbour	Construction traffic is inadequately considered; HGV movements of 6-12 an hour is a guess. Principal site access on Hawk's Road "ludicrous"; need for junction to be reconfigured; walk/cycle routes to Kingston Town and Norbiton Station should be incorporated to alleviate effects of population growth
18/ p41		A	Neighbour	Too many new flats along Kingston Road already. Not enough support services and road infrastructure to support this new proposal; price locals out of the market,
24/ p54		A	Neighbour	"I'm very supportive of the redevelopment of the Cambridge Estate but <i>the current proposals aren't suitable at all for the surrounding areas and so object to these</i> "; height and size, disruption, density
29/ p62		A	Neighbour	Policy breaches ; directly affected; height and scale Piper Road and Rowlls Road; first phase would impact people in adjoining streets of Piper Road, Rowlls Road, Somerset Road, Portman Road and to a lesser extent Linden Crescent and Bonner Hill Road; noise, dust and fumes associated with demolition and building over a 10 to 15-year period; sustainability with increased density – impact on infrastructure provision; design out of character, lacking distinctiveness; parking pressure; impact on natural green space and environment including cemetery; not consider concerns and objections of residents in surrounding streets
30/ p71		A	Neighbour	Significant negative impact on our home and other residents in x road. "The main

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				entrance road for Tadlow block... runs alongside our boundary thus further increasing pollution, noise, vibrations” – will be 40 flats. Need for separation between parking and shared boundary
34/ p95	Adverse health issues	A	Neighbour	Additional traffic and the safety issues and adverse health issues; parking; loss of mature trees and impact on air quality and quality of life; height opposite my house when current houses only 2 stories high; loss of natural light in to front rooms; error in plan does not show how houses to become 3 storeys; construction period of 10 years
60/ p190		A	Neighbour	Height, bulking, loss of light. Lose two hours light 8-10pm. Worse for residents of Cambridge Grove Road
63/ p196		A	Neighbour	Significant loss of light to property
64/ p198		A	Neighbour	Loss of light, effect on sparrow population, Need to have lights on – cost; plants – loss of light; lack of vitamin D; effect on health; Not understand why Kingston Council did not just compulsorily purchase all of the Victorian terraced houses on the odd side of Cambridge Grove Road.
11/ p18		A	Neighbour	Dwarf and dominate- Policy breaches; scale and dominance of specific buildings with policy breaches; Density of local area = 53; density of current estate = 94; Density of future estate = 245 dwellings per hectare; scale, layout and height breach of policy; tall buildings unacceptable and breach of policy; town-cramming, unacceptable density; pressure on schools and health; transport; privacy and light breaches particularly from buildings E and F; Floorplan incorrect that used for light study; design not in keeping with surroundings – policy breaches; noise, dust fumes; ecology and tree loss; lack of parking. Lists relevant policies
32/ p75	Claims developer mislead residents Photoshopping of	A	Neighbour Long term resident	<i>“Proposed design of Block B and its environs impact negatively on the surrounding streets”</i> – height and massing and architectural style of Block B, design of the Western elevation and environs, fencing, vehicular access Rowlls Road; car parking N of Rowlls Road;

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

	<p>before and after images</p> <p>Travel assessments conducted during lockdown</p> <p>Height, density, playspace, access, parking; planning breach as CRE not an area earmarked for change in local policy; need for proper cumulative effect assessment</p>		<p>P90</p>	<p><i>“Proposed design of the Plot E blocks and their environs impacts negatively on the surrounding streets” – “excessively high - preposterously so”</i>; The height of Block E4 should be reduced from eight to no more than five stories, and the height of Block E3 should be reduced from eleven to eight stories. Blocks E1 and E2 should also be significantly reduced in height. Proposed play space and community garden between Block B and Block E4 dangerously positioned next to moving cars; Plot E provides for insufficient planting of new mature and semi-mature trees;</p> <p><i>“Proposed arrangement of tall buildings across the entire Cambridge Road Estate redevelopment negatively impacts the surrounding streetscape”</i> Average height of buildings in the plots B, E and F fully five stories higher than the neighbouring two story Victorian architecture, proposed buildings in plots B, E and F would be as much as ten stories taller than their surrounding streetscapes;</p> <p><i>“Developer’s consultation with local residents has been inadequate and the developer has attempted to mislead residents and Council officials”.</i></p> <p><i>“Local residents’ questions were ignored, or met with obfuscation or deception; developer has attempted to mislead residents and Council officials about this change in building heights”</i></p> <p><i>“December 2020 CRE Newsletter purports to communicate changes in building heights, yet designates the heights of Blocks E5 and E6 as unchanged, when in fact they had increased. This is reprehensible behaviour”.</i></p> <p>Further claims of developer misleading residents by photo shopping before and after images in Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment;</p> <p>Travel assessments conducted during first lockdown? <i>Covid pandemic</i> - further market research should be commissioned and further detailed planning undertaken <i>Application for the proposed redevelopment of the Cambridge Road Estate does not form part of the Borough’s statutory Development Plan</i> - proposed redevelopment of the Cambridge Road Estate has not been subject to appropriate long-term</p>
--	--	--	------------	--

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				<p>strategic planning and assessment as an Area of Change in the Council's Core Strategy. Kingston's Core Strategy makes no reference whatsoever to the redevelopment of the Cambridge Road Estate; lack of local social and transport infrastructure. 3km travel distance for access to health facilities or school unacceptable; cumulative effects must be properly considered; <i>"Appropriate public access to planning is essential.</i> Because no proper strategic planning or assessment of the Cambridge Road Estate has been undertaken, reviewed by the Planning Inspectorate, and published in the Core Strategy, the public have been denied access to the information they need in order for them to properly fulfil their role in the planning process in relation to this application"</p>
53/ p139	<p>Council prevents due consideration of legitimate objections by anonymising responses</p> <p>No representation by local residents' association SSRA</p> <p>Process created where each group out for own goals</p>	A	Neighbour	<p>Methods for feedback and consultation have been a huge disappointment. Difficult to raise objections when the council's recent correspondence has been "to ensure you do not include any personal information" in feedback.</p> <p>This is impossible to do as a neighbour with a legally shared boundary with the council estate at Block B.</p> <p>Mismanagement of massive proposals, not broken down into phases. "Impossible to find information relating to your concerns"</p> <p>"Height and distance from Block B to our home remain a mystery to us." "We are not sure that environmental impact studies have been done properly, as we do know that on displays of our property the incorrect dimensions were used, and we raised this at Phase 2 of the CRE meetings. We do not know if this was done correctly in light assessments etc." "Phase 3 of the CRE consultation in February 2020 revealed a lot of changes that were conveniently concealed until the last exhibition. The building of block B was extended to 6 floors"</p>

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				<p>“Capacity. Roads, Doctors, schools, etc. will be overstretched. “</p> <p>“The process RBK has created with CRE, Sunflower Streets Residents Association (SSRA), and our councillors has been very disappointing, with each group out for their own goals and determined not to take on our views. We have not felt listened to at all.”</p> <p>“SSRA does not represent us. The SSRA did not represent Rowlls Road because they had us vote at a meeting for a road representative and then did not include him in meetings. They have shown no interest in representing our concerns and are opposed to them.”</p> <p>Issue with road access to parking at Block B affecting them</p>
35/ p97	<p>Crossrail 2;</p> <p>Equalities issue: Student VIBE building,</p> <p>Heat and energy cumulative effects</p>	A	Neighbour	<p>Loss of light;</p> <p>CrossRail 2 – <i>“3.27 - I find it astonishing that reference has been made to Crossrail 2, when the plans have been shelved, public transport usage has fallen off a cliff (and is predicted to change drastically post- COVID), and the project likely to never complete”</i>; increased density in one area; outlook;</p> <p>Discounting of effect on students unacceptable: <i>“5.32 - I take issue with the notion that the access of students to sunlight is any less necessary than residential properties - and I find it incredible that this should even be stated in such terms”</i>;</p> <p>post-Covid evaluation; architectural style;</p> <p>Effect on local environment: <i>“cumulative effect of ventilation discharge, the cumulative heat from mechanical heat recovery systems, cumulative heat and energy from population density and urban mass, and the cumulative impact of additional car usage”</i>; ecological studies have not accurately reflected the rich vein of wildlife in the area; Infrastructure particularly with no leisure centre in Kingston Town</p>
58/ p152	Failure of	A	Neighbour	Planning consultation time inadequate and many documents submitted close to the

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

<p>consultation process with new documents added at last minute</p> <p>Affordable housing</p> <p>Mental health and well-being of students discounted</p> <p>Out of character and context</p> <p>Density Design not integrated for people or wildlife</p> <p>Net biodiversity gain and urban greening factor fudged</p> <p>Equalities impact of increased density on social housing site in area NOT agreed as “opportunity area”</p>			<p>planning deadline of the 21st June. 13 new documents were added in the last 12 days before the deadline making it 358 documents for residents to try and read and interpret</p> <p>Affordable housing ; locks out potential public land for future social</p> <p>Housing; Mainly 1&2-beds, when 3-bed family homes needed; Inappropriate and poor value for public money; no cost/benefit analysis of refurbishment vs demolition; Over-massed and too high, unacceptable harm to surrounding buildings and residents;</p> <p>Light levels unacceptable for some adjacent properties, eg student VIBE building.</p> <p>Disturbed to see justification is because these people are 'just' temporary students, as if their well-being over a year is somehow less important. If anything, students are more vulnerable and stressed than the general population.</p> <p>Out of character and unacceptable in context and aspect/views for surrounding roads of mainly</p> <p><i>Proposed Density (~250 dph) is too high at upper limit of the urban density range for a PTAL of 4-6, yet the planning application admits that "the majority of the site has a PTAL of 1a and 1b" has a poor PTAL (very poor)."</i></p> <p><i>Proposed density is for an inner city Opportunity Area, neither of which apply to the Cambridge Road estate. Kingston is a town, not a city; Opportunity Areas in Kingston are yet to be formally designated.</i></p> <p>Design is not integrated for people or wildlife: Creation of physically separated green space, including segregated private green spaces, and the addition of far more hard surfacing in the planned 'green spaces', breaks up green connectivity and access for both people and wildlife.</p> <p>Natural realm – loss of trees, Natural realm evidence base is very incomplete;</p>
--	--	--	---

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				wildlife will be squeezed out, net biodiversity gain and urban greening factor fudged
7/ p10	Equalities implications of lack of social infrastructure	A	Neighbour	Height and scale will dwarf and dominate surrounding streets; change character of area; light and privacy; significant impact over 10-15 year construction period; not sustainable – healthcare, schooling, transport; parent of two young children; size of buildings makes design features irrelevant; pressure on parking
56/ p147	Impossible to read and process information in time given No attention to residents' concerns	A	Neighbour	Same as SSRA above with following added: “How are local residents supposed to have time to read and process such vast amount of material, it is impossible for us to have time to look into these. We ask that proper consultation on this development including the latest suite of documents is conducted.” “We strongly believe a development which is benign to the adjacent streets would be welcome and it is disappointing that despite repeated conversations and letters this has had no attention whatsoever.”
27/ p59	Lack of consultation	A	Neighbour	Live neighbouring small Victorian cottages; height and scale concern; light and privacy; skyline, “Manhattan”; pandemic, density and illness; inadequacy of train provision before additional population; need for proper consultation “I am shocked that there has never been a meeting between us local residents and the developers, we will be so impacted on by these developments”
8/ p12	green space and nature, mental and physical health	A	Neighbour	Loss of light and privacy increased height Building B; Noise, dust and pollution construction works; traffic and parking issues – insufficient parking provision; loss of green space – habitats and trees and impact of loss on mental and physical health
73/ p267	Loss of light	A	Neighbour Council counts as Public	Loss of light this road and Cambridge Grove Road. The planners justify this by quoting NSL practice that this is acceptable in an area of proposed regeneration and increased density. We do have a 'right to light' and this is our legal right. Although, page 187 of the document denies our rights. This can not be lawful. Housing development at the

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				<p>Former Fine Foods site (Bonner Hill Road / Cambridge Grove Road) is not shown on the Daylight and Sunlight Summary Survey drawings.</p> <p>This 3-storey housing development seriously affects 2-12 Vincent Road and all the properties on Cambridge Grove Road with lose of light. But it is not included in your plans.</p> <p>This is a grave oversight and should be included on the CRE plans and the Daylight and Sunlight Survey, as it will produce strikingly different results</p> <p>More social housing stock and integrate with Victorian housing in Vincent Road and Cambridge Grove Road</p>
76/ 273	Loss of light/ Incomplete analysis	A	Neighbour	<p>Appendix 9.4 of the overshadowing results seems to be missing some sections. The 'Transient Overshadowing Assessment' on pages 6-23 provides data for 21st March, 21st June and 21st December. Of these, the impact on many surrounding properties is greatest on 21st of June. Yet the 'Overshadowing Assessment' on the proceeding pages 24-37 only covers the 21st March date. This assessment is incomplete and should cover both the 21st June and 21st December dates.</p>
31/ p73	<p>Nature, including loss of trees</p> <p>Effect on health and well being</p> <p>Misleading information</p>	A	Neighbour	<p>Availability of local spaces to walk in and of nature close to your doorstep contribute very heavily to community wellbeing. CRE regeneration will create inaccessible, gated, dead spaces with token ornamental shrubs that will contribute very little to promoting nature and biodiversity in local area; Regularly bats foraging in many trees on the estate, not be possible with the species and size of trees on new estate. Gated areas within neighbourhoods do not promote a sense of togetherness in the community – segregation. Loss of healthy green spaces with birds and animals that need trees and hedges to live in, and to find food and raise their young in. The loss of mature trees on the estate and from its gardens has not been appropriately offset in the plans. Many of the trees - maples, sycamores, chestnuts, birch, beech, limes and many other species - are at least 50 years old and as well as valuable habitat for our urban wildlife, they also provide priceless ecosystem services (including air pollution cleaning, traffic noise reduction, oxygen producing, cooling and flood protection services) to the estate and neighbouring areas that have not been sufficiently accounted for in the new plans. Loss of mature tree; told no requirement for extra amenity services to be provided;</p>

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				<p>Planning of this development does not in any way cater for thousands more residents that it will bring in. The size of the "community centre" a token gesture compared to what would be needed for this size of increased population. Loss of light and traffic volumes;</p> <p>Misleading information - open days at Piper Hall exhibited display boards that misleadingly called these 8 or 9 (or higher) tower blocks "townhouses" and "maisonettes", which most people would assume to be Victorian style buildings of 3 or 4 storeys</p>
52/ p137	Negative impact on our home	A	Neighbour	<p>Significant negative impact on our home and other residents in road. Parking spaces up from 5 to 14. Currently there are c.12 spaces along our boundary for reference and these vehicles generate harmful levels of pollution (both PM2.5 and PM10) within the living areas of our home.</p> <p>There should be separation between our shared boundary (located 90cm from our house) and any parking, parking spaces should be fairly distributed around Tadlow and Rowlls Road should not bear all the traffic burden to and from the block</p>
57/ p149	NOT FAIR consultation process	A	Neighbour	<p>Letters regarding the re-consultation were sent to local residents on 13 and 20 May 2021 but did not have the forewarning letter that CRE residents were treated to. it remains unclear why this reconsultation is required, or what the changes to the plans may be. 21 documents added since we were first referred to the online application - impossible for residents to have sufficient time to review the documents and give them the consideration they need in order to form a view on the proposed changes. Issues with height/ daylight/ sunlight. "The documents which were uploaded to the planning application less than two weeks before the feedback deadline, and four weeks after we were advised that further information / amendments had been received by the council with respect to the planning application, highlighted that two of our rooms will be affected by the development"</p>
55/ p145	Poor practice	A	Neighbour	<p>Same as SSRA above with following added: "It is very poor practice and to me signals a lack of proper engagement with local residents. Badly done."</p>

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

	Lack of proper engagement			
62/ p194	Significant effect on quality of life	A	Neighbour	Significant loss of light at more than 40%; impossible to do video calls without light which required with home working.
33/ p91	Size of development Lack of health facilities, leisure centres and nurseries	A	Neighbour Parent of young children	Size, mass and height of buildings B and E; Parking and access; Playspace danger and pollution; nature and trees; local schools and amenities – <i>“As a local resident, I frequently cannot get a GP appointment, even for my children. When the Kingfisher leisure centre operated, it was a common experience for families to be turned away or given a one hour waiting time, because the swimming pool was too full. This is not ideal when trying to introduce children to sport and exercise.”</i> <i>“The two closest private nurseries frequently run a long waiting list”</i> ; type of housing <i>“This redevelopment seems to solely focus on smaller homes with no provision of large flats or self-contained houses”</i>
45/ p121	Very dangerous indeed	A	Neighbour With 5 year old child	Traffic, parking, safety, noise, dust, pollution, overlooking, loss of trees <i>“Children play in the surrounding streets and walk to school every day so large trucks driving to the site would cause safety issues and very dangerous indeed”</i>
15/ p36		A	Public	Lack of consideration for biodiversity gain/ preservation; assertions re bats/ birds not consistent with established measurements; 60+ tree felled; important and easily-spotted plant species missed; survey ignores well-established metrics for birds and bats
16/ p38		A	Public	Scale; increased population; noise, dust, fumes ; impact on surrounding area; ecology. parking
17/ p40	False pretences Equalities implications?	A	Public CRE resident?	The Regeneration was sold to residents on false pretences, through a landlord offer that made, promises incompatible with Council policy; The planning consultation was conducted over the Christmas period and during an international pandemic, when many people were distracted; suggestions made by participants of the Residents' Steering group were frequently ignored. Residents who have directly requested information have frequently received incomplete or late replies; The ptal score for the development site is on average 0-1; many residents will have to rely

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				on car usage, which is being discouraged to a large extent in the development, with percentage of parking spaces per unit reduced; The damage to ecosystems supported by trees will be extensive; effect on bats; reduction of green space; loss of light; overlooking; safety – fire and from pandemic effects; social cleansing exercise with “paltry” 210 extra London affordable rent homes; high cost of demolition incompatible with council’s profit motive; fumes, noise
19/ p43		A	Public	Construction traffic is inadequately considered; HGV movements of 6-12 an hour is a guess. Principal site access on Hawk’s Road “ludicrous”; need for junction to be reconfigured; walk/cycle routes to Kingston Town and Norbiton Station should be incorporated to alleviate effects of population growth
20/ p47		A	Public	Too many new flats along Kington road already. Not enough support services and road infrastructure to support this new proposal. Also no ,after how much social housing or affordable housing these type of developments price locals out of the market
22/ p50		A	Public	I fully support improvement to the estate. Concerns: increased flows of traffic and air pollution on neighbouring roads that are currently quiet residential streets (Bonner Hill). Height of some of the properties near to Piper Hall and the negative effect this will have on light and feel of surrounding area.
26/ p57		A	Public	Concerns re. pandemic. Construction plans and density need to be re-evaluated. Construction contributes to 40% of the planets greenhouse gases. Why do we need more retail space? Half of Kingston is already empty with no shops. Corruption at its best. Social cleansing under the guise of improving an area - well it won't improve it. It's grossly over density
28/ p61		A	Public	Parking, privacy, height; “Primarily the height of the buildings combined with density is unacceptable. Approving it in its current state would become a 21st century Alton Estate legacy”
72/ p265		A	Public	Excessive height or bulk of buildings, Inappropriate design/layout, Loss of light/Sunlight

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				<p>This will deprive residents from enjoying fresh air and sunlight in green spaces. Height of buildings means that many dwellings will be overshadowed, depriving residents from bright living spaces in the daytime.</p> <p>There seems little incentive offered to residents to leave their homes to mingle in social community, thereby aggravating isolation and ghettoization</p>
78/ p276 - 319		A	Public	<p>A. BREEAM targeted rating of excellent is not substantiated and cannot be met. Evidence shows score should be reduced at least to 56.44% from assumed rating of 72.50%</p> <p>B. London Plan Policies – possible breaches</p> <p>C. Other possible policy and legislative breaches</p> <p>Pictures of harm to ancient trees and recreational pressure in Richmond Park SAC and evidence of harm to ancient tree habitat and stag beetle and their larvae from recreational pressure</p>
84/ p329	Playspace	A	Public	Objections on fire safety, outdoor space, playspace, overheating risk
59/ p159 – p189	<p>12 June 2021</p> <p>Detailed objections including equalities issues</p> <p>See also 65/ p200</p>	A	<p>Public</p> <p>P. 159- 173 with Temple comment</p> <p>P 174-189 (with diagrams)</p>	<p>Detailed submission with policy breaches</p> <p>Barton Willmore has refused to respond to question "why" in the Temple Report on Wind Microclimate: Temple asked "Please can you explain WHY the conditions referred to below "appear to be calmer than would be expected for the scheme"? This has NOT been addressed in any way by Barton Willmore.</p> <p>Other reasons for objection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reserved Matters that can be CHANGED at a later date: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. layout and scale, ii. over-heating, iii. possibility closed public highways may NOT be re-opened, nor new highways provided through the estate 2. Assumptions about travel movements and vehicle-generated pollution from the

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				<p>Operational phase of the Estate are not sound and can not be relied upon</p> <p>3. Public Transport Accessibility Levels are low and assumptions not justified</p> <p>4. Loss of sun and daylight from development - well-being and suicide</p> <p>5. Noise (and overheating)</p> <p>6. Overheating (and noise) - Major Adverse effect on well-being and health predicted</p> <p>7. Over-reliance on fast food outlets</p> <p>8. Lack of Access to Open Space and Area of Deficiency</p> <p>9. Energy Centre</p> <p>10. Pollution and Dust during Construction</p> <p>11. HGV vehicle movements MUST be reviewed and screened IN to the Environmental Assessment</p> <p>12. The Applicant must ensure that all suppliers are members of the TfL Freight Operator Recognition Scheme ("FORS")</p> <p>13. <i>GP surgeries and dentists - health, well-being and spreading of disease, and equalities issues</i></p> <p>14. Nursery and early years provision - equalities and health issue</p> <p>15. <i>Equalities Impact Assessment not fit for purpose</i></p> <p>16. Health Impact Assessment absent; no assessment of how people from all new developments coming forward can reasonably have access to Richmond Park for recreational use whilst not harming its protected habitats</p> <p>17. Financial Viability Appraisal- gentrification by the back door?</p> <p>18. Opportunity Area – Major misrepresentation</p> <p>19. Density</p>
67/ 223	A developer’s “wet dream”	A	Public	<p>“This is staggeringly bad, ill thought though and horrible plan. It does not look after the current householders, their children and it is being built for profit. That our 'Royal' Borough is pushing to do this to our least able residents is beyond shameful. We need green spaces, HOMES. And this in every way is just a developer’s wet dream. Shame on anyone who votes for it.”</p>
41/ P112	Equalities impact	A	Public	<p>% affordable housing against policy; locks out potential public land for future social</p>

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

	<p>assessment “very poor” Affordable housing; Sale of public land Wrong kind of housing No comparison of alternative of refurb Out of character Flawed biodiversity assessment:</p> <p>Loss of trees and biodiversity Gardens not considered</p> <p>Effect on Richmond Park SAC</p> <p>Very poor Equalities Impact Assessment</p>			<p>Housing; mainly 1 and 2 bed, family homes needed; potential public land for future social Housing; no cost/benefit analysis of refurbishment vs demolition; Over-massed and too high; Out of character and unacceptable in context; density; design; carbon planning policies; 100 trees felled; demolition environmental effects; biodiversity loss; Loss of biodiversity and tree cover in GARDENS not considered in calculations – “no mitigation for their Loss”; green corridors, wildlife and plants, 1km of footpaths – all lost; natural realm evidence base incomplete; bat survey should be disallowed as too cold for bats to feed. Met Office temperature data for the April recording period gives night time temperatures of 5 and 6 degrees Centigrade. This is not allowed according to professional guidelines; CRE is Area of Deficiency for open space; conclusions of Environmental Statement are not evidenced;</p> <p>Richmond Council 2018 Local Plan acknowledges residential development likely to “exacerbate pressure” on Richmond Park SAC; mitigation for biodiversity loss inadequate and Biodiversity Net Gain calculations do not take in to account full range of species on the estate; adds in a few more plants than included in survey; no long term monitoring to take place; will hasten decline of Hogsmill chalk stream and its valley</p> <p>Equalities Impact Assessment very poor; claims no negative impacts despite extensive research to the contrary; no screening for a Health Impact Assessment despite fact that many residents on estate with disabilities or bad health</p>
<p>6/ p8</p>	<p>Affordable housing; radburn lines – footpaths and nature; impact on SSSIs and SACs</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>Public</p>	<p>Only 33.5% affordable housing breaches policy guidelines and Mayor’s and Council’s policies. 1 km of “Radburn Lines” to separate people from traffic will be lost as alleys replaced by roads. Privatised gate estate model leads to exclusivity and disconnectedness. Open space assessment flawed, loss of 100 trees environmental vandalism. Planned areas of housing in SEA of Core Strategy actively avoided increasing number of housing units close to Richmond Park SSSI SAC, Wimbledon Common SSSI SAC and Wisley and Ockham Commons SSSI SAC on basis of not increasing footfall near to protected areas</p>

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

37/ p102	Ballot process needs investigation Parking Trees Density Noise	A	Public	“The way in which the regeneration project was "sold" to residents needs investigation.” Car parking; loss of trees; breaks in tree lines, density and overlooking; loss of sunlight. Noise, reduction social housing. It will led to a reduction in social housing
80/ p321	Breach of NPPF 2021 policy 11 d) and policy 180 b) and c)	A	Public	"the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons" and Burnham Beeches evidence resubmitted
75/ p271	Breach of Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015	A	Public	Planning Application is in breach of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The updated application form on 8 April 2021 but is dated 12 November 2020. The date on which notices under section 65 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (“The 1990 Act”) and Section 13 (7) of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 must be served can be no earlier than 21 days before the date of the application. The planning application states that the notices were served on 12 November 2020, which is more than 21 days before 8 April 2021 when the updated planning application form for the Cambridge Road Estate redevelopment was submitted. Kingston Council is therefore prevented by statute from considering this planning application. Section 327a of the 1990 Act prohibits a local planning authority from considering an application where a requirement of the 1990 Act or any legislation made under the 1990 Act has been breached.
79/ p320	Burnham Beeches – City of London Corporation evidence about recreational harm to trees	A	Public	Evidence from City of London that an additional 490 visits to Burnham Beeches is of concern and may “adversely affect the integrity” of the site.

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				<p>I provide the City of London's (CoL) response as the neighbouring landowner of Burnham Beeches (BB), designated as SSSI, NNR and SAC. I have looked at the draft plan in relation to policy NR3 (Nature Conservation) and have the following comments on the associated HRA.</p> <p>Development reference HA19 is situated 3.8km from Burnham Beeches and the proposal is for 175 dwellings. Through work that we have carried out with South Bucks District Council we estimate that this will result in an additional 490 visits to the Beeches and it is our opinion that this is of concern and may adversely impact the integrity of the SAC. We also dispute the comment in Table 12 of the HRA which states that the SAC is largely woodland, which is resilient to recreational disturbance, and also the subsequent conclusion that the plan is unlikely to give rise to specific impacts arising from recreational pressure. While Burnham Beeches SAC is designated for beech woodland rather than birds (as the Thames Basin Heaths) that is not to say that visitor pressure cannot have a negative impact. High visitor numbers results in soil compaction and causes erosion, including around tree roots, which can be detrimental to tree growth. Increased dog numbers in association with visitors add urine and faeces that raise nitrogen levels in the soil as well as adding undesirable chemicals. In addition, vandalism by visitors, even if unintentional, can damage rare habitats such as wood decay in trees. Our work has shown that there is evidence that the tree health is declining and that there have been changes in the lichen flora in recent years and this can be attributed to increased visitor pressure. We would be happy to supply copies of the relevant reports and you might also like to talk with South Bucks District Council who have part funded some of the work.</p>
70/ p232	<p><i>Specific Equalities comments "EqIA minimises enormity of impacts upon elderly and disabled tenants"</i></p> <p>Contrived, misleading urban greening factor achieved through managed decline; loss of green space at ground level replaced partially at roof level</p>	A	Public council tenant	<p>As above PLUS: Disingenuous Urban Greening factor score - Design and Access Statement Vol 1_Chapt 8_Part 2_Page 1 CRE now, UGF score = 0.302; Planned UGF score = 0414</p> <p>i) The existing estate could easily be 'greened up' to a far higher score simply because it has inherently more green open space. This could be done now/in a refurb, if the council wanted to. Adding green roofs would further boost the estate's existing UGF to many times the planned regeneration UGF score. Landscaping was part of the Council's 'Better Homes' refurb. project for other estates, but denied to the CRE. <i>So the estate is being marked down due to council neglect (managed decline).</i></p> <p>ii) Loss of green open space in the proposed design is huge - lawns are down by 144% in the regenerated estate. Even if you reclassified the proposed semi-natural vegetation as 'lawns', it would still a third less than now. And the new estate is for about 2.5x the number of residents to share.</p> <p>iii) The developers claim the estate will be a much greener space, but this ignores the fact that a large % of this will be on roofs (15,326 sq m), ignores the destruction of existing mature trees (>100 to go) & wildlife (bats, large sparrow colony etc):- Replacing the green space with a high percentage of green roofs is only useful for small flying animals, and little use for residents to really walk/run or play.</p> <p>Inadequate EqIA: The CRE EIA still minimises the enormity of the impacts of the development upon elderly and disabled tenants, and other protected groups under</p>

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				<p>the Equality Act 2010. It just says there are "potential impacts" "during relocation", but "disruption will be limited". Yet the finances, health and well-being of residents involved in regeneration schemes are all put at higher risk. For example, the Centre for London report estimates there is between a 10 -25% increase in risk of ill health and 1-3% more likelihood of early death</p> <p>Lack of Health Impact Assessment</p>
50/ p133	Dereliction of duty by Council	A	Public	<p>“The regeneration of the CRE required because of years of underfunding in development.”</p> <p>Hardly surprising that residents voted to embark on this redevelopment given conditions on the estate.</p> <p>Scale, height, brick monstrosity – Kingston’s “Ayer’s Rock”. Architecture incompatible with location; council ignoring responsibilities as JV partner</p> <p>Negligent disregard for good planning principles.</p>
74/ p269	Development is not financially viable; affordable housing will be abandoned; lack of infrastructure – CrossRail 2 mothballed; No demand for private flats	A	Public	<p>According to the report’s methodology:</p> <p>“a viable development will support a residual land value sufficiently above the site’s Existing Use Value (EUV) or Alternative Use Value (AUV), to support a land acquisition price acceptable to the land owner. As such, where a development proposal generates a residual value which is higher than the appropriate benchmark value, it is deemed viable and therefore likely to proceed. Conversely, if the residual value is lower than the benchmark, it is considered to be economically unviable and consequently unlikely to progress.”</p> <p>The residual land value for the CRE regen is £2,651,000</p> <p>The benchmark land value for the project is £53,492,000</p> <p>The residual land value is therefore £50,841,000 lower than the benchmark.</p> <p>Therefore, the project is NOT VIABLE.</p> <p>The report also indicates that making up the difference will require the abandonment of plans for a large amount of the social housing promised for the development:</p>

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				<p>“The Council’s policy makes clear that the affordable housing contribution is subject to viability testing.” The problem isn’t social housing, it’s that the private housing won’t sell, and adding more properties won’t improve the situation. Again, the report helpfully explains why: “Residential property prices have fallen considerably across the Borough of Kingston Upon Thames in the previous 12 months. For all residential types, the fall has been 3.2%, while for flats and maisonettes, the fall has been greater still, at 5.6%.”</p> <p>The CRE Regen, in addition to the Royal Exchange developments are increasing the supply of newbuild flats to the market at a time when demand is falling. The more flats are built for private sale in the borough, the less they are worth. No infrastructure – CrossRail 2 mothballed</p>
42/ p118	Effect on wellbeing	A	Public	<p>Size, density, height, overshadowing. Loss of sunlight</p> <p>“This will be to the detriment of residents' wellbeing.”</p>
46/ p123	Foregone conclusion Anxiety, earing down, suicides, no reasonable compromise	A	Public	<p>“I am writing to you with regards the Forgone conclusion of the above planing stated above.”</p> <p>Details outlined then changed. Questions whether is happening to wear them down. Causes anxiety, questions if have led to suicides; no reasonable compromise; no contact from offices; number of letter regarding building control and incomprehensible language used.</p> <p>Asks for letter to be sent in a “clear succinct and most importantly comprehensive manor”</p>
38/ p104	Height, size and positioning next to Victorian two storey properties	A	Public	<p>Height, size, positioning of Blocks B, E and F. “None of the current buildings on the Cambridge Road and adjacent to Piper Road exceeds four storeys. The building heights proposed in the application on the same site are up to triple the existing height, which is unacceptable and will not relate well to the form, proportion, composition, scale and character of surrounding buildings. No analysis, as required by Policy 7.7, appears to have been undertaken to clearly demonstrate that the height, scale, mass and form of the proposed building would be acceptable in this</p>

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				location and therefore the proposals are fundamentally flawed.”
40/ p108	In-depth environmental and infrastructure issues Richmond Park SAC Low PTAL of area	A	Public	Air quality, noise pollution, biodiversity – effect on Richmond Park SAC on individual and cumulative basis, secondary schools, cumulative assessment of development effects generally, low PTAL of area
51/ p135	Lack of affordable homes 12-15 years construction “unbearable intrusion on the surrounding areas” Council ignores concerns	A	Public	Lack of affordable homes; Building proposals are too bulky for the site and will dominate the whole of Norbiton; Overall form and massing will appear as impenetrable lump on the skyline. Inappropriate architectural language more suited to London Docklands. Ungainly form and massing. This is made worse by the choice of materials, colour, lack of setbacks, lack of contrasting materials. Windows too small, making the buildings seem even heavier and inappropriate. 12-15 years construction “unbearable intrusion on the surrounding areas” “I do not expect the Planning Department or the DCC to listen to my concerns, as it didn't for Eden Campus . The excuse RBK used for not listening on Eden Campus was that they could only respond to the proposal, not influence the design. This is not the case here as as RBK is the applicant and will be the sponsor of a very harmful development. We expected better from the LibDems, they promise better, it would be great to see that happen. The current residents of CRE and people across the Borough, deserve so much better.”
68/ p225	Lack of due diligence of “what will be done with the existing residents”	A	Public	Whilst the new development creates an abundance of new dwellings, the balance is perhaps too far in this direction, at the cost of future quality of life especially for families with younger children. The additional burden on local amenities that this much denser development will bring must be explicitly mitigated. I am not satisfied that the matter of what will be done with the existing residents has been considered with the due dilligence.
69/ p226	Many different factors	A	Public	Affordable housing, use of public land, Lack of 3 bed family homes; poor value for money; no cost/benefit analysis of refurbishment option; overmassed, too high,

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

	As a council tenant, is “frightened”		council tenant	<p>density, out of character, design not integrated for people or wildlife; mayor’s carbon policies; felling of 100 trees, biodiversity, 1km of paths to go, no consideration of gardens, ecology report and Environmental Statement inadequate, area of deficiency, harm to Richmond Park SAC, biodiversity net gain calculations not correct, harm to Hogsmill; equalities impact assessment inadequate, no health impact assessment</p> <p>“As a resident of a council estate in Kingston, the lack of care in this EIA still frightens me.”</p>
49/ p129	Material Misrepresentation CRE is NOT in an “opportunity area”	A	Public	Letter to case officer dated 31 March 2021 contains material misrepresentation that CRE is in an “Opportunity Area”
61/ p192	Mental health, over-crowding, anti-social behaviour	A	Public	<p>“This building design is not suitable for healthy human use. Over crowding, unavoidable noise from too many neighbours, lack of sunlight caused by the building height, lack of green space. It is worsening the living conditions for all current residents and for more who move there or nearby. Unless you councillors are willing to live there for 20 years, you should not enforce it on others. This building will work well for criminals and those who behave in an antisocial way. For everyone else, it is a mental health disaster.”</p>
1/ p1	Nature, trees, parking, height design	A	Public	Loss of trees, biodiversity loss, parking, design, layout, excessive height, loss of light, sunlight
48/ p127	Parking; enormous towers	A	Public	“Building so many enormous towers at the boundary of the site will seriously impact the surrounding area, unlike the existing development that has a few large towers with significant distance between each of them and with the majority towards the centre of the site.”
47/ p125	Plans “like a prison block”	A	Public	Density, more green space, like a prison block, not blend with Victorian houses, quality of living for inhabitants, building contractors maximising profits not about Kingston residents and town developing in aesthetically pleasing way and conserving character

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

2/ p2	Population density, infrastructure	A	Public	Not enough social housing, Norbiton already highest density ward in Kingston; insufficient infrastructure
71/ p240	See 59/ p159 and 65/ p200-221	A	Public	Final response updated of 16 July 2022 (65/ p200-221) with AMENDMENTS marked in red
85/ p343	See also 71/ p240 59/ p159 and 65/ p200-221	A	Public	<p>New objections to Planning Committee based on new documents attached to planning application alongside original response dated 16 July 2021 – numbered 65 in this document</p> <p>This response should be read in its entirety as a single document</p> <p>A. BREEAM targeted rating of excellent is not substantiated and cannot be met. Evidence shows score should be reduced at least to 56.44% from assumed rating of 72.50%</p> <p>B. London Plan Policies – possible breaches</p> <p>C. Other possible policy and legislative breaches</p>
65/ P 200-221	<p>Updated objections dated 16 July 2021 to 59/ p159 taking into account new documents published at last minute</p> <p>Last minute changes, Inadequate time to respond to consultation, Breach of PSED, Breach of Town and Country Planning Act</p>	A	Public	<p>22 different parts (new ones only below, others were changed and are reproduced in full Freedom of Information document) :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Breach of consultation requirements: Inadequate time for Consultation on new information 2. Online availability of late documents breaches public sector equalities duty and Equalities Act 2000 3. Planning Application is in breach of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 4. Failure of council to fulfil its Equalities Duties as demonstrated in the revised Equalities Impact Assessment published on 23 June 2021 (the "New EqIA") <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. General equalities and human rights breaches ii. Out of date and irrelevant Equalities Impact Assessment used as comparators iii. No Plan level Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out iv. The planning application has been based on incomplete Equalities Data v. Outdated information has been used on CRE residents vi. Many specific breaches of Equalities Duties are evidenced in the New EqIA

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

	1990, General equalities and human rights breaches Details of ALL future phases have become “reserved matters” and subject to change			5. Reserved Matters that have been reserved for DECISION at a later date: i. Design Guidelines are materially misleading; ii. layout and scale; iii. appearance and landscaping; iv. over-heating; v. possibility closed public highways may NOT be re-opened, nor new public highways provided through the estate.
25/ p56		F (council say supports)	Public	I live locally to the development and I fully support improvement to the estate. I am concerned however about increased flows of traffic and air pollution on neighbouring roads that are currently quiet residential streets (Bonner Hill). I'm also concerned about the height of some of the properties near to Piper Hall and the negative effect this will have on light and the feel of the surrounding area.
66/ p222		F	Public	Area needs redevelopment and would benefit the local area as long as increases in demand for schooling and medical services are taken into account
4/ p4	Housing need, modern standards, clarity of design details, access	F	Public	Support principle of redevelopment, better use of previously developed land, much needed private and affordable homes to modern standards. Quality of design should be captured in of 1:5 or 1:10 scale detail drawings and listed as part of the planning application not left to planning condition because less control at this stage. No access through Somerset Road in intermediate phase if not proposed accessible in final Masterplan
23/ p52		F and A	Public <i>Works for Construction Innovation Hub</i>	Support increase in number of social rent houses and consideration of existing tenants so far; Concern – Phase 1 4 years; whole development 12 years – “A child would spend all their school life with this development occurring next to them. And this elongated duration would be a social as well as physical burden to the area”. “I would urge the council to require higher levels of modern methods of construction (MMC) for the future phases of the development”
36/ p100		F and A depends on interpretation	Public	“RBK doesn't have the stock to shorten the social housing waiting list. This makes unsecure tenure a never ending cycle, and particularly hard for moderate income and hard working families. The residents ballot has given RBK a clear

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

				<p>mandate. Objectors commenting on grounds of views being ruined, minor environmental impact or the notion of 'over development' must be balanced against the <i>dire need for more social and affordable housing</i>.</p> <p>So long as RBK extracts the very best deal for council/HA owned units versus private units then I fully support the application.”</p>
5/ p6	Density, infrastructure investment, social inequality	F/ A	Public	Compromised by density and need for infrastructure investment. 2.4x density with already stretched resources will build in future issues. Will be environmentally unsustainable and goes against what Kingston council “extols for social equality”
43/ p119	inappropriate design/ layout	n/a	Public	“The Developer, during Public Engagement, showed a typical Utility Cupboard in the mock-up to house a washing machine (it had plumbing installed) and a dryer. There was no venting provided for the latter, which I consider essential both for the convenience of the tenant but also to prevent condensation damage to the property.”
82/ p325		n/a	Right of Light Consulting	23 September 2022: Appointment on behalf of two further properties in <i>Vincent Road</i>
83/ p327		n/a	Right of Light Consulting	01 September 2022: “We understand the windows serving the above properties have acquired prescriptive rights of light over the development site. We also understand you have appointed GIA surveyors to evaluate and advise you on light matters.” Reference to FOUR properties in <i>Piper Road</i>

Cambridge Road Estate Planning Application 20/02942/FUL – Responses received under Freedom of Information Request

81/ p324		n/a	Right of Light Consulting on behalf of previously named properties	20 December 2022: “it has been highlighted to us by our clients that the assessment has not included the properties at xxx . Both of these properties are positioned directly adjacent to Phase 1 of the development proposal and have windows facing out directly over the site. Both properties were also included within the previous daylight and sunlight study undertaken in January 2021” Ref to <i>Piper and Vincent Roads</i>
86/ p412	Open space, access to nature, biodiversity, affordable homes	A	Sian Berry, Green Party Member of The London Assembly	7 October 2022: Access to nature; deficiency of access to open space; public rights of way; biodiversity; lack of affordable homes
54/ p143	New information uploaded at last minute, 74 properties affected by loss of light	A	Sunflower Street Residents Association Alliance (SSRA)	Objections from earlier this year still valid on two grounds: “1. Very large amount of documents uploaded close to deadline of 21 st June – well over 500 pages” – “undermines notion of a proper consultation” 2. 74 properties will be significantly affected by the development in terms of reduced access to daylight and sunlight” “This is totally unacceptable to those residents whose lives will be affected”
44/ p120		n/a	TEST	