

APPENDIX 1

Summary of Written Comments on Barking and Dagenham's Consultation Draft Local Implementation Plan

Appendix 1: Summary of Written Comments on Barking and Dagenham’s Consultation Draft Local Implementation Plan

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Transport for London	<p>Personal Safety</p> <p>The LIP needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals to reduce transport related crime and the fear of crime and how the proposals and their outcomes will be monitored Proposals to improve personal safety and security, especially for women and vulnerable groups, particularly at night (reference to Mayor’s ‘Safer at Night’ initiatives) Proposals to improve the sense of security felt by rail passengers at rail stations. <p>Consultation with the Public</p> <p>The LIP needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on how the Council consults local voluntary and community organisations on transport issues Information on local mobility forums 	<p>Personal Safety</p> <p>The LIP will set out proposals aimed at reducing transport related crime and fear of crime on the transport network. These will include working with the bodies responsible for security inside stations.</p> <p>Consultation with the Public</p> <p>The LIP will provide information on how the Council consults on transport issues and proposals for the future. The LIP will refer to the activities of the Barking and Dagenham Access Group, which brings together representatives from different voluntary groups for disabled people and Council Officers.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Transport for London	<p>Air Quality, Noise, Environment</p> <p>The LIP needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals to support the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy • A policy response to the Mayor's proposal for a Low Emission Zone • Policies and proposals to address transport related noise • Policies and proposals on the movement of waste by rail or water • A strategy for uptake of cleaner fuelled vehicles within the borough's own transport fleet and the freight fleets of contracted services. 	<p>Air Quality, Noise, Environment</p> <p>The LIP will include proposals to address transport related air pollution and noise, including support in principle for a proposed London Low Emission Zone. The LIP will include a policy encouraging the movement of waste by rail or water. The Council will explore opportunities to use rail or water to move waste, through a Joint Waste DPD to be prepared with 3 other ELWA boroughs. The LIP will set out proposals for the uptake of cleaner fuelled vehicles.</p>
	<p>Rail</p> <p>The LIP needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies in support of the London Metro concept including OrbiRail • Proposals for development of a freight interchange and freight distribution centres • A clear programme of proposals to improve the accessibility of rail stations in the borough 	<p>Rail</p> <p>The LIP will provide a clearer statement of support for the London Metro concept.</p> <p>The LIP will state that opportunities for freight interchange and freight distribution centres need to be looked at in the wider context of the South East, and not just the borough. External funding will be needed to carry out any studies, and the LIP will set out the funding requirements.</p> <p>The LIP will include proposals to improve accessibility to Rail/Underground stations, and in particular the need for a comprehensive upgrade of Barking Station/interchange in partnership with TfL and other agencies.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Transport for London	<p>Buses</p> <p>The LIP needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals to achieve journey time savings for buses • A commitment to provide bus standing and garage facilities to support extra bus services • Proposals in relation to bus priority • Proposals in relation to improve the accessibility of bus stops. 	<p>Buses</p> <p>The Council has been making improvements to bus priority and bus stops for several years, and the LIP will set out the Council's programme for future years.</p> <p>The Council will actively consider proposals from TfL for new bus standing and garage facilities, and will state this in the LIP. The Council will continue to lobby for improvements to bus services including new north/south bus routes and will seek to develop with TfL a comprehensive bus service strategy.</p>
	<p>Traffic Management</p> <p>The LIP needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on the review of parking and loading controls along bus routes and in other key locations in the borough • Proposals in relation to use of cameras and other measures to enforce bus routes • Proposals in relation to the implementation of 'Parallel Initiatives' on 'A' roads and busy bus routes • Proposals in relation to the reallocation of road space to more essential traffic, i.e. public transport, pedestrians and cyclists 	<p>Traffic Management</p> <p>The LIP will set out the need for a review of parking and loading controls along busy bus routes and in other key locations, and associated funding requirements. External funding will be required .Any review will need to take into consideration the views of businesses and residents particularly disabled people.The LIP will provide more information on bus lane enforcement and set out funding requirements.</p> <p>The LIP will include proposals in relation to 'Parallel Initiatives'.The LIP will provide more information and proposals in relation to bus lanes, cycle lanes and public realm schemes.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Transport for London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clearer indication of how the borough's policies and proposals will contribute to meeting the traffic reduction targets set by the Mayor of London • Proposals for the review of the worst congestion bottlenecks and measures to address these • Information on how the Council will meet its statutory duties under the Traffic Management Act 2004 • Information on the provision of information to the London Traffic Control Centre. 	<p>The LIP will set out how the Council's walking, cycling schemes and planning policies will contribute to traffic reduction targets, and how this will be monitored. The LIP will include expected public transport improvements that will also contribute to achieving such targets.</p> <p>The LIP will set out how the Council will meet its statutory duties under the Traffic Management Act 2004.</p> <p>The LIP will set out how the Council will provide information to the London Traffic Control Centre.</p>
	<p>Parking</p> <p>The LIP needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals for motorcycle parking, in particular in areas of high demand • Proposals for the review and implementation of parking and loading controls on 'A' roads and busy bus routes • A Parking and Enforcement Plan, which should include a policy to limit the amount of parking provided through public off-street car parks • A charging policy for off-street public car parks • Proposals in relation to Park & Ride sites and information on the mechanisms used to assess potential sites • Proposals for identification, review and implementation of potential new CPZs • Proposals to provide more parking for disabled persons • Information on how the Council will contribute to a robust and reputable Blue Badge scheme. 	<p>Parking</p> <p>The Council will prepare a Parking and Enforcement Plan, which will cover the issues of motorcycle parking, parking and loading controls, off-street car parks, and CPZs.</p> <p>The LIP will state the need to investigate opportunities for Park & Ride within the context of the wider Thames Gateway area. External funding will be required should a study be recommended.</p> <p>The Council intends to carry out a survey on parking for disabled persons which will inform any proposals on parking for disabled persons.</p> <p>The LIP will set out how the Council will contribute to a robust and reputable Blue Badge scheme.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Transport for London	<p>Streets</p> <p>The LIP needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans for a review of signing and lining within the borough • A programme for the preparation of a five year Highway Asset Management Plan • Proposals to implement 'Streets for People' schemes. 	<p>Streets</p> <p>The LIP will include a programme for the preparation of a five year Highway Asset Management Plan. A review of signing and lining will be looked at as part of the Plan.</p> <p>The LIP will set out proposals for 'Streets for People' schemes.</p>
	<p>Walking and Cycling</p> <p>The LIP needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals to improve conditions for walking and to support the London Walking Plan • Proposals for the review of traffic signal junctions and implementation of pedestrian phases • Proposals in relation to footway improvements • Information on how the Council intends to consult with user groups • Proposals for cycle parking at stations and on streets, 'Green Corridors', cyclist training and promotional events • A commitment to include cyclist's needs in all highway schemes • Details of the Council's cycle audit procedures • A programme for the review of key cyclist accidents locations. 	<p>Walking and Cycling</p> <p>The LIP will set out the need for a Walking Strategy to look at borough wide improvements to streets and the pedestrian environment. TfL's comments will inform the Walking Strategy.</p> <p>The LIP will include proposals for cycle parking at stations and on streets, 'Green Corridors', cyclist training and promotional events. The LIP will also include a statement on including cyclist's needs in non-cycling schemes, details of the Council's cycle audit procedures, and a programme for the review of key cyclist locations.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Transport for London	<p>Freight</p> <p>The LIP needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals for the development of a Freight Quality Partnership A commitment to engage with the London Lorry Control Scheme consultation process <p>Accessibility</p> <p>The LIP needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals in relation to the delivery of door-to-door transport services for disabled people, including through the Taxicard scheme and use of Public Hire Vehicles Information on how the Council considers the need for suitable pick-up/setting down areas for use by taxis and other door-to-door services Proposals to support an increase in the provision of powered wheelchairs and other mobility aids Proposals to provide parking for disabled persons at key locations and information on how disabled persons will be consulted. <p>Land use Planning</p> <p>The LIP needs to include details of the mechanisms used to assess where high trip generating uses are allowed.</p> <p>Water</p> <p>The LIP needs to refer to safeguarded wharves in the borough.</p>	<p>Freight</p> <p>The LIP will include proposals for a Thames Gateway Sub-Regional Freight Quality Partnership. The LIP will state that the Council will engage in the London Lorry Control Scheme consultation process.</p> <p>Accessibility</p> <p>The LIP will set out the need to carry out a survey of the parking needs of disabled persons in the borough. This survey will inform proposals on parking for disabled persons.</p> <p>The LIP will set out proposals in relation to delivery of door-to-door transport services for disabled people and the provision of mobility aids.</p> <p>Land use Planning</p> <p>Polices on the location of development are under review as part of the LDF process, and will be provided in the LDF.</p> <p>Water</p> <p>The LIP polices will be amended to include a reference to the borough's safeguarded wharves, subject to further review of the issue in the context of the LDF.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Transport for London	<p>Olympics</p> <p>The LIP needs to identify proposals associated with the 2012 Olympics.</p>	<p>Olympics</p> <p>The Council is looking into how it can promote the 2012 Olympics within the borough, and how it can improve transport links between the borough and the Olympic sites, including walking and cycling links. The LIP includes proposals for the Roding Valley Way, City to Sea and TGLP North East pedestrian and cycle routes.</p>
Thames Gateway London Partnership	<p>General Comments</p> <p>1. In relation to the Partnership's Transport Agenda that has informed significant elements of the London Plan, TfL's Five Year Investment Programme and the London Thames Gateway Development and Investment Framework (LTG-DIF), TGLP would expect boroughs to reflect this wider sub-regional policy context within their LIPs, both in terms of recognising the wider spatial dimension of existing and future transport problems and identifying practical solutions in partnership with their neighbouring authorities and stakeholders.</p> <p>2. TGLP suggest that it is particularly important that LIPs recognise the fundamental transport dilemma in East London of supporting substantial housing and employment growth whilst avoiding and mitigating unsustainable levels of traffic growth, congestion and pollution.</p>	<p>1. The LIP will be amended to better acknowledge TGLP's Transport Agenda.</p> <p>2. The LIP will be amended to underline this issue.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
<p>Thames Gateway London Partnership</p>	<p>3. TGLP would wish to see boroughs referring directly to the London Thames Gateway Transport Agenda, and the role of project delivery through the Regional Spending Plan and Partnership funding, as key elements supporting the objectives and priorities set out in the LIP. This would include the A1306 Environmental Improvement Package, Barking Interchange improvements and Travel Awareness scheme have been of direct benefit to Barking & Dagenham. Additionally TGLP would wish to see more emphasis to current TGLP initiatives, where these are being developed on behalf of all, or a number of boroughs, such as Barking Town Centre and Dagenham Dock. These references would ideally include:</p> <p>The employment of two travel plan co-ordinators</p> <p>The publication of a London Thames Gateway Cycling Strategy and Action Plan</p> <p>the TGLP “Cycling Linkages” initiative</p> <p>TGLP’s work, with Bexley Council, in piloting local Freight Quality Partnerships for town centres and industrial areas.</p> <p>the TGLP Station Access Scheme Development initiative, mentioned in 5.87 of the LIP. TGLP note the references to Station Access schemes from 5.76 of the LIP, however they state that F1 Forms are required to complement the main texts (Barking Station and Dagenham Dock) and the funding implications should be included in the financial totals.</p> <p>4. TGLP note that each scheme bid in the TGLP Regional Spending Plan has an Agree lead borough for the purposes of channelling BSP funding from TfL. It is essential that these RSP bids are fully cross-referenced to specific borough LIPs so that TfL are able to fully link them to a statutory planning document and also account for their cost in future years.</p>	<p>3. The LIP will be amended to include references and information on past and current TGLP initiatives and the employment of two travel plan co-ordinators. Form 1s will be provided in relation to a number of initiatives.</p> <p>4. Barking and Dagenham is one of the lead boroughs for Travel Awareness and the employment of two travel plan co-ordinators. The LIP will include Form 1s for both programmes.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
<p>Thames Gateway London Partnership</p>	<p>5. TGLP recommend that Barking and Dagenham refer to the Draft East London Sub-Regional Development Framework (EL-SRDF) which sets out policies and proposals for delivery of the London Plan within the sub-region in a number of key areas, including transport.</p> <p>6. TGLP suggest that Barking Town Centre and key development areas, which are mentioned in the first three chapters of the Draft LIP, could also be mentioned further in the wider sub regional context of London Riverside. TGLP are fully supportive of the London Riverside Action Group's objectives of promoting better transport to support the development of the area.</p> <p>7. TGLP suggest including a statement on the economic regeneration benefits that the various key infrastructure projects – East London Transit, Crossrail Line 1, Thames Gateway Bridge and DLR extensions – would bring to the Borough</p> <p>Targets</p> <p>8. TGLP suggest it would be useful to see a target for traffic growth in Barking town centre in the Final LIP. Additionally they would like to see a specific walking target set for the borough.</p> <p>Core Capacity Statement</p> <p>9. TGLP suggest that this section could refer to the additional capacity, in terms of strategic advice, scheme support and programme management provided by TGLP for member boroughs. Furthermore it should also be referenced that Barking & Dagenham provide an active role in the TGLP Integrated Transport Working Party (Vice-Chair - David Higham) and the TGLP Transport Task Group.</p>	<p>5. A reference to the Draft EL-SRDF will be included in the LIP.</p> <p>6. The LIP will include a stronger reference to London Riverside.</p> <p>7. The LIP will include a statement on the economic regeneration benefits of key infrastructure projects.</p> <p>8. Further work, data and consultation, including with neighbouring boroughs, is needed in order to set a realistic target for traffic growth. It is recommended that a target be set in the first Annual LIP Monitoring Report. Further work, data and consultation is also needed to set a realistic walking target. It is recommended that a walking target be set as part of the Council's future Walking Strategy.</p> <p>9. Noted. The Core Capacity Statement will also be changed to reflect the recent Council re-structure.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Thames Gateway London Partnership	<p>Funding Implications</p> <p>10. TGLP suggest that the LIP could reflect the potential for future TGLP Regional Spending Plan bids, beyond Barking town Centre and Dagenham Dock, to support key projects in Barking & Dagenham as partnership bids. Furthermore, B&D may also wish to consider whether future rounds of the Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF), if provided by Government beyond 2008, may enable further support for schemes which can be demonstrated to support additional housing development within the borough and further a field.</p> <p>Additional Comments from TGLP</p> <p>11. Chapters 1 and 2 of the Draft LIP could place greater emphasis on sub-regional issues and problems where these are common to those experienced by Barking and Dagenham. Specific references to the Draft EL-SRDF should be set out.</p> <p>12. Sections 2.31 – 2.37 (Cycling) and 5.42 – 5.47 should refer to the London Thames Gateway Cycling Strategy and Action Plan and TGLP Cycling Linkages (NCR13) project cited above. This linkage should also be made in F1 Forms in the final LIP.</p>	<p>10. The LIP will identify proposals for which partnership bids could be made. Dagenham Dock Interchange, public transits, freight, walking, cycling and traffic demand management are areas/projects where partnership bids are likely to be most appropriate.</p> <p>11. Noted.</p> <p>12. The LIP will include the suggested references and linkages.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Thames Gateway London Partnership	<p>13. F1 forms should be provided for the Barking Town Centre and Dagenham Dock schemes.</p> <p>14. An F1 Form needs to be completed for the Sub-Regional Travel Plan Co-ordinator and Travel Awareness budgets as Barking & Dagenham is currently co-leading on behalf of TGLP (with Havering). This currently projects £70,000 per year for 2005-2010 for the Travel Plan Co-ordinators (Darren Little [LBBD] and Ida Bergman [Havering]) and the Travel Awareness schemes £50,000 per year for 2005 - 2010. The scheme also needs to be mentioned within the contexts of paragraphs 5.89 & 5.90 in your final LIP.</p> <p>15. The Travel Plan Co-ordinator post needs to be included into chapter 5 as a LIP proposal and also mentioned possibly in paras 5.17 & 12.4 of the executive summary stating that there is a TGLP travel plan co-ordinator based in LBBD.</p> <p>16. Paragraph 5.93 needs to link freight proposals with the TGLP proposal for the development of a sub-regional Freight Quality Partnership and also reflect this in F1 Forms as appropriate.</p>	<p>13. The LIP will include F1 forms for Barking Town Centre and Dagenham Dock.</p> <p>14. The LIP will include F1 forms for the Sub-Regional Travel Plan Co-ordinators and for the Sub-Regional Travel Awareness programme.</p> <p>15. The LIP will include a Form 1 for the Travel Plan Co-ordinator post.</p> <p>16. The LIP will include a Form 1 for the TGLP Freight Quality Partnership.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
<p>London Transport Users Committee</p>	<p>1. We would like to have read more of actual schemes and projects.</p> <p>Streets for People</p> <p>2. We would like to see this as an overarching agenda – our streets are not just places to travel through and park cars, but the space where we, our children, walk, play, rest and do business. We welcome the approach that has been taken for the Barking Town Centre Strategy and hope that the themes in this study are extended to all Barking and Dagenham’s streets projects.</p> <p>One-way systems and Roads.</p> <p>3. Are considered problematic to bus passengers, cyclists and walkers. LTUC are against one-way systems and roads and wish to see a policy supporting their removal and proposals to tackle them.</p> <p>Better Bus Services</p> <p>4. Consider the bus to be the most important form of public transport for boroughs. Wish to see all bus stops / clearways up to LBI standard. Also wish to see a programme of filling in/removing bus lay-bys in Barking and Dagenham, as not of benefit to bus passengers.</p>	<p>1. Detailed information on schemes and projects was not ready in time for publication of the Consultation Draft LIP. This information will be included in the LIP.</p> <p>2. The LIP will set out the need for a Walking Strategy to look at borough wide improvements to streets and the pedestrian environment. These comments will inform the strategy. The Walking Strategy will complement the Council’s Urban Design Framework Plan.</p> <p>3. The issue of one-way streets has also been raised by the general public. Whilst one-way systems facilitate a smoother flow of traffic, it is recognised that they are not user friendly to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users. Motorists can also be inconvenienced by having to use a longer route. A statement will be inserted in the LIP saying that there is a need to identify where they may be problems in relation to one-way systems/streets, and to identify what can be done to rectify the problems (e.g. contra-flow cycle lanes). A balanced approach and consideration of all transport users’ needs will inform any proposals for one-way streets.</p> <p>4. The Council supports the LBI programme. The LIP will set out the Council’s programme with respect to bus stop works.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
<p>London Transport Users Committee</p>	<p>Managing Demand</p> <p>5. LTUC consider that contradictory statements exist in the LIP regarding demand management. The LIP should recognise the need to manage demand both via the planning process, road user charging and the management of on and off street parking.</p> <p>Rail Station access</p> <p>6. The policy support for improving access to rail stations is welcomed, but no schemes proposed. The Committee would like to see all Barking and Dagenham's stations identified and assessed with a view to implementing access for the sustainable modes and by the disabled.</p> <p>Supporting Town Centres</p> <p>7. As mentioned above the Barking study is welcomed. However, we want to see the LIP identify all of Barking and Dagenham's district and local centres and markets with a view to implementing improved access for the sustainable and by the disabled.</p> <p>Other</p> <p>8. We would like to see a chapter describing the transport issues for different sections of the population and the links between health and transport.</p>	<p>5. Noted. These comments will inform the Parking and Enforcement Plan.</p> <p>6. The LIP will set out a programme of station access improvements. Access to platforms is not within the Council's remit, however it will lobby for all stations in the borough to be made fully accessible.</p> <p>7. The LIP will set out the need to review access to all of Barking and Dagenham's district and local centres, and to develop proposals to improve access by walking, cycling and for disabled persons.</p> <p>8. The LIP will not contain any additional chapters. However the Council has carried out consultation with different sections of the population, the results of which will inform proposals and be used to add information to various chapters. The links between health and transport will be emphasised in the LIP.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Barking and Dagenham Chamber of Commerce	<p>General Comments</p> <p>1. The integration of <u>all</u> forms of transport is vital. There should be as seamless as possible a transition from one to another. That includes cars!</p> <p>2. The inadequacy of the relief road system around the Town Centre needs to be addressed, as do a number of other congestion hot spots.</p> <p>3. The proposed Thames crossing should be given high priority so that B&D can genuinely say that it is at the crossroads of East London!</p> <p>4. Parking in the Borough is an issue. Cost and perceived availability need to be addressed.</p> <p>5. Consultation with the Chamber of Commerce as soon as there are plans, which can be shown pictorially so that a business view can be fed into the process, should be automatic.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Agree there is a need to tackle congestion. Include in the LIP a programme for the review of the worst congestion bottlenecks in the borough, and a programme to monitor traffic levels in the borough. This has also been requested by TfL. Any schemes in relation to congestion will recognise the needs of all road users in a balanced way. There is also a need to recognise that as a rule in London it is not possible to address the congestion issue by merely building additional highway capacity for general traffic.</p> <p>3. The LIP lists the Thames Gateway Bridge (TGB) as one of the major infrastructure projects that it is supporting, and states the Council's desire for the bridge to include a dedicated roadway for public transport.</p> <p>4. Agree that parking is an issue. Review cost and perceived availability of parking as part of the Parking and Enforcement Plan, which will be included as part of the LIP.</p> <p>5. Noted. The Council has agreed to hold regular meetings with the Chamber of Commerce to discuss transport issues.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Barking and Dagenham Chamber of Commerce	<p>6. Parking facilities should encourage people to come into the Borough to shop or to do business. That means that we need good, safe, well-signed and cheap parking which is convenient to the destination of those using the facility. It also needs to be perceived as such by potential users. The Chamber of Commerce favour a review of short-term parking in the Borough. The idea behind this, which has been touched on previously in passing during meetings with officers and councillors, is to seek to enable small and quick purchases to be made easily, for example buying papers from a newsagent or dropping clothes in to the cleaners, etc,</p> <p>Comments made in relation to Consultation Questionnaire</p> <p>7. Accessibility for everyone should be increased, but not at the expense of those who already have good transport access, i.e. the whole standard must be driven up.</p>	<p>6. These comments will inform the preparation of the Parking and Enforcement Plan. Well located, well-signed and safe short-stay parking is seen as important to supporting businesses and services in town centres and district centres in the borough. However the supply of parking must also be managed to help reduce congestion, noise and air pollution, and encourage less reliance on the car.</p> <p>7. Accessibility to jobs, services and leisure should be increased but in a sustainable manner. This will require high quality public transport, good walking and cycling facilities, and better land use planning.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
<p>Barking and Dagenham Chamber of Commerce</p>	<p>8. To prioritise improvements for people with poor access to public transport, provided that this is not used as a licence to create difficulties or restrictions for those who use private transport.</p> <p>9. The choice of car or lorry for transport of people or goods is preserved and that encouragement is given by the incentive of a good public transport alternative which is perceived as cheap, convenient and comfortable.</p> <p>10. Environmental impact should be minimised so far as reasonably practicable, without unduly limiting economic growth.</p> <p>11. Pollution and nuisance created by traffic should be reduced <u>where practical</u>, provided that this is done in a manner which relies on increasing efficiencies and providing incentives and does not simply rely on restriction, regulation and control. Public transport, particularly in the form of buses, can be a significant contributor to pollution and nuisance both to residents and to those whose business or leisure activity brings them into the Borough.</p> <p>12. Passenger transport schemes such as e.g. East London Transit should be supported provided that this is not undertaken at the expense of road space for private transport.</p> <p>13. Links between different forms of transport modes (for example bus and train and services), should be improved provided that this is a genuinely comprehensive policy and includes private cars, commercial vehicles and air traffic.</p> <p>14. Extreme care should be exercised when considering adding restrictions to traffic flow. Humps, chicanes, extra road furniture, ill placed traffic islands and high curbs can all introduce new dangers of their own to all road users. Even too many and inappropriate road signs can be a hazard. Road safety is best achieved by education and well laid out crossing and access arrangements.</p> <p>15. Commuters are not automatically bad news! They may, for example, in the future be some of the upwardly mobile people we hope are going to stay in the Borough as they improve their lot. We should cater for commuter parking, perhaps a park and ride facility might serve a dual purpose in this respect.</p>	<p>8. The Council will consider the needs of all road users when developing improvements to the transport network.</p> <p>9. Agree that getting people to rely less on the car will require the incentive of good public transport that is perceived as cheap, convenient and comfortable. Regarding lorries, the LIP will encourage the long distance transport of goods by rail and water and a reduction of local lorry movements, which could be achieved through measures including freight quality partnerships and 'consolidation centres' like the one created for Heathrow.</p> <p>10. Agree that environmental impact should be minimised. Impacts on all aspects of the environment including people and the local economy should be considered when assessing the environmental impacts of a proposal.</p> <p>11. Agree that increased fuel efficiencies and incentives to use less polluting vehicles can play a large role in reducing traffic pollution and nuisance. Agree that public transport can be a significant contributor to pollution, which is why the Council supports the use of less polluting and quieter vehicles, as well as measures to ensure that public transport is not held up by congestion .</p> <p>12. The Council has safeguarded land in Barking Riverside so that ELT can run on its own roadway. Giving priority to ELT</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
<p>Barking and Dagenham Chamber of Commerce</p>	<p>16. Disabled people already enjoy a high priority. Indeed some think that there seems to be a disproportionate amount of space reserved for them in some locations which is relatively little used, resulting in poor use of road or parking space. Local disabled people need to be properly provided for, but a balance needs to be struck between giving them priority and creating inconvenience for the balance of the population.</p>	<p>where it will not have its own roadway is justified by ELT's potential to move large numbers of people without the congestion associated to cars. The Council wishes ELT to be a high quality transit scheme, so that it will attract car users.</p> <p>13. Agree that links between all transport modes should be improved.</p> <p>14. The Council' set up a Traffic Calming Scrutiny Panel, which carried out a review of traffic calming in 2002/03. The Scrutiny Panel's recommendations included: improving the consultation process; removing speed tables and cushions from bus routes and replace them with alternative measures; survey all road humps, speed tables and cushions in the borough to ensure that they have a height of 75mm and no more; improve monitoring of contractors to ensure traffic calming measures are installed consistently and to the correct specifications. Traffic calming measures have helped reduce the number and severity of road accident casualties in the borough, as well as the problem of 'rat-running'. Road safety is a high priority for the Council and it is required to meet casualty reduction targets.</p> <p>15. The Council will look at what options there are of increasing the amount of parking at stations, so that people use public transport for the greater part of their commute. The Council will work with TGLP to investigate the possibility of creating park and ride sites serving the London Thames Gateway Area.</p> <p>16. Access issues may be preventing fuller use of parking bays for disabled persons. The Council intends to consult disabled persons on their parking needs.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
<p>The Countryside Agency</p>	<p><i>The Countryside Agency provided generic advice to London Boroughs in relation to their LIPs. Relevant comments have been summarised below.</i></p> <p>Pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>1. The CA strongly endorse extensive policies setting out how the rights of way in the borough can be improved for pedestrians and cyclists. Additionally the CA believe B&D should offer a good walking and cycling network which encourages people to make full use of them. In particular, the Thames Path National Trail should be protected and promoted.</p> <p>Access to the Countryside and green space in the around London</p> <p>2. The CA recommend that boroughs adopts a policy to create and improve pedestrian and cyclist routes to the rural/urban fringe for recreation and to encourage public transport providers to identify, create and promote affordable and sustainable means for Londoners to get to the countryside in and around the borough and to other green spaces in the Borough.</p>	<p>1. The Council will prepare a Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP) and a Walking Strategy. The LIP sets out the Council's cycling programme that includes contributing to the LCN+, Roding Valley Way and North East Cycle Route/Footpath, and providing local cycle links including links through parks and green spaces. The Thames Path National Trail uses the south side of the Thames. However the Council supports the idea of a path on the north side, which the Thames Estuary Partnership is promoting under the name 'Thames Path City to Sea'.</p> <p>2. Access by bicycle and foot to green spaces in around the borough will be improved through the LCN+, Roding Valley Way, North East Cycle Route/Footpath, and new cycleways through parks and green spaces. Access to green space will also be promoted through the Council's Draft Urban Design Framework Plan and the Thames Gateway Green Grid. It is recommended that the LIP include a policy to create and improve pedestrian and cyclist routes to the rural/urban fringe for recreation, in particular to the 'Dagenham Corridor' and to the River Thames.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Highways Agency	1. The Agency would be concerned about any policy or proposal that would adversely impact on the M25 and M11 in terms of additional traffic. However, the Highways Agency cannot see anything in the current version of the LIP that would do so. The Highway Agency fully supports Transport Polices P3 and P4	1. Noted.
The British Motorcyclists Federation	<p>1. There has been a substantial increase in the numbers of people using powered two wheelers (PTWs) as a transport mode in recent years. It is important to take into account this rise in use when considering accident figures. It is also important to take into account blame for accidents as usually around 66% of accidents involving a PTW are the fault of another road user.</p> <p>2. The BMF encourages transport interchanges to provide sufficient parking for PTWs. This can encourage modal shift and can assist with reducing car journeys.</p> <p>3. The council should provide for more PTW parking. This too can reduce car journeys. Around 6 PTWs can fit into a car sized bay, and on the road they do not contribute to congestion significantly.</p> <p>4. PTWs can be very socially inclusive due to their relatively low cost and for the smaller bikes their low running costs. In addition they are viewed by many women as being a safe mode of door to door transport (in comparison with late night bus or train travel). Those working shifts are also finding PTWs an inclusive and safe mode.</p> <p>4. The BMF is urging boroughs to consider an experiment allowing access to Advanced Stop Lines (ASLs) for PTWs so that more data can be added to that already collected by Newham’s ASL experiment. Again, legal access to ASLs can provide significant safety benefits for PTWs and Newham’s experiment has shown little conflict between riders of PTWs and of pedal cycles.</p> <p>5. The BMF welcomes initiatives to educate all road users and also encourages the borough to assist with making riders aware of further training and riding assessments such as those on offer from BikeSafe.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. It is recommended that the Parking and Enforcement Plan review the supply of parking for PTWs at transport interchanges.</p> <p>3. It is recommended that the Parking and Enforcement Plan review the supply of parking for PTWs in the borough.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p> <p>4. The LIP will state that the Council will consider an experiment allowing access to ASLs for PTWs.</p> <p>5. Noted. The Council is working with TfL on road safety initiatives for PTW riders.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
<p>The British Motorcyclists Federation</p>	<p>6. The BMF is aware that reduction targets for KSIs for PTWs are not being met, however, there has been an increase in use and in many areas, in spite of the targets not being met, there is still a reduction in the accident rate.</p> <p>7. In line with the Mayor's decision to exempt PTWs from the London Congestion Charge, the BMF believes that there should be no fiscal measures to reduce the use of PTWs.</p> <p>8. The BMF is encouraging Barking and Dagenham to consider at least 1 experiment to allow PTWs into bus lanes. This is being trialled by TfL on 3 major A roads including the A13, however, the segment of the road network being used is tiny and the BMF believes that it will be necessary to gather more data and data from local roads to assist with decisions about bus lanes use by PTWs.</p> <p>9. Street defects such as potholes and uneven road surfaces can prove extremely hazardous not only to PTW riders, but to cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The BMF recognises that some locations can be particularly hazardous for riders and once again would like to suggest that the new IHIE guidelines might offer assistance with engineering methods to improve safety.</p> <p>Traffic calming features need to take into account the needs of PTW riders. Many calming features pose real hazards to riders – especially at night or in the rain as they are difficult to see. There is assistance on this matter in the new IHIE guidelines. Endangering one category of vulnerable road user in order to protect another would be counterproductive.</p>	<p>6. Noted.</p> <p>7. Noted.</p> <p>8. The LIP will state that the Council will consider with TfL an experiment allowing access to bus lanes for PTWs.</p> <p>9. Noted.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
<p>The British Motorcyclists Federation</p>	<p>10. It is the BMF's understanding (from discussions at TfL LMWG) that calculations of the number of miles travelled by the motorcycling community have been proven to be underestimates. In the light of this, it is likely that previous studies based on mileage and comparisons of accident rates with other road users may be overestimates. More data regarding accidents involving PTWs needs to be collected, and the analyses of any such data need to include data about which party is to blame. For some times figures have shown that in around 66% of accidents involving a PTW another road user is to blame</p> <p>The BMF welcome Barking and Dagenham's commitment to meet the 40% reduction of PTW KSIs by 2010, however, this may be difficult to achieve in the light of the rise in PTW use.</p> <p>11. The BMF encourages boroughs to produce Motorcycling plans or strategies to assist with motorcycling issues.</p> <p>12. Improving parking facilities for PTWs and ensuring that they are secure could connect the areas of the borough with poor transport links to Barking Station. Parked PTWs are lower than cars and therefore do not obstruct the vision and so bays can be put into areas that would be unsuitable for car parking. In addition a large number of PTWs can fit into a comparatively small space (around 6 PTWs to a car space).</p> <p>13. The BMF welcomes the initiative to pool resources with other boroughs (funds and ideas). It may be necessary to involve rider groups in any such initiatives and the BMF would welcome any approaches to be involved.</p> <p>14. The BMF welcomes the review of the provision of parking for PTWs and would like to encourage Barking and Dagenham to consider security measures to help prevent PTW theft.</p>	<p>10. The LIP notes the rise in PTW use. The LIP will state that boroughs and TfL will need to jointly consider further measures to reduce PTW KSIs.</p> <p>11. Noted. It is recommended that the LIP refer to Motorcycling plans as an issue to explore, in particular in relation to road safety.</p> <p>12. It is recommended that the Parking and Enforcement Plan review the supply of parking for PTWs in the borough.</p> <p>13. Noted.</p> <p>14. It is recommended that the Parking and Enforcement Plan consider security measures in relation to parking, including PTW parking.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
The British Motorcyclists Federation	<p>15. The BMF also urges Barking & Dagenham to take the new Government's Motorcycling Strategy into account in its LIP as well as produce it's own PTW strategy.</p> <p>16. With respect to Parking, BMF suggest that B&D investigate whether it can benefit from the funds TfL has earmarked to assist with provision of new motorcycle bays as well as investigating whether there is any possibility to increase provision at stations and transport interchanges which would encourage multimodal journeys.</p>	<p>15. It is recommended that the LIP contain a reference to the Government's Motorcycling Strategy.</p> <p>16. Noted. The Council will review the provision of motorcycle parking in areas of high demand.</p>
Motorcycle Action Group	<p><i>The Motorcycle Action Group commented on omissions in the MTS and flaws in the Mayor's guidance. Whilst these comments have been noted, they are beyond the remit of the LIP. They could however be submitted to the Mayor of London when the MTS is updated. There were also comments that were non-specific to Barking and Dagenham. Issues that are relevant to Barking and Dagenham have been extracted from these.</i></p> <p>General Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MAG advocates PTW in Bus lanes. 2. MAG advocates the extension of trials of shared use of advance stop lines by PTW 3. MAG urges that a commitment be made in the LIP to increase motorcycle parking provision, especially in areas of high demand and for the provision to be secure. 4. MAG is of the opinion that PTWs can assist in delivering social inclusion. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refer to response to BMF comment 8. 2. Refer to response to BMF comment 4. 3 The Council will review the provision of motorcycle parking in areas of high demand. 4. Agree.

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Motorcycle Action Group	<p>Specific Comments to Barking and Dagenham</p> <p>5. MAG urges the Council to monitor the casualty rate as expressed per passenger kilometre.</p> <p>6. MAG is willing to work with Barking & Dagenham to reduce road casualties.</p> <p>7. MAG draw attention to the Institute of Highway Incorporated Engineers' "Guidelines for Motorcycling" which will assist engineers in designing traffic schemes with the needs of motorcyclists in mind.</p> <p>8. MAG would welcome an invitation to join a Barking and Dagenham Road User Forum.</p> <p>9. MAG is somewhat concerned that no mention, other than briefly in appendix 7.1, is made of motorcycle parking. MG considers that Appendix 7.1 does not adequately address the issue of motorcycle parking provision and they would like to see a commitment from B&D to ensure that adequate and secure motorcycle parking provision is made.</p>	<p>5. It is recommended that the Council include the casualty rate per passenger kilometre as an additional indicator used to measure PTW casualties.</p> <p>6. Noted. It is recommended that the Road Safety Plan refer to the Pan London Road Safety Forum.</p> <p>7. Noted.</p> <p>8. It is recommended that the LIP refer to the idea of setting up a Road User Forum.</p> <p>9. It is recommended that the Parking and Enforcement Plan review the supply of parking for PTWs in the borough.</p>
Rambler's Association Havering & East London Group	<p>1. The fact that walking is part of most journeys whatever means are used for the remainder of the journey is important. Travelling to school, shops, the bus stop, to work or leisure activities - indeed few journeys unless in an ambulance, will not involve a walk, and it is now becoming more understood that the lack of exercise is a serious health matter.</p> <p>2. There are very few footpaths shown on the Boroughs Definitive Map and this is a concern. The publication of The Big Green Map is a welcome start - but incomplete as major routes linking the green spaces are not indicated. It would be useful to be able to refer to a Street Register that has as an appendix a list of all non-vehicular paths. The Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP) must look at the overall network and how gaps might be closed.</p>	<p>1. Agree. The LIP will set out the need for the preparation of a Walking Strategy for the borough.</p> <p>2. Mapping of routes and a street register are not within the remit of the LIP. However the proposed Walking Strategy would involve the production of a Walking and Cycling map. The comments on the gaps in the network will inform the preparation of the RoWIP.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
<p>Rambler's Association</p> <p>Havering & East London Group</p>	<p>3. A new DLR line to Barking Reach from Gallions Reach Station via Creekmouth and on to Dagenham East should be considered.</p> <p>4. A pedestrian and cycle crossing of Barking Creek near its mouth should be considered. These might be at the same location which would be suitable for the Thames Path (City to Sea vision of Thames Estuary Partnership).</p> <p>5. Although a bridge crossing the River Thames is contentious there is however a need for a crossing, preferably in a tunnel. A light rail connection with Thamesmead should also be a goal.</p> <p>6. If the Fords ferry could be reinstated to serve the public perhaps from the existing (ex power station) jetty another multi user facility would be available for development as appropriate and when needed for leisure trips as well as a major transport link (river bus service) across the River and into central London.</p> <p>7. A local car club might be started using small electric vehicles.</p>	<p>3. The Council supports an eastwards extension of DLR to Dagenham Dock, via Barking Riverside. The Council has safeguarded land for DLR in Barking Riverside.</p> <p>4. The LIP will state support for a pedestrian and cycle crossing near the mouth of Barking Creek.</p> <p>5. The LIP states that the Council supports the idea of a dedicated roadway on the Thames Gateway Bridge, to connect Greenwich Waterfront Transit with East London Transit.</p> <p>6. The LIP states that "The Council will support the provision of river bus passenger services on the Thames and Roding." A statement will be added in the LIP stating support for a review of potential demand for river bus services and facilities (jetties etc.).</p> <p>7. The LIP will state that the Council will investigate measures to support the creation of car clubs, including planning policies and S106 agreements.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
CTC and London Cycling Campaign	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Throughout the LIP there are numerous references to cycling, and the attitude is fairly positive. 2. Table 1.1. The interpretation is wrong as the table only has 12 LAs in it – B&D being 6th of them. Two of the boroughs are not in London, but even if this were not so, the average given is the average of the table, surely – it doesn't say London average. 3. Table 1.2 is missing 4. (2.1) Land use planning. The reference to “vehicles” should say “motor vehicles”. Cycles are vehicles too. I suspect there are other incidences of this error in the LIP. 5. (2.2) Traffic Calming. Mention of Southwark doesn't seem relevant. 6. Enforcement. Uncertainty as to what is meant by “the Lodge Avenue Rail Bridge. If this means the bridge that carries Lodge Avenue over the railway then it is surprising that it has “high footfall”. 7. (4.1) Promotion. The Description of the CCE as “the organisation responsible for promoting cycling in the capital” is misleading as several organisations do this. “on behalf of the Mayor of London” or something similar needs to be added as CCE is part of TfL which is the Mayor's transport agency. 8. National Bike Week promotes cycling nationally as its name suggests. 9. The last para of (4.1) says that “the council organise Bike Week”. I don't think so! 10. “Dr Bike” is not really an organisation – it's just a “brand” for people (usually volunteers) doing cycle health checks, usually for free. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Table 1.1 will be modified. 3. Table 1.2 will be included in the Cycling Action Plan. The table presents data from annual cycling counts carried out in the borough between 1992 and 2002. 4. Agree that “more vehicles” should be changed to “more motor vehicles”. 5. This will be corrected. 6. This should be the Ripple Road Rail Bridge and will be changed in the LIP. 7. Agree. “On behalf of the Mayor of London” will be added. 8. ‘Bike Week’ will be changed to ‘National Bike Week’. 9. Accepted. This will be changed to “the Council participates in National Bike Week”. 10. Agree. The reference to ‘Dr Bike’ will be modified to make it clear that it is a brand rather than an organisation.

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
<p>CTC and London Cycling Campaign</p>	<p>11. (7.2). The caption should be “East London Transport Strategy” not “East London Transit”.</p> <p>12. (6.1) In SMART targets the T is for “Time bound” not “Targeted”. (In SMART objectives the T is for targeted. The London Cycling Plan may refer to SMART targets / objectives, but the idea does not originally come from that plan.</p> <p>(i) Cost of owning a bicycle</p> <p>13. The LIP says this can be prohibitive, but</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Many people already own a bike (and the reason they’re not using it is nothing to do with cost). b) Some owned bikes aren’t used because they need repairing. The council needs to work with partners to ensure that people have access to maintenance for their bike / training in how to do it themselves. c) There is a growing number of bike re-cycling schemes. These are to be encouraged as they provide a training opportunity and a source of cheap bikes – cheap because they aren’t new, rather than “cheap and nasty”. d) There are two schemes to get tax relief and spread the purchase cost - - www.booost.uk.com [the three o’s is correct] and www.cyclescheme.co.uk. The council should promote these amongst local companies. e) The cost of owning children’s cycling equipment could be mitigated by selling the equipment on when a child grows out of it. The council needs to work with partners to ensure that such a “clearing house” is available. f) Related to this, schools could operate a scheme where bikes are loaned or leased, or themselves provide a clearing house for bikes to be sold on when grown out of. 	<p>11. This section is referring to the proposed East London Transit scheme. The content of this section will be modified to provide a better description of the scheme.</p> <p>12. Agree. The reference to SMART targets will be modified.</p> <p>13 (a) Agree.</p> <p>13 (b) Agree. It is recommended that the Cycling Action Plan refer to initiatives that could facilitate bike maintenance, such as training.</p> <p>13 (c) Noted. The LIP will include a reference to bike re-cycling schemes.</p> <p>13 (d) Noted. The LIP will include a reference to tax relief schemes.</p> <p>13 (e) Noted. The LIP will include a reference to a ‘clearing house’ for cycling equipment.</p> <p>13 (f) Noted.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
<p>London Thames Gateway Development Corporation</p> <p>Comments made at Officer level</p>	<p>1. Para.1.27 on page 11 needs to be updated given the areas south of the Thames have been excluded from the UDC and for planning purposes 5 Boroughs are involved.</p> <p>2. The second sentence of Para.1.29 on page 12 needs amending. The UDC will be seeking to assist the regeneration of all the major sites in LBBB within the UDC area not just Barking Riverside and does not have an ability to “deliver” development in the way that sentence suggests. Suggested wording after “partners” is “to help bring forward the regeneration of major sites in those parts of the Borough for which it is the planning authority”.</p> <p>3. Paras.12.15-17 on Page 138. This section needs changing. The Corporation’s funding regime is such that it will not be able to significantly directly fund infrastructure as this section suggests. It will be responsible for deciding what goes into S106 agreements and might also be able to assist projects using its CPO powers. Other than that it will be one of several ‘lobbying’ bodies where priorities are identified, seeking money from the main funders such as Central Government/TfL.</p> <p>4. Full support is given for the importance of the DLR extension and also ELT being provided as priorities to ensure high quality development is provided on key sites in the Borough and that the funding implications need to be fully appreciated.</p>	<p>1. The section on the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation will be updated.</p> <p>2. This sentence will be changed to clarify the Corporation’s role.</p> <p>3. This section will be changed to clarify the Corporation’s role.</p> <p>4. The Council has made it clear to TfL that both the DLR extension and ELT are crucial to creating high quality sustainable development in the borough.</p>
<p>Economic Development Team, LBBB</p>	<p>1. Good north/south and east/west links are needed to support economic development.</p> <p>2. Need for interim bus services to Dagenham Dock ahead of ELT to serve growing employment area and avoid ingrained patterns of car use. Dagenham Dock is the borough’s key growth site for employment opportunities and there is no public transport, bar Dagenham Dock station, following removal of bus service and ferry crossing.</p> <p>3. Considerable work has been done by the Economic Development Team on developing and implementing a programme for the borough’s Industrial estates.</p>	<p>1. The Council supports improvements to the public transport network, especially north/south links that are deficient. The LIP sets out the need to review the bus network and propose new bus routes.</p> <p>2. Agree. The LIP will include a proposal for an interim bus service to Dagenham Dock. The LIP will also set out the need for bus services between Dagenham Dock and Dagenham Heathway.</p> <p>3. Noted. The LIP will incorporate the work carried out on the borough’s Industrial estates.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Economic Development Team, LBBD	<p>4. The LIP doesn't really mention travel to work patterns and the implications of new development on these.</p> <p>5. The term London Riverside should be used when referring to the stretch of land including Barking Riverside, Dagenham Dock, South Dagenham and Barking Town Centre. This is the area covered by the LTGDC.</p> <p>6. The LIP should mention the Regeneration Strategy and Economic Development Strategy, as well as the draft SREDIP. It should also mention job opportunities outside the borough.</p> <p>7. Barking and Dagenham contains well over half of London's safeguarded wharves identified by the Mayor of London.</p> <p>8. Under proposed road improvements, add Creekmouth Road Improvements including Loop Road.</p> <p>9. More thought needs to be given to how to separate residential and freight traffic, especially north of the borough where there is substantial industry.</p> <p>10. Dagenham East station – complaints about security and access to the station by local employers on behalf of their staff.</p>	<p>4. The LIP and future monitoring will consider future travel to work patterns and what impacts any changes may have on the transport network.</p> <p>5. Noted. This term will be used.</p> <p>6. Agree. The LIP will refer to these documents as well as job opportunities outside the borough.</p> <p>7. Noted. The LIP will emphasise the important role that Barking and Dagenham's wharves play and opportunities to increase their use.</p> <p>8. The Creekmouth Road Improvements will be added to the LIP.</p> <p>9. Agree. The LIP will state that there is a need to take a borough-wide look at traffic related to servicing and deliveries.</p> <p>10. The Council is currently developing a scheme to improve access to the station, and will lobby London Underground to make the station step free as part of its plans to upgrade stations by 2020.</p>
Transport 2000	<i>Transport 2000 provided a checklist of broad principles against which they invited London boroughs to compare their Draft LIP. These principles will inform the writing of the Final Draft LIP.</i>	
Barking – Gospel Oak Line User Group	<p>1. Contrary to what the LIP implies, there is considerable scope for councils to enter into partnership schemes with operators to improve stations.</p> <p>2. The Barking – Gospel Oak Line User Group hopes that B&D will do all it can to get capacity improvements on the Barking – Gospel Oak line, to enable longer and more frequent trains to be run.</p>	<p>1. The LIP states “The Council is keen to work in partnership with the rail industry to improve both the internal and external travel environment of stations in the borough.”</p> <p>2. The Council will lobby for longer trains and more frequent services on the Barking – Gospel Oak line. The Council will also lobby for station improvements, electrification of the line, and extension of services to Rainham. Barking and Dagenham is part of the North Orbital Rail Partnership, formed to consider improvements/issues etc. in respect of the Silverlink</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Barking – Gospel Oak Line User Group		Metro network - which includes Barking/Gospel Oak line. Barking and Dagenham has also given evidence to the GLA on improvements needed for the line.
Urban Design Team, LBB	<p>1. There is little reference to design as being an important aspect of contributing to and ensuring better usage of alternative means of transport, better connectivity, quality, local distinctiveness, popularity and use.</p> <p>2. No reference to TfL Streetscape design guidance.</p> <p>3. Para 3.8. first bullet point. Bearing in mind the focus on ELT and DLR extensions, should there not be a reference to 'new and strengthened' public transport routes?</p> <p>4. Need for clarification of what is meant by "good sub regional networks".</p> <p>5. Stronger or specific reference to design should be made in Policies and justifications for, P1, P3, P5, P8, P11, P12, P13, P14, P18, P19, P28.</p> <p>6. The LIP suggests almost a 'blanket' approach to introducing pedestrian priority, which will not be applicable, acceptable or practical in some areas, including Barking Town Centre.</p>	<p>1. The LIP will include a reference to the impact and importance of design.</p> <p>2. The LIP will refer to the TfL Streetscape design guidance. This is important as many of the proposals in the LIP will require TfL funding.</p> <p>3. Agree. The LIP will include a reference to 'new and strengthened' public transport routes.</p> <p>4. The LIP will clarify this point.</p> <p>5. These policies will be reviewed.</p> <p>6. The reference to pedestrian priority areas will be modified.</p>
Urban Design Team, LBB	<p>7. P56, para 3.43. Reference is made to incorporating features to reduce the risk of crime and promote maximum safety and security. Could this reference also include after this, '<i>and improve the overall townscape and urban design quality</i>'.</p> <p>8. P62, para 3.76. Reference could also be made here to the objectives in all schemes to raise the quality of design.</p> <p>9. References and inferences regarding design quality in Chapter 5 could be stronger, in particular in connection with the overall regeneration objectives.</p> <p>10. Para 5.105 refers to a Borough's Design Statement, which Barking and Dagenham does not have.</p>	<p>7. The sentence will be changed to include '<i>and improve the overall townscape and urban design quality</i>'.</p> <p>8. Agree. This will be added.</p> <p>9. Chapter 5 will make stronger references to design quality.</p> <p>10. This reference will be deleted and replaced with a reference to the Council's draft Urban Design Framework Plan and Public Realm Strategy, which will set out guiding principles in relation to urban design.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Residents	Public Transport <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bus Driver's need to take more care of their elderly passengers, ensuring they are sat down before moving off. 2. Conflict between number of buggies and other bus users. 3. Frequency of buses (287 and 173) needs to be really improved. 4. Bus stops don't provide shelter from the cold. 5. Bus lanes need to be enforced. 6. Lack of sufficient space on buses for wheelchairs 7. Entry/exit ramp too narrow on the new buses 8. On mobility routes all buses need to be accessible. 9. Poor access at underground stations for mobility disadvantaged passengers. 	Public Transport <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This comment will be passed on to London Buses who are responsible for bus services. 2. The issue of buggies taking up space on buses has been raised by the general public. This comment will be passed on to London Buses who are responsible for bus services. The LIP will state the need to investigate whether demand responsive services or Community Transport could help cater for the transport needs of parents with young children. 3. This comment will be passed on to London Buses who are responsible for bus services. 4. The Council has raised with TfL the issue of bus stops and protection from the elements and will continue to do so. 5. The LIP will set out proposals to improve enforcement of bus lanes.

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Residents	<p>Public Transport (cont'd)</p> <p>10. No ramps at stations.</p> <p>11. No or poor assistance at stations.</p> <p>12. There should be special little buses for people with buggies.</p> <p>13. There needs to be two double length shelters to cater for the number of passengers waiting outside Barking station.</p> <p>14. Bus stops at supermarkets are placed out of the way.</p> <p>15. Can LBBD bring pressure to bear on London Buses if residents request a bus stop or a bus stop or bus route to be diverted?</p> <p>16. There is no direct bus service to Oldchurch hospital.</p> <p>17. Bendy buses are difficult to sit in if you are an older person and offer an ideal opportunity for pick pockets.</p> <p>18. Thames Gateway Bridge – More road traffic and pollution. Why not a tunnel under the Thames linking Silverlink's Stratford – North Woolwich trains to Thamesmead and a semi fast Dartford – Stratford – Stansted Airport service?</p>	<p>6. This comment will be passed on to London Buses who are responsible for bus services.</p> <p>7. This comment will be passed on to London Buses who are responsible for bus services.</p> <p>8. Agree. TfL are rolling out low floor buses on all routes.</p> <p>9. The Council will lobby for all stations in the borough to be fully accessible.</p> <p>10. The Council will lobby for all stations in the borough to be fully accessible.</p> <p>11. The Council will raise this issue with transport providers.</p> <p>12. This comment will be passed on to London Buses who are responsible for bus services.</p> <p>13. This comment will be passed on to London Buses and will inform future proposals to improve Barking station.</p> <p>14. This comment will be passed on to London Buses. Where practicable bus stops should be located close to the entry/exit of major facilities they serve. These comments will inform the Council's LDF.</p> <p>15. The Council raises issues relating to buses with London Buses at meetings of the borough's Public Transport Liaison Group.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Residents	<p>Safety (cont'd)</p> <p>23. In Woodward Road, speed tables are located on the approach to bus stops which creates potential for people being thrown off balance when standing up.</p> <p>24. It is very difficult to cross Whalebone Lane South to get to the bus stop near Stanley Avenue. A traffic island would make it safer and easier to cross.</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>25. Parked cars on pavements are a problem for mobility scooters.</p> <p>26. Issue of disabled parking outside homes.</p> <p>27. Outside Barking Station there are no areas for drop off for disabled persons or those with luggage.</p> <p>28. People are confused about the rule of one dropped kerb per household.</p> <p>29. There are too few wardens enforcing double yellow lines around stations.</p> <p>30. Cars parked along Longbridge Road at all times of the day.</p>	<p>Safety (cont'd)</p> <p>22. This comment will be passed on to the appropriate Council department. Note to Council for action.</p> <p>23. This comment will be passed on to the appropriate Council department. Note to Council for action.</p> <p>24. This comment will be passed on to the appropriate Council department. Note to Council for action.</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>25. The LIP will address the issue of parking enforcement. The LIP will state that alternatives to footway parking such as parking bays should be explored and implemented where practicable.</p> <p>26. Disabled persons can request from the Council a reserved parking space outside their house. It is recognised that some people may not know about this service and that more should be done to make it known.</p> <p>27. The LIP will make proposals in relation to 'kiss & ride' bays, drop off/pick up points and parking spaces for disabled persons.</p> <p>28. This rule aims to strike a balance between providing access to properties and leaving space for vehicles to park. The LIP will state that alternatives to footway parking such as parking bays should be explored and implemented where practicable.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Residents	<p>Parking (cont'd)</p> <p>31. If the rail car parks were priced more reasonably, people would not need to park in the streets.</p> <p>32. People from the college and parents from Rush Green School park in Lincoln, Laurel, Gorseway and Rose Glen.</p> <p>33. Putting a cycle lane between parking bays and traffic is a good idea as cars have somewhere to park and the cycle lane stays free. This is what has been done on a section of Porters Avenue.</p>	<p>Parking (cont'd)</p> <p>29. These comments will be passed on to the appropriate Council department. Note to Council for action.</p> <p>30. The Council is aware of this situation. The LIP will state that solutions to stop cars parking illegally on footways and in cycle lanes will be explored.</p> <p>31. Pricing of Council car parks will be reviewed as part of the Parking and Enforcement Plan.</p> <p>32. These comments will be passed on to the appropriate Council department. Note to Council for action.</p> <p>33. This design has benefits for both motorists and cyclists, however there are a number of obstacles to using this design across the borough, including the cost. The LIP will state that this design will be used more widely where possible and where finances permit.</p>
Residents	<p>Walking</p> <p>34. It is not safe to walk around Barking Town Centre during the hours of darkness or on market day's closing and opening.</p> <p>35. Barking Town Centre is overcrowded, full of obstacles and filthy, making it unpleasant to walk.</p>	<p>Walking</p> <p>34. The Council took into account the issues of personal safety and security when developing the Barking Town Centre Movement Strategy, to be implemented over the coming years. The LIP will set out proposals on safety and personal security. The LIP will also look at the issue of safety on streets.</p> <p>35. The Council has taken into account these issues when developing the Barking Town Centre Movement Strategy, to be implemented over the coming years. These issues will also be looked at as part of the Council's Walking Strategy.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Residents	<p>Other</p> <p>36. Taxis cause major delays to buses especially when they stop to set down/pick up passengers. Taxis cause congestion and often carry few passengers; which makes them environmentally unfriendly.</p> <p>37. The Mayor's proposals, on occasions, need questioning whereas the Borough seems to accept Mayor infallibility.</p> <p>38. Schemes should be advertised in the Citizen for public comment.</p> <p>39. Cyclists should be segregated from pedestrians and prosecuted for riding on footpaths.</p> <p>40. Why can't local tax payers vote (at election time) on the Council's / Mayor's expenditure proposals such as the Thames Gateway Bridge (as is done in the USA) before their money is committed.</p>	<p>Other</p> <p>36. Taxis help people with mobility difficulties get around. They also help people without access to a car to carry out activities that are easier to do by car, such as bulk shopping, or to access destinations poorly served by public transport. They also fill the gap when bus or trains don't run, for example late at night. They also save car journeys.</p> <p>37. The Council is required by law to implement via the LIP the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy, and to meet a certain number of statutory targets.</p> <p>38. Noted. The Council already consults stakeholders and residents on its schemes, however use of the Citizen could help better publicise consultation. This comment will be passed on to Engineering Services.</p> <p>39. The Police are responsible for enforcing cycling bans on footways. The LIP will set out the need to look into the issue of cycling on footways.</p> <p>40. This issue is beyond the remit of the LIP. However consultation on the LIP and separate consultation on other projects including the Thames Gateway Bridge have give citizens the opportunity to express their views on projects and plans.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Residents	<p>Other (cont'd)</p> <p>41. [Bridge Strengthening] Surely the cheapest solution is to reduce weight limits.</p> <p>42. Need to limit disruption caused to traffic by maintenance works.</p> <p>43. Need to protect people living by railway lines from noise.</p> <p>44. Dagenham and Rush Green are left out when it comes to improvements.</p> <p>45. Lincoln, Laurel, Gorseway or Rose Glen need a mini-roundabout, the junction with Dagenham Road is dangerous.</p> <p>46. Motorists endure too many restrictions and penalties. The Council needs to change its attitude to the motorist.</p> <p>47. Residents do not want cul-de-sacs to be replaced by through roads in the Gascoigne Estate.</p>	<p>Other (cont'd)</p> <p>41. The Council is required by law to strengthen bridges so that they can carry 40 tonne lorries.</p> <p>42. The LIP will set out how the Council intends to limit disruption caused by roadworks and works carried out by utility companies, and will refer to the Council's new duties under the Traffic Management Act 2004.</p> <p>43. The LIP will set out proposals in relation to transport related noise. Rail noise, however, is beyond the Council's remit.</p> <p>44. Noted. The LIP includes proposals to significantly improve the Heathway in Dagenham.</p> <p>45. Comment to be passed to appropriate Council department. Note to Council for action.</p> <p>46. Noted. The comment did not give examples of restrictions or penalties so it is difficult to determine what is meant exactly. Restrictions such as one way streets or banned turns are not made without reason and can be reviewed. The management of parking and traffic on the borough's roads needs to take in many factors and conflicting interests, and requires that choices be made.</p> <p>47. Comment to be passed to appropriate Council department. These comments will inform any future proposals for the area.</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comments	Officer Response
Residents	48. More money should be spent on making the borough 'cleaner, greener and safer'.	48. "Cleaner, Greener, Safer" is an overarching objective for the Council and the LIP is part of many Council wide initiatives to these ends. The LIP will build a case for attracting more funding towards making the borough a cleaner, greener and safer place. The LIP's remit does not cover street cleansing however the LIP will stress that street cleansing needs to be a continued priority for the Council. The LIP will also refer to the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act, which will give the Council new enforcement powers.