

# CEX351 APPENDIX E

## LIP III Consultation - LBH Responses to Issues Raised

Comment/Issue	Instances	LBH Response	LIP Change Description
<b>PUBLIC TRANSPORT</b>			
<p>Public transport needs to be cheaper, quicker and more reliable. It is too expensive compared to the car and congestion makes buses unreliable.</p>	10	<p>We agree that reliability is a key factor in the attractiveness of public transport and the LIP outlines a number of measures in the delivery plan to reduce congestion and to work with TfL to improve services. These include encouraging modal shift by providing better walking and cycling infrastructure, additional public transport provision and the promotion of smarter choice behaviour change measures. Also included are objectives around reviewing parking restrictions and implementing engineering measures to improve bus reliability. LB Hounslow has limited influence on the fares charged on buses and trains however we will continue to lobby for an affordable public transport network.</p>	None
<p>Too much new development and multiple occupancy housing allowed in the borough which causes congestion and crowding on public transport, especially in areas where public transport is insufficient or being cut.</p>	9	<p>LB Hounslow recognises the pressure that a growing population and new development puts on the transport network. The amount of development permitted is defined by policies contained within our Local Plan (and the London Plan) and the LIP has been written to align with the housing and job targets it sets. All new developments are assessed through the planning process and transport improvements requested when appropriate (objectives 8a,8b &amp; 8d). The LIP delivery plan includes specific development mitigations such as new rail links, increased bus provision and new walking and cycling infrastructure designed to reduce the impact in key areas such as congestion and air quality. We work closely with TfL to ensure they are aware of where new development will take place but where there are proposed reductions in public services by TfL, we will assess their impact and oppose any changes that reduce services relied on by existing or new residents.</p>	None

Orbital and cross borough public transport needs improvement. Bus capacity improvements are required for example those from the west of the borough to hospitals, for those accessing Heathrow (all terminals) and to serve new schools. Many routes are overcrowded and require increased frequencies e.g. bus route 235.

Objections to TfL proposed changes to buses which serve Isleworth and West Middlesex Hospital.

More bus lanes are needed to make travelling by bus faster than driving if they are to be attractive.

Better use of mobility services/shared mobility throughout Borough: suggestions included: free shuttle buses to tubes, school minibus services, more use of business employee shuttles. Requests for capacity and accessibility improvements at rail and tube stations. Rail stations mentioned include Gunnersbury, Kew and Feltham.

7	The LIP identifies orbital and cross borough routes as one of the biggest challenges faced in Hounslow. We are committed to working with TfL to enhance public transport particularly for the thousands of residents who work at Heathrow and will be lobbying for a new Heathrow Southern Rail access as well as additional bus services. The LIP includes objective O5c which covers cross-borough and orbital service improvements in a way that is competitive with the car. Public transport provision for all new schools is assessed as part of the development process and funding for new services requested where required (Objective 8d).	None
4	LB Hounslow have already submitted a strong objection to these proposals as we believe they reduce services vital to the accessibility of West Middlesex Hospital and cross-borough services. The LIP makes it clear in objective 5c that this area remains a priority.	None
4	The LIP delivery plan includes consideration of bus lanes as part of programme 14 and objective O7a amongst other engineering measures to improve bus reliability. The need will be assessed on a case by case basis.	None
4	The LIP includes a commitment to investigate demand responsive bus services (objective 6g) and to emerging technologies (objective 3f).	None
3	We are aware that capacity and accessibility improvements are required at several stations on the Hounslow loop and LIP objective O9f. The current works around Feltham station will enable longer trains to be used in 2020 and we are already working with train operators and TfL to improve capacity at Gunnersbury (objective 9f) and accessibility at all stations on the Hounslow loop via step free access (objective O6c). We are also working with TfL to improve accessibility at Piccadilly Line stations.	Outcome 9 challenge added around station capacity.

A reliable park and ride service needed - it has worked elsewhere to relieve congestion.

Improve access to the bus network for elderly users and those with physical impairments, including seating and bus shelter. The services can be a lifeline for many vulnerable users.

Proposals for tram services in town centre locations.

The sheer number of people with huge pushchairs reduces the capacity for other passengers and disabled people.

Ensure Piccadilly Line trains stop at Turnham Green

LiteBRT (Bus rapid transit along A4) preferable to full BRT

3 We do not believe that a P&R schemes would be successful in Hounslow for a number of reasons: 1) They require high-frequency bus services to attract car users, and having several shopping destinations (Chiswick, Feltham etc.) means there is unlikely to be sufficient patronage on each route to justify the scheme. 2) P&R schemes work best when there are high levels of flow from rural areas to town centres. P&R schemes also need to be relatively far out from the town centres to make the mode change worthwhile. Hounslow is predominantly residential, and most trips to town centre destinations are short-distance journeys (making a typical bus journey suitable rather than driving to a P&R bus stop). 3) The amount of land and cost of providing P&R car parks would be significant; recouping this money would be through fares which would mean either high-cost fares >£1.50 (unattractive) or require high daily patronage demand (unlikely in Hounslow). It is noted that there are car parks at a number of stations in the borough including Hounslow West and Osterley.

None

2 LIP outcome 6 outlines our approach to improving the accessibility of the bus network. It includes commitments towards seating and real time information and we will continue to respond to resident requests for shelters and seating. The LIP recognises that public realm improvements are required around bus stops to improve accessibility.

None

2 The introduction of tram services has had a positive impact on cities such as Nottingham and Manchester. They are however extremely expensive and there are minimum requirements for road space that do not exist in the borough. For these reasons we have no plans to investigate tram schemes.

None

1 Comment noted. Priority space is available on buses for buggies but TfL policy is that priority is given to wheelchair passengers.

None

1 This is already an agreed policy position that LB Hounslow campaigns for actively as set out in objective 9d - the LIP does not propose a change to this policy.

None

1 Suggestion noted. The potential for a BRT scheme will be considered as part of the current work into a transport strategy for the Great West Corridor.

None

The increase in walking and cycling needs to be supported by infrastructure. Focus on continuous segregated routes, good surfaces and providing showers/lockers/cycle parking in public areas and at transport hubs.

Support for CS9 implementation, including extension to Heathrow, some conditional on it being properly lit and surfaced. Hounslow should express its support more strongly.

Opposition to CS9. CS9 will act as a deterrent to pedestrians due to narrower footways on Chiswick High Rd which may be dangerous for pedestrians and slow traffic causing air pollution. It may also take space away from bus lanes.

Some road surfaces and pavements are in poor condition which discourages active travel. Hounslow should re-surface all the roads that have not been done in the last round of re-surfacing.

Objections to shared use pavements - potentially dangerous for pedestrians and slower for cyclists.

8	The proposed Hounslow priority cycle network focuses on delivering full 'origin to destination' routes that are segregated wherever possible whilst our cycle parking programme will have a renewed emphasis on town centres and leisure destinations (Objective O1h). Lockers and other on-site facilities can be more difficult to achieve particularly in town centres where space is privately owned, however through our business engagement work we encourage all employers to provide these facilities. We will also work with leisure centres and other public buildings to ensure that existing facilities are open to and suitable for cyclists.	Challenge added (1E) to explicitly acknowledge cycle parking and other facility issues.
5	LB Hounslow broadly supports the implementation of CS9 (LIP objective O1c) on the condition that the design balances the needs of local residents and businesses with those of cyclists. We continue to listen to the opinions of local residents and work actively with TfL on tuning the design accordingly. We fully support an extension to Heathrow (route 1 of Hounslow Priority Cycle network) and will be working with TfL and Heathrow airport to secure funding.	None
5	See response above. CS9 will be subject to further public consultation in Spring 2019 which will give residents another opportunity to express their views. Whilst LB Hounslow's position is to support CS9 we will be analysing TfL's latest design to assess the effects on all street users. The final decision is expected to be made by Cabinet in the summer. The council does support improved cycle infrastructure on this key route whether or not CS9 is approved and this is part of the priority network.	None
5	We agree that poor road surfaces discourage active travel and in more extreme circumstances can be dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. Hounslow Highways have an obligation to maintain the roads in the borough to a high standard and the improvement of roads is prioritised according to condition.	None
5	The preferred option for a cycling facility in Hounslow is a segregated facility where interaction with other user types, be it pedestrians or vehicles, is removed. However, there are situations where, for example, the road width available limits our ability to provide both a segregated cycle track, footway and traffic lanes. We are committed to using segregated facilities whenever feasible and that vehicular traffic considerations are counterbalanced by our key commitments to encouraging active travel.	None

Parking restrictions need more enforcement where there are cycle paths to enable use.

Shift funding more to active travel infrastructure, education and training are not as effective/are needed after infrastructure.

Why only one priority cycle network route in first period?

Lighting needs to be improved for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users feel safer. Alley ways and the areas around bus stops mentioned specifically. LED uplights are not a good substitute.

Crossings over busy roads such as A4 and A312 need to be improved as the roads sever communities - need more time to cross, better lighting, improved junctions (specifically at A4/Sutton Court Road North)

There is not enough focus on pedestrian safety.

4 There are circumstances under which parking on cycle paths cannot be enforced, for example where an on-carriageway lane is marked by a dashed line or where there is a shared facility and pavement parking is allowed. The council needs to consider a number of needs when designing cycle lanes so it is not always possible to provide mandatory cycle lanes. We can and do enforce other situations including where there are other operational restrictions e.g. yellow lines. The government is consulting on proposals to allow enforcement of mandatory cycle lanes using CCTV which is supported.

None

4 Education and training are an important part of the overall strategy, teaching people how to travel safely whatever the mode of transport for example. The right infrastructure is also important and there is already significant cycle infrastructure in place in the borough. and a number of residents already regularly cycling that would benefit from training and increased awareness. The balance of the budget reflects the need to offer free education and training for school children and other vulnerable road users and the potential for large numbers of people to change their mode of travel.

The main reason multiple priority routes will not be progressed in the first period is that a number of legacy projects e.g. Staines Rd are ongoing and will continue into this LIP period.

None

3 The LIP includes the objective to embed the Healthy Streets approach in all public realm design processes. The approach includes standards for lighting and other measures that contribute to safety. Objective 6a seeks to improve the areas around bus stops. Comment on uplighters noted.

None

3 LIP objective 1g will look at opportunities across the borough to reduce severance through the introduction of new and improved crossings. We are aware of the need for improvements at Sutton Court Rd and have recently included it in a funding bid to TfL.

None

3 The strategy under outcome 2 gives pedestrians and cyclists equal weight however with the commitment to the Mayor's Vision Zero target much of the detail around pedestrian improvements is included in the Vision Zero Action Plan rather than the LIP.

None

Requests for the creation of a wider network of safer, segregated cycle routes that do not cause more congestion.

Allow cycle hire schemes in borough like Mobike and Ofobike (I used them a lot and the misuse of bikes would decrease over time once people were used to them)

Prioritise pedestrian bridges over roads

Cycle parking needs to be secure to deter thieves - CCTV installed.

The proposed Hounslow Priority cycle network route 15 is a concern for this Chiswick Conservation area (detailed comments provided). Cycle route planning through this residential area should be subject to an impact analysis.

For shorter journeys, I like to cycle however roads in the area often are unsafe for cycling - drivers are hostile and there are no or poorly maintained bike lanes, often with massive drains/grates in the middle of them and broken glass.

Walking paths are not level and can be too narrow.

2 See response on Hounslow Priority Cycle network. During the design phase, the impact on congestion is always considered before we implement new cycle infrastructure.

1 Mobike have been running a trial during 2018 in Brentford and Chiswick. We continue to assess its impact and will be considering full adoption of a bike share scheme in 2019 (LIP objective O1i).

1 Bridges over roads can be beneficial in some locations where severance is a particular issue, e.g. the A4, but they can also make journeys longer and be barriers to the less mobile. This strategy promotes the reduction of severance, introduction of healthy streets and improved road safety and the best solution will be considered on a case by case basis.

2 As part of our new cycle parking programme, we will be providing funding for CCTV in public locations where power and data connections are feasible. Objective 1h refers.

1 The public, including conservation groups and residents, will be consulted on proposed designs and routes.

1 The LIP commits to providing a priority cycle network as well as other improvements to encourage cycling and improve road safety. Objectives refer 2c, 2e, 2f, 2g for example. The roads are maintained by Hounslow Highways under a PFI contract but an additional objective has been added to work with Hounslow Highways to improve the quality and safety of cycle routes.

1 The maintenance of footpaths is covered by our PFI agreement with Hounslow Highways and the LIP commits to enforcing high standards under objective 6b. The width of pavements is a focus under the healthy streets approach and the LIP will aim to bring about improvements in this area.

None

None

None

Consideration of CCTV added to Challenge 1E..

None

Add objective 1n to work with HH to improve quality and safety of existing cycle routes

None

## ROADS/CONGESTION

The car will always be necessary for some journeys and so LIP should take this into account. Nothing is as quick/reliable as the car - essential for elderly, parents with children, shopping and those with goods to carry. Could have negative impact on High St economy. Public transport/cycling not an option for business journeys which involve late night travel with equipment.

Support filtered permeability or other traffic reduction schemes such as one-way on residential roads. Be good to include some suggested streets in the LIP.

LIP should recognise the role of HGVs (particularly in residential areas) in increasing congestion. Potentially ban HGVs in peaks.

Requests to re-open Church Street as it has made congestion worse on Twickenham Road and the surrounding area.

Reject Mayor's transport policy and consider a less anti motorist policy - do not introduce measures at the expense of personal freedoms, as car use should be up to the individual.

5 We recognise that the car is still the most convenient or practical way of travelling for some journeys (particularly some orbital routes) and that there are sections of the population that rely on the car, especially for journeys at unsociable hours when public transport services are infrequent. This is reflected in the targets for mode share and parking standards which acknowledge that car use will still be required. It should be noted that people who walk or use public transport to access town centres generally spend more and stay longer which benefits businesses. When developing specific policies or schemes an Equalities Impact Assessment will always be completed to ensure that the needs of these groups is taken into account.

None

4 Objective 3b of the LIP commits to support residents where demand exists for schemes that will reduce traffic in residential areas. Areas have not been named since we need to take resident demand into account in planning schemes.

None

4 Challenges 3A and 3E recognise the impact HGV's and other through traffic can have residential streets. LB Hounslow has the power to restrict HGV's access to residential roads and does so where regular problems are reported by residents.

None

3 The council monitors traffic management schemes carefully to ascertain their impact on the wider network. The closure of Church Street, Isleworth was progressed via an experimental traffic order in order to establish in reality what the impact of removing through traffic on this road would be on traffic volumes, journey times, air quality, safety and modal shift on surrounding roads. The results of this assessment were reported to the local area forum in March 2017 and the determination was made by that body to make the closure permanent as the data generally supported the policy case for closure. The new LIP places more emphasis on supporting residents who wish to improve the liveability of their streets and, if anything, therefore strengthens the policy case for keeping this road closed to through traffic.

None

3 Overall, LB Hounslow supports the goals of the Mayor's Transport Strategy and believes that the only way to support predicted levels of growth without intolerable levels of congestion is through the expansion of public transport and active travel. There are no plans to remove the option of personal motorised transport, policies may be introduced to make it a less attractive option than more sustainable options. It should also be noted that rejection of the Mayor's Transport Strategy would lead to the loss of a significant revenue

None

<p>Make bus lanes accessible to cars at certain times to cut congestion and traffic</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>stream (£2.3m per annum) to deliver schemes that benefit all road users, including motorists, which could not easily be replaced.</p> <p>Some of the bus lanes operational in LB Hounslow already allow car use at certain times of day (for example on Chiswick High Road) however where 24 hour bus routes run, restrictions tend to operate full-time. Making bus lanes accessible to cars especially at peak times when congestion is worst can increase bus service times, making them less attractive and ultimately creating more congestion since people switch to the car so this is not supported by the Mayors Transport Strategy.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><b>OTHER ISSUES</b></p>			
<p>The LIP does not mention on the effects of aircraft noise/pollution or set out council's position on Heathrow expansion</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>The impacts of noise pollution are covered in detail by the Strategic Environmental Assessment which accompanies the LIP however a note will be added under outcome 4 of the LIP. LB Hounslow's stated position is for a "better, not bigger, Heathrow" and we continue to lobby based on this. If however expansion is to occur we will be working closely with Heathrow Airport to ensure the best outcomes for Hounslow.</p>	<p>Additional challenge and section added to outcome 4 to better define noise pollution and position on Heathrow.</p>
<p>LIP needs more focus on the school run as it is a major cause of congestion. Can staggered start times and parking restrictions or US style queuing systems be considered?</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>The primary mechanism within the LIP for school engagement is via the STARS (see Outcome 1) programme. Under this scheme we support schools to reduce the impacts of parent parking via a variety of behaviour change and on-street measures including staggered start times and parking restrictions. Where the problem is particularly acute, we will consider the introduction of 'school streets' style parking restrictions where parking is prohibited in the area around a school during drop off and pick up times.</p>	<p>Add objective 2c around parent parking and school streets</p>



Objections to 20mph on grounds of negative effect on air quality or not needed for improved safety.

Request to increase street tree planting above the current replacement strategy and make roads more scenic

Prioritise stopping Heathrow expansion or reducing flights over Hounslow to improve air quality.

The LIP is not ambitious enough/does not reference the need to address climate change. Suggestions included: Expressing greater urgency to cut Pms (particulate matter) from buses, HGVs and private cars in addition to NO<sub>x</sub> and pressing for the whole of Hounslow to be included in the ULEZ.

Need to reduce speed of cars and goods vehicles / enforce 20mph limits.

The objectives are too vague and therefore not useful

Accessibility of Heathrow by public transport is poor, yet there are many airport taxis

Objection to CPZs since they encourage car ownership and can isolate the elderly.

3 TfL have produced evidence to support the case for 20mph zones both in terms of safety and air quality. One report (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/20-mph-speed-limits-on-roads>) notes reductions in those travelling at the highest speeds whilst another (<http://content.tfl.gov.uk/speed-emissions-and-health.pdf>) finds that speed reduction schemes do not increase emissions.

None

3 The healthy streets approach adopted by the LIP includes the increased use of greening and general planting to improve the public realm. Its application will lead to an overall increase in street trees.

None

3 LB Hounslow's stated position is for a "better, not bigger, Heathrow" and we continue to lobby based on this. If, however expansion is to occur we will be working closely with Heathrow Airport to ensure the best outcomes for Hounslow including securing significant funding for mitigations on the transport network.

Objective 8i added

3 The extent of the LIP's commitment to climate change is covered under outcome 4 however we agree that in some instances it was not explicit. Many of the schemes designed to combat air pollutants will have a similarly beneficial impact on carbon emissions as will the council's Air Quality Action Plan. Our stated position on the ULEZ is that it should cover the whole of London and the LIP does not change this.

Challenge 4A and 4E now reference climate change.

2 The LIP includes the target for all residential streets to be 20mph by the end of the LIP period (Objective 02c). Enforcement of 20mph limits is carried out by the Met Police in Hounslow although it is acknowledged that the extent of this is limited by available resources. London Councils are currently undertaking a project to investigate the potential for borough councils to enforce these limits.

Change wording of 02c to say extent of 20mph scheme

2 The overarching objectives at the start of the LIP are high level since they must cover the breadth of topics within the LIP. The individual objectives under each of the nine outcomes are much more specific however.

None

2 We agree that there is scope to improve public transport links to Heathrow and the LIP outcomes (for example 5c & 9c) support both the Southern Rail Access proposal and better bus services.

None

2 LB Hounslow responds to resident demands for CPZs and we take into consideration all views expressed during consultation. We do not have evidence to suggest that CPZs increase car ownership currently.

None

Use new technology better - pre-booking demand responsive buses for example

Casualty data should not be the determinant for a road safety scheme

Some of the delivery lorries used by supermarkets are far too big for safety on suburban roads.

The ongoing use of alleys and cut-throughs for fly-tipping makes some walking routes feel quite unsafe. This also happens when the alleys are edged with land which is technically private and not the council's responsibility; the regulations could be changed for the council to have more powers in such cases.

Introduce smaller electric buses, covered cycle tracks, covered walkways, flyovers and trams and you may start to make a difference

Increased availability of buggy spaces on buses to facilitate school runs by public transport may help.

Ensure underpasses are kept clean and secure, modernise if possible.

Zero tolerance of aggressive driving by vehicles drivers to cyclists and cycling infringements such as running red lights, cycling without lights after dusk etc

2 Whilst specific technologies are not mentioned, the LIP includes objective 03f. "To continuously monitor new technological developments and adapt the LIP as needed to maximise the beneficial impact of new innovations."

None

2 Casualty data will need to be part of the process in identifying locations for road safety improvements. It is used to identify patterns and locations where there have been collisions and thus where improvements are required. However, other factors are also used in identifying locations for improvements and in detailed design. This will be a key element in helping to meet the Vision Zero target and in promoting active travel.

None

1 Objectives 3g and 3h relate to improving deliveries. The council requires all new developments to ensure they can be serviced in an acceptable manner. In general, the council can't control the type of vehicles used by third parties.

None

1 Fly tipping is not the responsibility of this strategy.

1 It is LB Hounslow's position that the introduction of electric and hybrid buses to Hounslow should be accelerated beyond the timetable currently proposed by TfL. Trams are covered in a previous answer. Comments on covered walkways noted.

None

Objective 4c strengthened to cover cleaner buses.

1 Comment noted and will be passed to TfL as the relevant body for consideration.

None

1 Underpasses on the TLRN are maintained by TfL. Where the council is Highway Authority, they will be maintained in accordance with the standards set out in the highways PFI contract. This strategy aims to promote healthy streets and active travel and this is covered in the objectives.

None

1 Enforcement is a police matter but the council works closely with the police regarding enforcement. The council will work with all agencies to meet the Vision Zero target (objective 2a).

None

Stop spending money on endless consultations, PR, education etc and put the funds into changing infrastructure

Air quality stops me cycling

Find a method for seriously disabled persons to access the transport network. Too often the access points are too far removed from the disabled persons homes.

Orbital road network is inferior to east/west - this causes congestion.

Increase the cost of driving with a pollution charge / use fiscal incentives to discourage car use

Public transport needs to improve for existing users not just new developments

Reduce public parking in favour of green spaces, generous footpaths - there is not enough being done to create pleasant, safe walking environments.

Restore public toilet provision, which has been completely eliminated in the town of Hounslow. This is particularly important for elderly or disabled pedestrians

Make west mid carpark and Isleworth station carparks free

1 Comment noted. Council policy requires consultation with local residents but funding for schemes is maximised as far as possible. Road safety education is a key part of the overall strategy.

1 Comment noted.

1 From engagement activities with our Disability Community Forum we have noted that end to end journeys need to be considered in the LIP for those with mobility impairments. This feedback will be shared with TfL during our regular discussions and we will work to find solutions which may take the form of more responsive services. Outcome 6 refers.

1 Agreed and noted. One aim of this strategy is to reduce the percentage of people travelling by car.

1 LB Hounslow already imposes a diesel surcharge in resident parking zones and is currently considering a 'workplace parking levy' in the Great West Corridor area. In addition, we support the support the extension of the Mayor's Ultra Low Emission Zone to cover the whole of the GLA area rather than the inner London boundary currently proposed for 2020/21.

1 Agreed and noted. There are some objectives in the LIP Outcome 5 related to transport provision in growth areas however the majority apply to all areas.

2 By embedding the Healthy Streets approach in our design processes (objective 2f) we believe that walking environments will become safer and more pleasant. We recognise that in some cases there will be competition for space with parking and in these instances, we will work with residents through our consultation processes to try and agree a reallocation of space. Ultimately however we will be led by our residents.

1 Funding cuts in recent times have resulted in the closure of public facilities. However, under a new initiative in 2018, the council has provided shops, pubs, petrol and train stations across Hounslow with new, highly visible 'Use our toilet' signs to put on display. The signs make it instantly visible to members of the public that the facilities are available on the premises. To date, 127 locations are involved in the scheme. They can be found at [www.hounslow.gov.uk/publictoilets](http://www.hounslow.gov.uk/publictoilets)

1 Suggestion noted however we believe this would go against the core objectives of the Mayor's Transport Strategy. These car parks are not within the council's control.

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

I am not convinced that the funding and political will are sufficient to meet the objectives.

Fewer signs/paint - less clutter

Consider municipal green bonds as a source of funding

Are roads wide enough for car share lanes?

More cycle to school clubs

SDSA and other road safety initiatives work well and should continue

Put a barrier around M4 to improve air quality

Simplify all CPZs to 9-5 to avoid confusion.

If we install lifts at stations must make sure they work

Requests to improve traffic flow e.g. Apex Corner, Hampton Rd

The government has not identified a favoured route option for Southern Rail Access to Heathrow and it is in the early stages of development - the LIP could reflect this.

1 The LIP has been developed with the input of local councillors and will be signed off by them in February 2019. LB Hounslow has a strong track record in delivering innovative transport schemes, for example we were one of the first boroughs to implement lamppost EV charging. To deliver all of the objectives in the LIP, new funding streams will be required however these are identified and represent realistic options.

1 LB Hounslow already applies a borough-wide de-cluttering policy for all public realm environments - LIP does not change this policy.

1 The LIP puts forward a number of larger infrastructure projects, including new rail lines in Brentford and Bedfont that will require some form of capital borrowing. The council is aware of the option of Green Bonds and since no decision has been taken, will continue to assess all funding possibilities for transport schemes.

1 Car share lanes are generally thought not to be feasible on local roads without widening to create additional lanes - a policy that would go against the commitment to creating space for active travel.

1 Comment passed on to relevant team members. This is covered in Objective 2d.

1 Comment passed on to relevant team members. Objective 2a covers this point.

1 This option is currently under investigation by the air quality team. The council has a separate Air Quality Action Plan.

1 CPZ timings are proposed and agreed with the local residents - changes would need to be lead by them.

1 Comment noted. Objective 6c could be strengthened to include maintaining facilities to ensure they repaired as quickly as possible if not working.

1 Suggestions noted on locations where action is needed and individual schemes will be subject to local consultation. Apex Corner and Hampton Road West are the responsibility of TfL.

1 Comment noted although LB Hounslow have a preferred option that we believe would provide the best outcome for the borough.

None

Objective 1d to include de-cluttering.

None

None

None

None

None

None

Objective 6c updated.

None

Outcome 9 - note added that govt has not committed to a route

The shift from private to public is too optimistic, as its the idea of car-free developments. Prefer the policy to incorporate ways to encourage more sustainable private transport such as improved facilities for motorcycle and scooter use. Opening up bus lanes to powered two wheelers would be a positive move and align with the Mayor of London's stated policy on this.  
 Parking is far too expensive for working people and those accessing the High Sts.

24/7 parking charges on main roads

Extra 'severance' created by new developments is not considered in the LIP.

Priority cycle network does not go far enough.

More real time info at bus stops needed, particularly at airport/Feltham & hospital

Work with other bodies to improve out of london links

Provide more shops within walking distance

Ban all non-electric vehicles

Step up provision of car clubs

Residents need a realistic choice of transport methods - car, bike, bus

1 The strategy commits to encouraging more sustainable private transport such as promoting use of electric vehicles and use of car clubs as well as promoting a shift to sustainable and active travel. Objectives 3c,3e and 4i refer for example.

1 Parking policy responds to local needs which will vary from location to location and this includes the cost of parking. Hounslow's parking charges are in-line with other London boroughs and charges that are too low encourage long-term parking and potentially reduce shopper turnover on High STs. This document focusses on meeting the Mayor's targets for mode share which includes reducing car dependence. Objective 3c commits to reviewing parking controls.

1 Parking policy responds to local needs which will vary from location to location. This document focusses on meeting the Mayor's targets for mode share which includes reducing car dependence.

1 The Local Plan is the planning policy document for the borough and this promotes permeable developments. Objective 8a of the LIP states that we will use the planning system to reduce severance.

1 The reasons for the proposed priority network are set out in the LIP but this can and will be reviewed during the lifetime of the strategy.

1 Agreed and noted. The provision of more real time information is set out in policy 6f.

1 LB Hounslow has a good relationship with South Western Railways and will work with other bodies as necessary to improve such links.

1 This is beyond the scope of the LIP however this is an issue understood by our planning team.

1 The government has set out national policy and timescales on this matter. LB Hounslow does not propose to introduce a different policy due to the difficulty of implementing this separately.

1 The LIP already includes this commitment under objective 3e.

1 Agreed and noted.

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

Road safety, we need more pelican crossings and traffic management in the whole of Heston  
Support 20mph in residential Rd  
Support for Workplace Parking Levy.  
Be explicit when Hounslow means the borough or the town centre

Please ensure cycle training is local and accessible - often it seems to be in Hounslow or Chiswick.  
Better enforcement and engineering measures will be required to ensure 20mph limits effective

Support Docked Bike Scheme

Must ensure take conservation areas into account when planning transport improvement

Failure to understand the West of the Borough (a number of ways in which the Borough is characterised are not accurate for the Feltham area) - more needs to be done in this area to integrate with Heathrow.

The council needs to give feedback on consultation comments, or at least acknowledge whether or not feedback can be acted upon  
Increase platform width at Gunnersbury to cater to commuters

1 Comment noted. Addressing severance and promoting healthy streets is a key aim of this document and is covered for example in objectives 2c, 2d and 2f.

1 Comment noted.

1 Comment noted.

1 Comment noted.

1 Comment passed on to relevant team members.

1 Agreed. As part of the Healthy Streets framework, several physical techniques for limiting speed will be considered e.g. chicanes, humps. Enforcement remains a matter for the police which who the council liaise with in this respect.

1 The potential for a docked scheme has previously been investigated but it was concluded that the cost was prohibitive.

1 All schemes within conservation areas follow internal streetscape guidance which sets specific standards for those areas and any schemes within conservation status are passed to the LB Hounslow conservation officer for review during design stage.

1 The LIP does commit to improving both public transport and active travel connections between Heathrow and Feltham e.g. objective 5c. Section 2.2 of the LIP does highlight the differences in character between areas and this has been taken into consideration during policy development. No specific examples of why the document fails to understand the west of the borough have been provided for the council to respond to.

1 The council will note or respond to all comments.

1 Capacity and accessibility at Gunnersbury station is a priority issue for this LIP period and is covered by objective 9f. It is unlikely that platform widths can be increased however.

None

None

None

Ensure document refers to Hounslow or the borough

None

None

None

None

None

None

None

LIP seems to make an assumption that developments are set in stone and all measures are enacted to fulfil development targets

1 The London Plan and Local Plan are the relevant planning policy documents for the borough and set out targets for housing and employment that the borough needs to meet. The LIP sets out transport policies that aim to enable these levels of development to be met but all developments need to go through the planning process where they may or may not be approved. If the levels of housing and employment the borough is required to meet change then the transport strategies may need to respond accordingly.

None

Give councillor fund to residents instead.

1 All funds are allocated according to council policy however comment has been noted.

None

---