

7. The onsite GP was a good proposal that would have benefited both the extra-care residents and also the public. Instead, its **proposed removal is divergent to the main purpose** of the development (extra-care); **diminishes the public amenities** to a less useful landscape garden area (we already have Hyde Park on our doorstep?), and puts further pressure on residents to be required to travel out of the site for their regular health visits.
8. **Issue of single vehicular access point** - South End, as the only vehicular access point is **far too narrow and restricted to support** some 250-500 new residents. This is the same for some of the neighbouring roads which traffic would have to come through to reach South End (from Kensington Court, Victoria Road through to St Albans, Kensington Court Place, etc).
9. The substantive increase in traffic to support this dense development of flats will **substantially raise both noise and air pollution levels** (especially around Ansdell Street, Kensington Court Place, Kensington Court, Thackeray Street and South End).
10. The proposal for the landscaped public space will also **encourage even higher levels of foot traffic**, and cause those residing in the properties in the neighbourhood to **suffer from increased pedestrian noise**. In particular, those on South End, Ansdell Street, Kensington Court Place, Thackeray Street, Kensington Square will be directly impacted, where noise levels already tend to be 'magnified' due to the narrow streets, taller mansion houses and lack of greenery to dampen sound (e.g. we already have had the occasional loud pedestrian noise from people walking from Richmond College and the Builders Arms to the high street).
11. With the increase in both vehicular and foot traffic, the impact of such a development will **destroy the otherwise tranquil nature** of the Kensington Court and Victoria Road neighbourhoods, as most of the foot and vehicular traffic will need to pass directly through this area to get to South End.
12. Surely the increase in traffic as a result of this development entering from Kensington Road via Kensington Court and Victoria Road will also be in **direct conflict with** the council's **designated "quietway"** provided on the Kensington Court – Kensington Court Place – St Albans Grove route.
13. The deck over the railway lines is an innovative idea; however the proposal has not gone far enough and lacks any convincing work done by the developer to extend this proposal to explore **an alternative vehicular access point from Wrights Lane**. If plans can be drawn up to support a deck over the train lines, surely it would be equally feasible to construct a ramp (e.g. similar to those used in shopping centres) to facilitate vehicular entry from Wrights Lane across the train tracks instead? Creating **an entry point from Wrights Lane will in fact be much closer to the High Street Kensington tube station** than even the pedestrian access from Kensington Square.
14. More work could be put into developing the 'step free' access to the tube station study. Those areas that are not owned by LUL or Heythrop could be looked into further and the relevant stakeholders sought to have all other options properly considered.
15. The **proposed route for construction traffic has not changed and for it to last till 2023, remains unacceptable**. Even between the hours of 9am-3pm outside of the school runs, there are many pedestrians along those residential roads. The roads are narrow and with off-street parking, cars will be prone to damage from passing heavy traffic and we will likely to lose many of the parking spaces (which are already in short supply in the immediate neighbourhood) to long-term suspensions over a 5-year construction period.