

Appendix 1: LIP Consultation Response Summary

Public Consultation Feedback

Consultee	Date/Method of Engagement	Summary of Response/Issues Raised	Council Response/Actions
General Public	02/11/18 – 07/12/18 - Online Questionnaire 13 responses received	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was some support for the overall approach adopted in the draft LIP, with over half of the respondents either ‘strongly agreeing’ or ‘agreeing’ with the proposed objectives. • There was broad support for additional transport links/services to places such as Stratford and Canary Wharf, as well as measures to improve safety and security on the local transport network and improve the local street scene. • There was less support for the proposed Delivery Plan and three-year Programme of Investment, with only a third of respondents either ‘strongly agreeing’ or ‘agreeing’ with the proposals. • Chief among the concerns raised were the potential impacts on general traffic as a result of proposals to implement bus priority schemes and the potential for further conflict between pedestrian and cyclists with the introduction of new cycling schemes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the very low response rate to the online questionnaire, it is not possible to draw any meaningful conclusions from the consultation exercise. • No changes are proposed to the draft LIP as a result of the feedback received from the general public. However, the Council is mindful of the concerns raised by respondents around the potential impacts/conflicts of new bus priority and cycling schemes and will ensure that detailed public engagement is undertaken as part of all scheme development/ implementation work to allay these concerns and ensure measures are fully supported by the wider community.
Barking and Dagenham Access Group	19/11/18 - Access and Planning Review Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was broad support for the approach adopted in the draft LIP, with forum members welcoming investment in measures and interventions that would result in improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. Additional text to be included in the final draft LIP highlighting how the ‘co-design’ approach to scheme development/ implementation can address perceptions of safety.

Consultee	Date/Method of Engagement	Summary of Response/Issues Raised	Council Response/Actions
		<p>accessibility; improved safety and security; and the creation of healthy, inclusive places.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forum members highlighted the need for people's perceptions of safety to be addressed as much as actual safety issues themselves and for all schemes to be designed taking into consideration the needs of the least abled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of 'Healthy Streets' approach will ensure that the needs of the least abled are taken into consideration during scheme development/ implementation.
Metropolitan Police	19/11/18 – Written Representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response highlighted the need for a greater commitment to be made in the LIP to adopting 'Secured by Design' principles as a proven means of reducing crime and fear of crime within the borough. • Adoption of SBD principles would bring a number of benefits to the Council and the wider community, including the creation of areas in which resident feel safe and secure and the promotion of healthy, sustainable living. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. Adoption of 'Healthy Streets' approach will ensure that issues around crime and fear of crime are taken into consideration during scheme development/implementation. However, additional text to be included in final draft LIP highlighting a greater commitment to adopting key SBD principles.
London Cycling Campaign	03/12/18 – Written Representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCC generally encouraged by the many mentions of cycling throughout the document, accepting that it is a vital form of transport. However, has some concerns about the specifics of some proposals, the lack of specifics in others and the absence of some projects from the LIP. Key issues/considerations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of clarity and ambition on targets, especially interim targets; ▪ Insufficient detail on/weight given to proposed new strategic cycling and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Targets</u>: Interim/final targets align to those set by TfL. Proposed small increase to cycle mode share reflects existing low-level mode share figure and availability of funding to affect change. • <u>Routes</u>: Alterations to text proposed to clarify position on/add weight to borough commitments around existing/proposed new cycle routes. • <u>Cycling schemes</u>: Scheme design/ implementation will be informed by 'Healthy Streets' and 'Vision Zero' approach, with all schemes built to London Cycling Design

Consultee	Date/Method of Engagement	Summary of Response/Issues Raised	Council Response/Actions
		<p>Quietway routes and existing LCN/LCN+ routes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need for good quality and safe cycle connections to/from Barking Riverside; ▪ Proposals to use central reservations to provide fully-segregated cycling facilities problematic – would involve additional carriageway crossings, deplete greenery and unlikely to be comfortable/legible; ▪ Pledge needed to fix legacy permeability and maintenance issues; ▪ Important that proposed river crossings incorporate cycling from the outset. 	<p>Standards. ‘Co-design’ approach also central to successful development/delivery of all schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Legacy issues</u>: LIP scheme design process will address legacy permeability/ maintenance issues in specific areas. Councils HIP programme will also address long-standing carriageway maintenance issues. Local Transport Fund ‘Minor Works’ programme will look to address all other small-scale legacy issues. • <u>River crossings</u>: Proposed crossings will accommodate pedestrians/cyclists and would feed into the long-planned National Cycle Network route along the Thames north bank and River Roding.
LB Bexley	11/12/18 – Written Representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes proposals to extend riverboat services to Barking Riverside as this could lead to future services calling at wharves and piers along Bexley’s riverfront. • Notes that draft LIP does not include any commitment to petition TfL to continue to consider further road-based Thames river crossings at Belvedere/Rainham and Gallions Reach/Thamesmead. Consider a missed opportunity given the potential for such crossings to enable and support significant economic growth in east and southeast London. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. Introduction of timetabled river passenger services to/from Barking Riverside would provide the borough with additional cross-river connectivity, a direct transport link to the key employment hubs of Canary Wharf and central London and relieve pressure on the local road/public transport networks. • Focus of long-term schemes/ interventions listed in cpt3 is mainly on those schemes that would directly impact on the borough and which support the Council’s wider growth ambitions. The Council is broadly supportive of additional Thames River

Consultee	Date/Method of Engagement	Summary of Response/Issues Raised	Council Response/Actions
			crossings and will continue to lobby for these key infrastructure improvements.
TfL City Planning	12/12/18 – Written Representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TfL considered that the LIP aligned with the MTS and welcomed the Council’s commitment to increasing sustainable travel and seeking to reduce traffic and levels of car ownership across the borough. • TfL also welcomed the borough’s adoption of the ‘Vision Zero’ approach as a means of seeking to eliminate all deaths and serious injuries from the local transport network. • A number of recommendations have been made on how aspects of the plan could be strengthened. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Providing additional information on how the borough will achieve ‘Vision Zero’; ▪ Providing further information on how LIP schemes/programmes are/will be prioritised, both in scale/geographical location; ▪ Updating a number of charts/graphs to provide clarity and to reflect recently published data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This content/direction of the LIP reflects the Council’s commitment to looking at new and innovative ways of addressing the various transport, environmental, health and inequality issues that affect the borough and large parts of London. • Following further discussions with the City Planning team, the Council accepts the recommended changes/additions and the draft LIP has been updated to reflect these comments/suggestions. Details of how/where these changes have been made are set out in the table below.

TfL Consultation Feedback

TfL Comment/Recommendations	Council Response/Actions	Where Addressed
LIP Guidance Requirements/General Feedback		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LIP does not follow the structure in the template but includes a table in Annex A that identifies where in the document each of the LIP mandatory requirements can be found. Each requirement has been addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current structure represents preferred approach to LIP development. 	N/A
Chapter 1: Introduction and Wider Context		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The democratic process taken to approve the submission of the LIP is well set out. It may be beneficial to name the portfolio holder that initially approves the document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LIP document approved by Council Cabinet and Assembly. Relevant portfolio holder is acknowledged in Foreword. 	Foreword
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory consultees have been referenced although this section will read differently following consultation. Any amendments to the document based on feedback should be noted in the final version, along with the naming of groups consulted (as opposed to generic terms). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text updated to highlight additional consultation/ engagement undertaken in November 2018 and the outcomes of this. Details of specific individuals/groups consulted provided. 	Section 1.3 (Formal Consultation) – Paras 1.3.4 – 1.3.7 Annex C
Chapter 2: Borough Transport Issues and Objectives		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures have been provided within this chapter to set out the local context but several of the maps / images (e.g. Figures 2.1 and 2.5) are unclear and their quality / resolution should be improved in the final LIP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maps/images reviewed and updated to provide greater clarity. 	Section 2.2 (Borough Overview) – Figure 2,1 Section 2.4 (Section 2.4 (Challenges and Opportunities) – Figure 2.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional analysis and information on casualties in the borough to show that Barking and Dagenham have understood their local issues to show further commitment to the Vision Zero approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information on borough casualties provided, including 2017 casualty figures and details of those vehicles which present the greatest risk. 	Section 2.3 (Local Transport Context) - Table 2.2

TfL Comment/Recommendations	Council Response/Actions	Where Addressed
		Section 2.4 (Challenges and Opportunities) – Paras 2.4.7 – 2.4.9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point of accuracy on 2.5.9, KSIs in Barking and Dagenham rose in 2017 by 38%, 42% for serious injuries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph updated to reflect 2017 casualty figures. 	Section 2.5 (Borough Transport Objectives) – Para 2.5.9
Chapter 3: LIP Delivery Plan and Programme of Investment		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LIP states adoption of the Healthy Streets Approach under the priority area of ‘Creating Better Streets and Places’ however adopting the approach implies all schemes delivered on the borough’s streets should encourage more walking, cycling and public transport use and deliver improvements against the ten ‘Healthy Streets’ indicators. As such, ‘improvements to traffic flow’ and ‘reducing traffic bottlenecks’ should not be priorities in themselves. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text updated to highlight all-encompassing nature of the Health Streets Approach. Reference to ‘improvements to traffic flow’ and ‘reducing traffic bottlenecks’ removed and replaced with ‘improvements to bus journey times’ and ‘creating liveable spaces’. 	Section 3.2 (Measures and Interventions) – Para 3.2.12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional details on how casualty savings will be made and how the borough will deliver according to the Vision Zero approach should be included to show a thorough understanding and commitment, for example there is no mention of adopting a Safe Systems Approach, road risk or tackling danger at the source in the document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text updated to include details on how the Council will achieve casualty savings and deliver Vision Zero approach. 	Section 3.2 (Measures and Interventions) – Paras 3.2.9 – 3.2.10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With further regards to Vision Zero the focus of the 2019/20 delivery plan is heavily on engineering with no mention of analysis of riskiest locations such as town centres and no mention of vehicle improvements, work related road risk (or FORS). Also, education appears to focus on vulnerable road users and not those who cause harm. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text updated to highlight different range of road safety measures/interventions the Council will implement in line with the Vision Zero approach. 	Section 3.2 (Measures and Interventions) – Paras 3.2.9 – 3.2.10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be helpful to include details on how programmes are, and will be, prioritised both in terms of scale and geographical location (as per requirement 21a). For example, how would the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details of how Delivery Plan is prioritised by geographical location already provided in Section 3.2. 	Section 3.2 (Principles and Priorities) – Paras 3.2.1 – 3.2.2; Table 3.1; Figures 3.1

TfL Comment/Recommendations	Council Response/Actions	Where Addressed
<p>prioritisation process be used if schemes need to be added / removed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further clarification provided on how prioritisation process would be used for adding/removing schemes. 	<p>Section 3.5 (Programme Prioritisation and Monitoring Arrangements) – Paras 3.5.2 – 3.5.4</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite no bus priority funding in table 3.5 the borough could show commitment to bus priority highlighting where new measures would be sought e.g. pinch points, as part of future scheme development etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text updated highlighting how the Council will work with TfL to identify other locations within the borough where bus priority improvements may be beneficial. 	<p>Section 3.4 (Strategic Funding Programmes) – Para 3.4.8</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 3.9, stakeholder management plan(s) may be helpful and could also include producing risk assessments at a scheme level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table updated to include reference to stakeholder management plans. New table added containing risk assessment at scheme level. 	<p>Section 3.5 (Managing Risk) Tables 3.9 and 3.10</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points of accuracy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 3.1 is unclear and should be improved in the final LIP; In 3.3.5 the new bus/transit river crossing is expected to be part of a Housing Infrastructure Fund bid rather than a Growth Fund bid; In 3.4.6 the Ilford to Barking cycle route should be referred to as a 'Future Route' as opposed to a 'Quietway'; 3.4.8 Suggestion to mention the City in the East growth study that identified the need for increased bus services for Barking Town Centre and measures being developed as a result; Make it clear if 'The Heathway' in row two of Table 3.8 is the same as point 2 in Figure 3.2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant text has been updated to reflect correct terminology. Maps/images reviewed and updated to provide greater clarity. 	<p>Section 3.3 (Funding Sources) – Para 3.3.5 Section 3.4 (Strategic Funding Programmes) – Paras 3.4.6 and 3.4.8 Figures 3.1; 3.2 Table 3.8</p>
<p>Chapter 4: Performance Management and Monitoring</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targets follow the TfL trajectories issued in the borough data pack. However, two targets have been set for KSIs in 2041, there should only be one of zero. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erroneous target removed. 	<p>Section 4.2 (LIP Indicators and Targets) – Table 4.1</p>

TfL Comment/Recommendations	Council Response/Actions	Where Addressed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A revised set of borough trajectories for Outcome 2 and Vision Zero have been issued and boroughs need to update their targets to reflect these new trajectories in their final LIP for 2022 and 2030 (2041 is unchanged at 0). The borough is also asked to include additional text in the final LIP under Outcome 2 explaining the reasoning for the change in trajectories and targets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road safety targets updated to reflect revised borough trajectories and additional explanatory text added. 	Section 4.2 (LIP Indicators and Targets) – Figure 4.2 (+ new text box) and Table 4.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To demonstrate commitment to and understanding of the targets set commentary around Figure 4.1 and 4.3 should include the impact of growth and housing delivery on these targets e.g. an increasing mode share in the context of increasing trips. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text update to highlight impacts of growth/housing delivery on targets. 	Section 4.2 (LIP Indicators and Targets) – Paras 4.2.5 and 4.2.10