

APPENDIX 1

SECOND LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN CONSULTATION - SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Consultee	Method/ Date of Response	Response Summary	Officer Response/Action
LB Redbridge	Email – 30/12/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad support for LIP aims/objectives • Highlights poor public transport connectivity between the boroughs, especially in Little Heath area. • Acknowledges that additional bus services required from both boroughs to Queens Hospital. • Supports plans to improve access to Chadwell Heath station and is willing to be involved in scheme development. • Suggests greater emphasis on movement of freight by water, particularly in relation to development of Barking Riverside. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments acknowledged and support welcomed. • The Local Development Framework safeguards all of Barking and Dagenham's safeguarded wharves.
Disablement Association of Barking & Dagenham (DABD)	Email – 13/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues raised concerning public transport accessibility. Early consultation with access groups required when new infrastructure/equipment is developed to ensure all access issues are addressed. • Highlights poor public transport access to Queens Hospital and other clinics/health facilities in the area and states need for action to address this. • Confirmed that Council has now withdrawn funding for the local Community Transport Scheme meaning that services provided to certain individuals/groups are no longer subsidised. Result is that certain services/facilities are no longer accessible to some. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments acknowledged. • Council welcomes comments on the LIP schemes set out in the document • LIP identifies need to improve access to Queen's hospital as a key issue.

Consultee	Method/ Date of Response	Response Summary	Officer Response/Action
London Cycling Campaign – Barking & Dagenham Branch	Email – 01/02/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that objectives could be prioritised/ranked in order of importance. • Suggests a borough-wide 20 mph zone would be more effective in reducing casualties than individual zones. Would also reduce street clutter and be more cost effective. • Highlights the need to improve the permeability of the borough for cycling, particularly in Barking Town Centre. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments acknowledged. • No plans to prioritise objectives – are all of equal importance for different reasons. • Added emphasis to 20 mph zones and improving cycling permeability given in LIP. • Council did put itself forward to TfL to pilot borough wide 20 mph zone covering the borough’s residential streets.
Transport for London (TfL)	Email – 03/02/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall a very sound submission, but a number of additional actions are required. <p><i>Delivery Plan –</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section on how borough will address High Priority Outputs. • Additional information on other funding sources and timescales for interventions. • Indication as to whether any Major Schemes are to be advanced. <p><i>Consultation -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of statutory consultees required. <p><i>Performance Management -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification of road safety baseline targets. • Give consideration to reducing number of local targets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments acknowledged • Clarity on how High Priority Outputs will be addressed now provided • Other funding sources and timescales for interventions clarified • List of potential Major Schemes now included. • Local targets reviewed and reduced

Consultee	Method/ Date of Response	Response Summary	Officer Response/Action
London Travel Watch	Email – 03/02/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes the fact that LIP acknowledges the importance of bus services. However, suggests that additional emphasis is placed on improving bus stop accessibility. • Suggests continued implementation of bus priority schemes to improve attractiveness of the bus. • Suggests that LIP includes a local target for bus journey time. • Concerns expressed that plan proposals are not substantive enough to address congestion issues in the borough. • Welcomes the target to increase levels of cycling in the borough, but concerned that proposals are not substantive enough to achieve this. • Welcomes the proposal to increase cycle parking, but should be catered for partially on carriage-way. • Welcomes the commitment to Better Streets agenda. Emphasis should be placed on tackling basic problems (e.g. dropped kerbs, entry treatments, etc.) • Suggests that smarter travel initiatives are supported by additional restraint/reallocation measures to ensure no new trips are created. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments acknowledged. • LIP Corridor/Neighbourhood schemes to consider bus stop accessibility enhancements as a matter of course. • Borough to undertake a review of all bus priority measures to assess their effectiveness before proposing additional measures. • Cycling target will be challenging • Bus journey time indicator now included • Proposals for new cycle parking/public realm improvements will take into consideration local needs/space considerations.
English Heritage	Email – 03/02/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of historic environment needs to be given a higher priority in the LIP, especially in the objectives – current emphasis placed solely on environmental enhancement. • Suggests that an overview of the historic environment is given to ensure that it is identified as a transport issue and that delivery plan priorities include the need to protect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments acknowledged. • Policies in Local Development Framework ensure appropriate protection of historic environment and no need to repeat them in the LIP

Consultee	Method/ Date of Response	Response Summary	Officer Response/Action
		heritage assets where appropriate.	
London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC)	Letter – 03/02/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes the support expressed for projects important to the ongoing regeneration of London Riverside. However, reference to Dagenham Dock Station, Beam Park Station and new River Roding bridges required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments acknowledged – Dagenham Dock station referred to extensively, and reference to River Roding Bridges now included. Beam Park station is in Havering.
LB Havering	Email – 04/02/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad support for LIP aims/objectives. • Acknowledges that additional bus services required from both boroughs to Queens Hospital. • Would welcome closer partnership working with borough to explore possibility of expanding Mayor's Cycle Super Highway to LB Havering. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments acknowledged. And support welcomed. Will work with Havering to explore potential of extending Cycle Superhighway.

ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT CONSULTATION – SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Consultee	Method/ Date of Response	Response Summary	Officer Response/Action
English Heritage	Email – 03/02/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the overall LIP programme, subject to the need to have regard for historic character in the design of transport infrastructure (e.g. surface treatments, street furniture, signage, etc.). • Environmental Report should identify opportunities to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments acknowledged and have been addressed in Environmental Report.

Consultee	Method/ Date of Response	Response Summary	Officer Response/Action
		<p>benefit the historic environment through transport initiatives such as contextually appropriate public realm enhancement and schemes to reduce the impacts of traffic on the historic environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends that English Heritage's register of Heritage at Risk be referred to as an indicator for any assets which are put at risk through transport impacts. • Reiterates the need to enhance the setting of the listed Barking Station. • The Mayesbrook Park Access Improvements should identify negative impacts of the car park on the historic character of the park. 	