

## APPENDIX 2 – STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

In refining the Transport Plan for Hammersmith & Fulham a multi-stage consultation strategy was developed, which exceeds the requirements for consultation as part of the LIP2 guidance, and was agreed by the cabinet member for the environment and deputy leader of the council. This statement of community engagement details the consultation strategy and reports the results of stages one and two and how they have fed into the boroughs objectives, delivery plan and targets.

- **Preliminary Engagement**

The preliminary stage of the consultation was to develop a strategy which consisted of three key stages, along side the preliminary stage. From this strategy an action plan was agreed.

A second part to the preliminary stage of consultation was for officers to introduce the concept of the boroughs second LIP to the Older People Consultative Forum. A presentation was delivered on 29 April 2010 to the group detailing the principles of the LIP2, the requirements on the borough and the timescales proposed.

- **Stage 1 consultation**

The first key stage of the consultation was to issue the agreed action plan to the statutory consultees and those organisations that we were aware of that had an interest in transportation matters. The action plan is reproduced in full below:

**Action Plan for the Preparation of a Transport Plan for Hammersmith & Fulham 2011-14 (LIP2)**

All London Boroughs are legally required to prepare a Transport Plan (Local Implementation Plan) to show how they intend to implement the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy in the borough.

The Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, issued his Transport Strategy (MTS2) on 10 May this year and also issued guidance to boroughs on how to prepare their LIPs. Transport for London (TfL) require boroughs to submit their draft LIPs by 20 December 2010.

LIPs 2 (so-called because this is the second round of LIP preparation; the first LIP covered the period 2005-2009 and was approved by the Mayor in March 2006) consist of three parts:

**1. Borough Transport Objectives**

This section sets the geographical context of the borough and sets out evidence based objectives which look towards 2031, the period covered by MTS2. We have to identify how we will work towards the MTS goals of:

- Supporting economic development and population growth
- Enhancing quality of life for all Londoners
- Improving safety and security of all Londoners
- Improving transport opportunities for all Londoners
- Reducing transport's contribution to climate change, and improving its resilience.

Our suggested objectives are set out in the "Consultation" section below.

**2. Delivery Plan 2011 -14**

This is a costed and funded programme of "interventions", which will include the new LIP areas of corridors and neighbourhoods, maintenance and smarter travel. We are required to identify how our interventions will deliver the Mayor's high profile outputs of :

- Cycle superhighway schemes
- Cycle parking
- Electric vehicle charging points
- Better Streets
- Cleaner local authority streets
- Street trees.

The programme for 2011-12 has to be submitted in advance of the main LIP, by October 8. Current TfL indications are that we will have about 5% less than this year's funding over the next three years – i.e. some £2 million for Neighbourhoods and Corridors, £300,000 for Smarter Travel, and £400,000 for principal road and structure maintenance. This of course could change as a result of current national budget proposals.

**3 Performance Monitoring Plan** - TfL have identified the following statutory indicators:

- Mode share
- Bus reliability
- Asset condition
- Road traffic casualties
- CO2 emissions

The boroughs will identify and agree with TfL appropriate targets in these areas and may adopt other targets.

#### **Consultation Strategy**

We have adopted a three stage consultation strategy, of which this letter is the first stage. We are asking statutory consultees and community groups who have previously expressed an interest in transport issues if they have any comments on our approach to preparing LIP2 and on our suggested objectives. The statutory consultees are Hammersmith & Fulham Disability Forum, the Metropolitan Police, and neighbouring boroughs – Kensington and Chelsea, Wandsworth, Richmond, Hounslow, Ealing and Brent. The non-statutory consultees are the West London Alliance, Cross River Partnership, Hammersmith & Fulham Historic Buildings Group, Fulham society, Hammersmith Society, HAFAD (Hammersmith and Fulham Action on Disability), and Hammersmith & Fulham Cyclists.

The second stage of the strategy will start in September. We will prepare a leaflet setting out our proposed transport objectives as described below to a wider range of groups, including English Heritage, Sustrans, Freight transport association, Living Streets, the AA and RAC, elected members, the local strategic partnership, representatives of older and younger people and community groups, with an advertisement/editorial in H&F news, the Council's newspaper, and the website and report on the process to the Council's Environment and Residents Services Select Committee.

#### **Borough Transport Objectives (*Ten Ways to Improve Transport Opportunities in Hammersmith & Fulham*)**

The ten suggested objectives, based on our Community Strategy, the Mayor's Transport Strategy, the emerging Local Development Framework and West London sub-regional Transport Strategy.

1. Providing appropriate transport infrastructure and demand management to support the borough's major regeneration areas, - White City Opportunity Area, West Kensington, Earls Court and North Fulham, South Fulham Riverside, Hammersmith Town Centre and riverside, Old Oak Common and Hythe Road area
2. Continuing to promote major improvements to the West London Line, with new stations and enhanced local and sub-regional passenger services.
3. Supporting the development of HS2, the High Speed Rail link between London, the West Midlands and the north, with an interchange station with Crossrail and the Great Western line at Old Oak Common
4. Reducing road congestion, particularly on north-south routes, without attracting additional extraneous commuter traffic, through better signal timings and co-ordination of road works, traffic smoothing and, where appropriate, physical construction
5. Supporting residents and businesses through parking controls which prioritise their needs over those of extraneous traffic such as football supporters or commuters.
6. Reducing the adverse environmental effects of transport by encouraging walking, cycling and the use of public transport and cleaner vehicles, through school and workplace travel plans, cycle training and improving the attractiveness of walking and cycling routes.
7. Improving the urban realm through "Better Streets" principles – decluttering, high quality street furniture, tree planting, and improving safety and security.
8. Securing access improvements for all, particularly people with disabilities.
9. Improving road safety and reducing casualties, particularly for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists, older and younger people.
10. Increasing capacity and reliability of the Piccadilly and District lines.

We will prepare a draft LIP for approval by the Council's cabinet in December 2010, following which we will submit it to Transport for London. We will also deposit copies in the town hall and libraries, and publish the plan on the council's website, with an article in H&F News. We will also take the plan to the Environment and Residents Services Select Committee in the new year.

On 28 June 2010 the action plan was sent to the following 17 organisations, along with a request for comments back by 30 July 2010.

- **Hammersmith & Fulham Disability Forum**
- **The Metropolitan Police**
- **The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea**
- **The London Borough of Wandsworth**
- **The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames**
- **The London Borough of Hounslow**
- **The London Borough of Ealing**
- **The London Borough of Brent**
- **West Trans**
- **The Fulham Society**
- **The Hammersmith & Fulham Society**
- **North Orbital Rail Partnership**
- **Hammersmith & Fulham Cyclists**
- **Hammersmith & Fulham Historic Buildings Group**
- **The Hammersmith Society**
- **SWELTRAC**
- **Transport for London**

Only one response to the stage one consultation was received and this was from H&F cyclists. Seven points were raised on specific actions that would improve and increase cycling in the borough rather than on the LIP2 consultation strategy. The seven points raised are below with a response on each one issued to H&F cyclists on 2 November 2010.

1. Request for a 20mph speed limit on residential roads
2. Request for a 20mph speed limit on Hammersmith Bridge
3. Request for action to reduce cycle theft
4. Request for action to reduce illegal parking in cycle lanes
5. Request for cycling performance indicators
6. Request for cycling casualty reduction action to be take pro-actively
7. Request for the completion of the Fulham Palace Road slip road scheme

A point by point response was issued to H&F cyclists and a meeting was held with senior officers and the cabinet member for environment.

The stage one consultation involved informal discussions with Transport for London on the emerging borough transport objectives. At stage one the borough had ten transport objectives which were reviewed in light of officer discussions.

- **Stage 2 consultation**

The second key stage of the consultation consisted of a web based questionnaire on the seven transport objectives reported on page 19 in the main body of the LIP2 and the delivery actions proposed by the council of how best to achieve the objectives. The web based consultation ran from 7 September 2010 to 2 October 2010 and was supported by a half page advert (below) in the H&F news which is delivered to every property in the borough along with a press release.

**A Transport Plan for Hammersmith and Fulham**

Hammersmith and Fulham Council, along with all London Boroughs, has to produce a Transport Local Implementation Plan to show how we will implement the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy in our borough.

We have identified seven local transport objectives from the Mayors strategic goals and from the Councils core values. These are:

- 1** To support sustainable population and employment growth in the five regeneration areas. (White City, Earl's Court/West Kensington, Hammersmith Town Centre, Fulham Riverside and Old Oak Common).
- 2** To improve the efficiency of our road network.
- 3** To improve the quality of our streets.
- 4** To improve air quality, reduce noise from transport and reduce carbon emissions in the borough.
- 5** To make it easier for everyone to gain access to transport opportunities.
- 6** To support residents and businesses by controlling parking space fairly
- 7** To reduce the number of people injured and killed on our streets.

**TELL US YOUR VIEWS**  
We would like to know your views on these objectives and the measures we are proposing to achieve them.

To find out more look on the council's website, [www.citizenspace.com/local/lbhf](http://www.citizenspace.com/local/lbhf) or e-mail [LIP@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:LIP@lbhf.gov.uk) or write to Transportation Policy, Highways & Engineering, Environment Department, Town Hall Extension, King Street, London W6 9JU or telephone Nick Boyle on 020 8753 3069 or Chris Bainbridge on 020 8753 3354

 

In addition personal invites were issued to the seventeen organisations listed at the stage one consultation and the thirteen organisations listed below:

- **English Heritage**
- **Freight Haulage Association**
- **Road Haulage Association**
- **Living Streets**
- **AA**
- **RAC**
- **London Fire Brigade**
- **London Ambulance Service**
- **Public Carriage Office**
- **London Travel Watch**
- **Local Agenda 21**
- **British Motorcycle Federation**
- **Motorcycle Action Group**

In addition to the web consultation the draft transport objectives, delivery plan and targets were scrutinised by the council's Environment and Residents Services Select committee on 7 September 2010. The actions from this committee was to invite every residents and tenants group in the borough to take part in the web consultation. Invites were sent out by letter on 12 September 2010.

Each of the seven borough transport objectives was supported by the councils preferred delivery actions, and respondents were asked to choose which ones they thought would best achieve the objectives they supported. In total 126 responses were received during the consultation with the headline results as follows:

---

### **Objective 1 – sustainable development**

The following five delivery actions were offered to support this objective in order of their relative popularity with respondents (101 in total):

<b>Promote improvements to the performance of the underground and suburban rail networks in the borough</b>	<b>33%</b>
Promote the high speed 2 rail hub at Old Oak Common	<b>27%</b>
Support tailored transport studies to ensure that development is matched to transport capacity	<b>19%</b>
Promote the provision of improved strategic road connectivity to meet the essential needs of development	<b>15%</b>
Promote demand management strategies to release capacity on the road and rail networks	<b>7%</b>

Thirty-six additional comments were received in response to this objective as below:

#### **Do you think anything else can be done to support objective 1?**

1. Promote improvements to the performance of the underground and suburban rail networks in the borough
2. Improve cycle paths and facilities for cycling, in the five target areas and throughout the borough.
3. Tubes to operate 24hrs a day even if late night/early morning services nit so frequent. "encourage" TFL to speed up W/E maintenance, public tube (and bus) services at weekend a joke.
4. Make it safer and easier for cyclists - this may mean reducing the number of cars on the road and ensuring that the Congestion Charge is kept for the Western section. Actively promote walking as a method of transport (and the health benefits thereof)Prove that the penalties hat car drivers pay are turned into improvements for the above.
5. Of course walking and cycling are key in an inner city borough but the road network should not be overlooked. The failure of Ealing council to add an additional lane to the A40 west of Gypsy Corner is scandalous given that the houses were demolished under compulsory purchase orders.

This results in a bottleneck which leaves Westway, and roads feeding the A40 (Wood Lane in particular) choked at peak times. It's also surprising that there isn't a road bridge over the Thames at Imperial Wharf; Battersea and Wandsworth Bridges are very busy. Similarly, a road bridge at Barnes Bridge would help loads on Hammersmith and Putney bridges.

6. Extra added capacity to the road network will simply be filled immediately with existing un-met demand and should not be viewed as the answer. Certainly the underground and rail networks should be given priority over vehicle infrastructure. Further, walking and (particularly) cycling should be better promoted (and infrastructure provided) as means of transport for short and medium distances in and around the borough. Many car trips are short distance and removing a reasonable percentage of those would free up capacity for the remaining traffic.

7. 1) Make it safer and more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists thereby encouraging people to use methods other than cars and public transport: - Re-instate the congestion charge and include the area west of Holland Park Rd and the Shepherds Bush roundabout. - Introduce more cycling paths and cycling super highways to encourage a more sustainable and healthier mode of transport - Install more pedestrian crosswalks - particularly in areas such as the Goldhawk Rd enabling people to go via foot- currently it's virtually impossible to cross that road safely. Just count the zebra crossings or crosswalks from Paddenswick Rd to Shepherds Bush Green. The cross walks are too few. Cars rule that road.

8. Increase parking charges to promote the use of public transport.

9. Increase road and parking capacity as much as possible.

10. Continue to encourage the growth of bicycling by adding additional bike routes in conjunction with strategic roads for example beside Cromwell Road (there are areas of unused grass which bikes could use) and so on. Also add more bike stands where bikes can be locked - they need to be available at every parade of shops, for example Fulham Palace Rd, Munster Rd, Hammersmith, King Street etc. Biking is good every which way for everyone.

11. Stop all non-essential immigration. Create jobs for the unemployed in these areas before importing unemployment and pressure on finite resources.

12. Promote cycling and/or install Barclays Bicycle Hire to connect people to other transport networks e.g. getting from Hammersmith to Kensington Olympia Overground.

13. The Bus service, in parts of the borough there are 2 or more buses that will cut across and enable you to get from one end of the borough to another without any problems. Yet from Fulham High Street/ Putney Bridge (very busy with people changing from train to bus) there is only 1 bus (220) that can link you to Hammersmith, Shepherds Bush and White City. You either have to wait ages and hope that the delays won't mean you being unable to get on it or go part way and walk to another bus stop to try and get a bus down. It used to be you got on a bus and could travel from A-B sitting down this is a dream on the 220 route

14. Could be cleaner, especially at West Ken. Steps need a good scrub to remove debris

15. Improve cycling and walking facilities. Make cycling a safe option for novice cyclists. Improve road crossing facilities for pedestrians. Make sure any development is allowed only with a no car-use assumption.

16. Lobby the GLA to extend the London Cycle Hire Scheme westwards to include all these areas. Improve general conditions for cycling, including persuading local police to enforce the law where it most impinges on cycling safety - eg, motor vehicles encroaching in Advanced Stop Zones at traffic lights, use of mobile phones whilst driving, and parking in cycle lanes.

17. Please make the Piccadilly line stop at Ravenscourt Park. It is now a major tube stop since the Eastern European communities have moved here.

18. These objectives can be achieved by making the above areas friendlier for cyclists and pedestrians (dedicated cycle lanes and areas, pedestrian precincts).

19. All areas of population growth should have daily local services and retail facilities designed into them within easy walking distance to reduce the need to make road or rail journeys.

20. Encourage more cycling by improving the road network to make it safer and speedier

21. Ensure that cycling infrastructure is enhanced in the borough. From dedicated cycle lanes, cycle parking and improving road junctions to improve safety for cyclists.

22. (a) restrict availability of parking on new developments so as to encourage use of public transport (b) continue to discourage the "school run by car" culture (c) continue to make cycling a safer, viable option for all

23. Everyone's mad about cycling. Good if one is able to. But what about people who aren't. There should be more buses to help people like me who live between two very busy roads but have to walk 15mins to get on a bus. Blythe Rd should have a small hopper that would reduce the high number of cars that come to the 5 local schools around Brook Green.
24. Reduce business rates in areas where businesses are failing to develop. Some of the retail spaces around Shepherds Bush Green have been vacant for over a year. The W12 Centre is a ghost town. The council should be working with the landlords to find and support business tenants that make a positive impact on the borough.
25. Studies would be useful if they are actually taken seriously and residents are consulted all the way through the process with residents' views seen as vital.
26. Improve cycling provision and facilities. Work with cyclists to make joined up routes that feel safe and so encourage more people to use them and cycling to become more 'normal' like Holland
27. Transport does not end at the Borough boundary, adjoining Boroughs - particularly with regard to roads - must also be involved.
28. IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR CYCLING!
29. encourage small shops to open up. Put a limit on chain stores monopolizing our streets. No more Statbucks!!!!
30. Introduce / improve cycle routes. Bring cycle hire scheme to LBHF (and all other boroughs in zone 2)
31. Provision for cyclists particularly well thought out cycle lanes are lacking in most of the borough
32. More roads will just mean more cars. Better public transport, better pedestrian and most importantly (in keeping with the 2026 London cycling target) better cycling facilities will make these regeneration areas nicer places to live and work, and therefore make them more attractive to people looking to live/work there.
33. Better pedestrian facilities and town centre improvements. Less guard rail and street clutter and additional planting might encourage people to walk and use town centres more.
34. Restrict population growth, as transport is already overcrowded
35. A fast-speed rail link will bring thousands of jobs and regenerate a deprived area. Will have a much bigger impact than some new buses or more transport studies.
36. Provide a range of alternatives to car use and promote local business to business relationships to reduce reliance on goods and services from outside the region.

### **Summary**

**The most popular comments for objective one were relating to improving cycling conditions in the borough for existing and new trips, followed by improving public transport and walking trips. This is not surprising given the limited scope for providing additional road capacity to support development.**

**The targets set out in the body of the transport plan to increase the percentage of trips by bike or on foot confirm our commitment to improving conditions for these trips in our borough. This can only be achieved through targeted engineering improvements through our capital programme and continued promotion of these modes through training and campaigns. Likewise the two bus reliability targets, one strategic and one local, reflect the performance of the public transport in the network we have some influence over (road efficiency).**

---

## Objective 2 – road efficiency

The following six delivery actions were offered to support this objective in order of their relative popularity with respondents (132 in total):

<b>Promote sustainable and active modes of travel through a tailored ‘smarter travel’ programme of initiatives.</b>	<b>24%</b>
Work with and take swift action with regards to utility companies to reduce delays caused by their work on the road.	<b>22%</b>
Support the TfL traffic signal timing review programme and consult on the remove unnecessary traffic signals.	<b>19%</b>
Review on street restrictions and enforcement protocols to ensure they are appropriate and as part of the controlled parking zone review programme.	<b>12%</b>
Review network performance data and develop schemes to improve flow of all traffic at congestion “hotspots”.	<b>12%</b>
Assess road condition and prioritise resurfacing based on condition and available budgets	<b>11%</b>

Thirty-six additional comments were received in response to this objective as below:

### Do you think anything else can be done to support objective 2?

1. remove excessive 'street furniture' to avoid confusion. Promote and install cycling lanes
2. Work with and take swift action with regards to utility companies to reduce delays caused by their work on the road. Promote sustainable and active modes of travel through a tailored ‘smarter travel’ programme of initiatives. Support the TfL traffic signal timing review programme and consult on the remove unnecessary traffic signals.
3. The key is sustainable and active travel. Cycling will be a vital component of this.
4. Increase frequency of bus service. Enforce no parking regulations in bus lanes.
5. The key thing is to reduce demand for single occupancy car travel by promoting cycling and public transport
6. Ensure that companies within the area have to pay for parking to deter people from using their cars. increase the amount of cycle training for the young so they grow up relying on the bike and not the car.
7. Consider sensible solutions to known problems - for instance: peak traffic on roads around the junction of Margravine Gardens and Palliser Road (Barons Court). Perhaps parking should be reduced to ensure there is roadwidth for passing cars? Perhaps a width restriction should be erected to stop large lorries using the route as a shortcut and then getting stuck in the tight turns? Relatively small measures could make a big difference. However, nearby, on Gliddon Road, signs have recently appeared banning U-turns. Clearly these have been installed to limit problems caused by cars blocking traffic by such manoeuvres but the result of this is that traffic wanting to turn right off the eastbound A4 is now forced to travel much further - either via Hammersmith or via North End Road, adding to the congestion on these sites. Was this the most sensible solution?
8. Remove traffic by promoting alternative transport.
9. Yes. 1) Re-instate the congestion charge. 2) Encourage developers to work together to ensure that a number of construction projects & initiatives take place at the same time to stop the



continuous digging up and patching of the roads in our Borough. Using the Goldhawk Rd as an example, various development works have taken place over the last 24 - 36 months whereby the road has been ripped up, replaced, dug up, repaired, etc. Surely, it's been done at additional taxpayer cost and at enormous inconvenience to local businesses and residents.

10. The key is to reduce the volume of traffic on the borough's roads and that should be done by (a) improving public transport, and (b) increasing car parking charges to discourage drivers.

11. Increase road and parking capacity as much as possible.

12. Improve facilities for pedestrians and cycling. Lobby for the new bike hire scheme to be available locally and for it to accept Oyster cards. Incentives to discourage personal car use and encourage sustainable transport.

13. Offer free or cheap parking to stimulate business.

14. Make utility companies finish joint & coordinated work (wherever possible) at priority hotspots (such as Shepherd's Bush Green) within the absolute minimum period required by working 24 hours per day if necessary. They should pay penalties if they exceed agreed time periods.

Shepherd's Bush Green roads seem to have been under one utility digging program another on a constant basis since I moved here in 1981, 29 years ago! This is frankly ridiculous and I hope now that plastic yellow gas pipes and blue plastic water pipes are being installed this will come to an end. It is utterly exhausting, unsightly, frustrating and damages the economy. Surely it must end sometime!

15. Yes. Dismantle ridiculous restrictions on mobility imposed by the previous council/travel plans. For instance cut out chicanes such as found at Peterborough Road that just cause congestion without yielding any real benefit. Ensure no repeat of barmy ideas such as narrowing the street at Fulham Broadway and King Street through unnecessary pavement widening. Restrict hours on bus lanes - for instance the daft Saturday morning restriction on Fulham Palace Road when there's few commuters. This will stop bunching up, as will persuading LB Wandsworth/TFL to curb their excessive 24 hour bus lane after Putney Bridge.

16. Reduce reliance on roads by encouraging people to not own a car or take a taxi and by taking transport or cycling instead.

17. More safety for cyclists

18. Reduce amount of motorised traffic by giving priority to cycles and pedestrians in new planning.

19. Try the "carrot" approach, rather than relying on penalties, in order to tame and reduce car traffic. Car sharing schemes and alternatives to the school run (guided walking and cycling) are programmes already implemented throughout London.

20. Continue to allow motorbikes to travel in bus lanes.

21. Instead of focusing on cars, to improve the efficiency of the network the focus should be on facilitating people to cycle and walk. This would improve the efficiency of the network.

22. (a) allow "turn left on red" at selected junctions (b) if there are going to be yellow boxes at junctions, enforce them; they are not enforced at present

23. Think about people who can't walk very far and who do not have a blue badge. They need their cars too you know to get about.

24. Get some Boris bikes, more car club cars, and less on-street parking.

25. MAintain consistent traffic light phasing. Get Westfield pull in and drop off into dedicated pull ins on Wood Lane, providing more than exists.

26. The 'smarter travel' programme of initiatives could be promising but I did not tick that box as I am not sure what exactly it entails at this point.

27. See answer to Q3 above. Little faith in TfL, there are too many absurd traffic light sequences (which Boris promised to change and has done nothing) to believe that traffic flow is within their capability. Set up a citizens 'common sense' panel to advise.

28. IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR CYCLING!

29. Introduce / improve cycle routes. Bring cycle hire scheme to LBHF (and all other boroughs in zone 2)

30. more widespread use of 20mph limits together with appropriate enforcement will help to even out traffic speeds, cut crashes, and enhance safety for walking and cycling as alternatives to short car journeys

31. Improve congestion and reduce road maintenance budgets by supporting a move away from single occupancy cars and towards sustainable forms of transport such as cycling.
32. Better information on roadworks so people can avoid areas with known problems. Finish roadworks more quickly by working extended hours and possibly at night. I don't think that a lane rental system is guaranteed to work – it could just end up with consumers being charged more as utilities pass on costs. There should be penalties for companies that fail to complete works within a reasonable period of time.
33. Roads are often blocked because selfish people park their cars with emergency lights on so they can buy milk or fast food. Make all major links red-routes. Put decent cycle lanes along all major roads. Ban people from driving their children to local schools
34. Promote flexible working time in the borough to reduce 'peak flow'. Promote alternatives to car travel for school children and teaching staff. Increase bus lane network to make improve reliability and efficiency of bus transport. Introduce punitive measures to car travel at peak times to smooth peak flow
35. Remove the pedestrian crossing at the traffic lights/crossing junction of North End Road and Talgarth Road so vehicles can turn left (into Talgarth Road from NER)and not create tailbacks down North End Road towards Fulham Bdwy.

### **Summary**

**Again the most common response was to improve conditions and promote cycling as an alternative to the car in order to reduce congestion on our road network.**

**The second most common response was the specific use of traffic management tools in order to get the most out of the existing road network. Other common themes were; to promote walking and the pedestrian environment, the co-ordination of road waorks and the use of enforcement.**

**The annual programme of investment detailed in the LIP2 delivery plan shows how we promote suatainable and active modes of transport through our Smarter Travel projects, while through our Neighbourhoods and Corridors programme we seek targetted improvements to our road network to unlock local capacity, whilst not creating conditions that releases supressed demand.**

---

### **Objective 3 – quality streets**

The following seven delivery actions were offered to support this objective in order of their relative popularity with respondees (130 in total):

<b>To minimise the amount of unnecessary street furniture in new schemes and prioritise the review of existing street furniture.</b>	<b>25%</b>
To plant more street trees where possible.	<b>22%</b>
To continue to utilise the 'streetsmart' design guide and its overriding principles of delivering streets that are well designed and well engineered.	<b>13%</b>
To consult extensively on highway improvement schemes to secure the necessary support to implement.	<b>12%</b>
To develop an annual justified programme of highway improvement schemes.	<b>12%</b>
To complete the Wayfinding signing strategy in the three town centres.	<b>8%</b>
To ensure that every street in the borough will be part of an area based project as part of our highways investment programme.	<b>8%</b>

Twenty-eight additional comments were received in response to this objective as below:

**Do you think anything else can be done to support objective 3?**

1. To minimise the amount of unnecessary street furniture in new schemes and prioritise the review of existing street furniture.
2. One of the main threats to the quality of our streets is their abuse by drivers - especially freight drivers - as shortcuts and rat-runs. I support all measures to prevent this.
3. More sympathy for cyclists
4. Quality and \*even\* pavement surfaces, reducing clutter and unnecessary signage. Try to provide a pleasant and tidy environment for pedestrians and an urban environment which does not feel like it is centred around car use.
5. Remove traffic calming features.
6. Reduction in traffic volume and noise.
7. Add bicycle schemes and bike parking bays/stands when reviewing street furniture and design. For example bike parking stands can be part of 'safety' designs instead of railings as pavement borders. The more we encourage bikes the less cars and cars should give way to bikes ... not the other way round. Bike schemes and road markings are a good way of forcing cars to drive more slowly, more carefully and more safely.
8. Have options in plain English not gibberish. Have links on any words that need explaining. Cut out road humps that damage vehicle axles. Stop the spread of 20mph zones and avoid the use of hyped average speed cameras. Fix potholes as soon as they arise, as delay makes repair more expensive.
9. Leave an online form with a Google map point picker for cyclists & drivers to highlight poor roading, that way you can be alerted of issues promptly in order to patch the road before it becomes an even bigger and more expensive problem.
10. Pedestrianise major streets. Remove cars from Fulham Broadway and Hammersmith station areas.
11. have more room for people who are walking and cycling. Yes reduce unnecessary street furniture. You need a link to streetsmart design guide -what is it?
12. Wider pavements, physically segregated cycle lanes and less chaotic parking arrangements for cars (esp. cars belonging to residents) will improve the quality of our streets.
13. Street furniture and street lamps of more traditional design makes streets more welcoming and friendlier places to walk.
14. Ensure that designs make pedestrian and cycling as easy and pleasant as possible. Ensure that works in the historic parts of the borough are treated sensitively.

15. By reducing speed limits and encouraging more people to cycle (and less to drive)
16. Consultations can be skewed/packed by bussing-in; inviting people to local involvement & feedback from daily users will give a fairer view BUT ONLY if that feedback is then acted upon. A lot of things round the borough must have looked good on paper but are dangerous on the ground.
17. Clean up the pavements, particularly the gum around the tube station. K&C seem to be souring their pavements using some kind of machine - if you go up Addison Gardens to the K&C side, all the way to the end the pavement suddenly looks like new. I think they sand-blast it or something. Anyway it seems to work. Separately there must be some way of motivating people not to drop gum outside the tube station. Where I work, in Caxton Road, there is \*always\* rubbish on the street, particularly outside a building near the Uxbridge Road end. Perhaps a combination of fining the residents and providing better rubbish bins for them to use would help solve this. Finally, organisations should not be allowed to set up stalls outside the tube station. Literally every day there are charity collectors, paintball people, and radical religious people - particularly 'Scientology' sellers. I urge the council to prevent these people from selling this utter nonsense to the vulnerable people of our borough.
18. Insist on clearer signage for Westfield car park on Wood Lane and Shepherds Bush Green. Keep up with the swift removal of flytipping, posters, graffiti etc to ensure areas are constantly aesthetically pleasing which encourages people to keep it that way. Maintain all street cleaning.
19. Keep up with the swift removal of flytipping posters, graffiti etc to ensure areas are constantly aesthetically pleasing which encourages people to keep it that way. More trees are definitely a good idea. Also ensure all streets are well lit all through the night so residents feel safe and secure in a pleasant environment.
20. IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR CYCLING!
21. get rid of the masses of For Sale signs. Fine dog owners who allow their dogs to foul the streets.
22. design for lower speeds to improve the quality of streets for walkers and cyclists punish dog owners who allow their pests to contaminate the pavement, ditto litter louts including smokers dropping fag ends now that perfectly good receptacles have been provided and are emptied at council tax payers expense
23. Consult with different users such as cyclists for example.
24. Pedestrianise major areas that are currently massive traffic magnets, remove unnecessary street clutter and furniture, and encourage people to leave their cars at home by building and promoting first class cycling facilities in the area.
25. Take a look at Kensington High Street and use that as an inspiration.
26. Penalise badly behaved cyclists who have no regard for pedestrians Redo the pavement outside the Lyric to make it less slippery
27. Prioritise demand from pedestrians and cyclists making effective links between the different public transport modes and the town centres.
28. To not use any budget on posters and lampost banners proclaiming what a great borough we are and we're so clean, etc. Use this for actually keeping it clean, if it's clean we'll see it for ourselves.

### **Summary**

**Once more cycling featured heavily - in that it can reduce the amount of cars on our roads and create a nice environment in which to live and work. The collection of litter was also a popular comment and, whilst outside the remit of a transportation plan, this will be passed onto colleagues in Waste Management. Other popular comments included general decluttering, even footways and reducing the flow of traffic all of which are high level outputs from our extensive programme of investment detailed in the delivery plan within the LIP2.**

## Objective 4 – Improved air quality

The following five delivery actions were offered to support this objective in order of their relative popularity with respondees (132 in total):

<b>To plant more street trees where possible</b>	<b>30%</b>
To promote sustainable and active modes of travel through a tailored 'smarter travel' programme of initiatives	<b>26%</b>
To promote the use of cleaner vehicles through parking permit policies	<b>18%</b>
To install car club and electric charging bays where appropriate	<b>14%</b>
To continue to provide travel planning assistance for all schools and businesses in the borough	<b>10%</b>

Thirty-five additional comments were received in response to this objective as below:

### Do you think anything else can be done to support objective 4?

1. Promote cycling by installing cycling lanes and offering cycling safety classes for children
2. To promote the use of cleaner vehicles through parking permit policies. To Install car club and electric charging bays where appropriate.
3. The objective must be to reduce motor traffic densities. This can only be achieved by substituting sustainable modes of transport.
4. Enforce current vehicle anti pollution measures. make resident parking bays for residents only not for ticket holders as well thus discouraging people from car use. Stop aircraft landing flight paths over the area. More pedestrianisation and/or vehicle restrictions
5. Easier cycling
6. Improve traffic flow to reduce pollution from standing traffic. I don't support any of the five options given but am forced to choose one
7. It is very important not to think that just because a vehicle is electric or low on emissions that it is ok - people have to be persuaded that cycling and walking is healthier and perfectly safe and possible. To re-introduce Policing of the streets so that car drivers who disobey the rules are penalised so that pedestrians and cyclists feel safe.
8. Reduce vehicular traffic. Promote walking and cycling and improve facilities, particularly for local trips but also as a commuting option. Ensure that delivery vehicles have enough access to allow shopping delivery services etc which can help reduce car dependency.
9. 1) Plant more trees. 2) Encourage electric and hybrid cars through parking schemes. 3) Re-instate the congestion charge.
10. Reduce unnecessary delays to traffic, for example traffic signals. Increase road and parking capacity as much as possible.
11. Segregated pedal cycle lane allowing bikes to travel West along the northern side of Hammersmith Broadway gyratory. The current arrangement - where bikes heading from Hammersmith Rd towards King St must travel around 3 sides of the gyratory with lane changing traffic - is dangerous and unnecessary. Extend eastbound cycle lane on King St all the way to the gyratory, allowing a more direct route for cycle traffic heading East.
12. Bike improvement and encouragement schemes.
13. Recognise that air quality is most damaged by diesel vehicles; petrol ones are relatively clean. Carbon dioxide is given off by all living creatures and is not a pollutant that ruins air quality, so don't waste time penalising the irrelevant. Keep traffic moving. Open roads more quickly after closure (cf A4 Cromwell Road incident). Have signage so that vehicles do not avoid snarled-up areas.

14. Children do not need to be dropped off at school in a car each – organise some walking buses for use instead.
15. Non-polluting buses!
16. Re-instate the air quality monitoring stations at Hammersmith Broadway and Brook Green. Improving air quality is a laudable aim, but (as I'm sure you're well aware) it's rather cynical to say you want to do it when you can't even measure it.
17. All of the above, plus cycling and walking as alternatives to driving.
18. Encourage neighbourhoods that are walkable with daily facilities within easy walking distance. Discourage big box retail that is designed to attract motorists from miles around.
19. To positively support walking and cycling over motor vehicles by changing priorities.
20. Cars = air quality problems. The borough is a route into and out of London, and thus the Borough should push for an extension of the western extension of the congestion charge to include LBHF, and ensure that the Mayor delivers on the LEZ.
21. Charge less, for "cleaner" cars, for: - resident's parking - non-resident parking - car parks in the borough (ie. make some hybrid-only)
22. Introduce school buses especially along Blythe Rd where there are 5 local schools.
23. We need quieter, cleaner, smaller vehicles on the roads, so the council should structure incentives to support that. Charge more to park the most polluting vehicles (Richmond has a scheme like this), or indeed simply the larger the vehicle, the more you pay.
24. Endorse the TPO and extend them.
25. Continue to charge for non-residents to park in the borough to discourage them from driving in.
26. Air quality doesn't seem a problem to me - no available statistics to 'be concerned about'.
27. IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR CYCLING!
28. increase "Green" public transport
29. Introduce / improve cycle routes. Bring cycle hire scheme to LBHF (and all other boroughs in zone 2)
30. more widespread use of 20mph limits together with appropriate enforcement will help to even out traffic speeds, which will lower emissions and will also enhance safety for walking and cycling as alternatives to short car journeys, thereby contributing to modal shift away from car use and better air quality. there would also be fewer crashes which cause congestion and long polluting idling traffic queues
31. Encourage cleaner forms of transport.
32. Promote walking and cycling in the borough by removing the current car prioritisation thinking, create more bus and cycle lanes to improve peoples use of public transport. Essentially, anything to cut down on the number of cars and HGVs moving through.
33. Stop laying on more smelly polluting buses. Look at if unburnt kerosene emissions from planes are a problem
34. Stop people from the suburbs driving through our borough to work or to drive their children to work each day. Remove one lane on the A4 heading into London
35. Remove the pedestrian crossing at the traffic lights/crossing junction of North End Road and Talgarth Road so vehicles can turn left (into Talgarth Road from NER) and not create (Co2 omission producing) tailbacks down North End Road towards Fulham Bdwy.

### **Summary**

**Promoting cycling topped a varied list of alternatives which included; providing school buses, land use planning policies to reduce the need to travel and freight consolidation. Promoting walking was the second most popular comment, followed by smoothing traffic, then reducing pollution from buses and reducing the levels of traffic on our roads.**

**We have set very challenging air quality targets for 2025 that will only be met through a combination of approaches including those mentioned above, through our existing programmes of investment.**

## Objective 5 – Improve transport opportunities

The following five delivery actions were offered to support this objective in order of their relative popularity with respondees (106 in total):

<b>To support improvements to the accessibility of bus, underground and overground rail services</b>	<b>29%</b>
Provide high quality, uncluttered footways	<b>24%</b>
To protect dropped kerbs and designated crossing points from obstructions through existing programmes of investment	<b>16%</b>
To ensure that every street in the borough will be part of an area based project as part of our highways investment programme	<b>16%</b>
To develop and prioritise a programme of access improvements to bus stations and bus stops	<b>14%</b>

Twenty-two additional comments were received in response to this objective as below:

### Do you think anything else can be done to support objective 5?

1. clear excess 'street furniture' provide more safe places to lock bicycles
2. To develop and prioritise a programme of access improvements to busstations and bus stops. To ensure that every street in the borough will be partof an area based project as part of our highways investment programme.
3. A high proportion of journeys in the borough could be easily done on footwere the footpaths not so cluttered. Providing high quality footpaths isimportant.
4. Lifts, escalators and more frequent services.
5. Smooth and simple pavements. Uncomplicated access. Dropped kerbs andaccessibility should be built into everything that is done - included pavementdeviations due to works etc. Should not be viewed as an afterthought.
6. None of your suggestions above will work. I resent being forced by yourprogram to choose an option I oppose as the least worst one. NOTE: I do notsupport the one I have ticked, ut I oppose the others more. Reduceunnecessary delays to traffic, for example traffic signals. Increase road andparking capacity as much as possible.
7. better facilities for cyclists at train and tube stations
8. Transport opportunities in the borough are actually very good on the whole. But the more people that bike the more we free up public transport generally and the less cars we have on the road, which allows public transport (buses inparticular) to move faster. The Old Oak Common link to Crossrail (mentioned above) would be also be a major strategic improvement in connection with Objective 5 and should proceed.
9. Provide better car parking near stations, particularly Hammersmith and Parsons Green, to allow modal interconnection. Investigate using derelict land as parking for commuters to relieve parking stress.
10. As above - try and get the cycle hire scheme put further West so that people can be connected to public transport more easily.
11. Fix the pavements, make them wider.
12. Make cycling facilities that suit novice as well as experienced cyclists. Ideally segregated cycle lanes where possible, where fast cyclists can continue to use the roadway. Extend central London bike hire scheme to H&F. Combat cycle theft.
13. Agree with these points. Bus stops not always easy to access for people in wheelchairs or with children.

14. Make more shared space streets where appropriate. Giving pedestrians and motorists equal right of access to streets makes for safer, calmer and friendlier streets that are not dominated by cars but allow motor vehicles.
15. c
16. Local involvement & feedback from daily users.
17. and that every long road has a bus going through it like BLYTHE RD. Ban people from cycling along pavements!!!! Fine them on the spot!!!! also people who speed in these electric wheel chairs!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
18. better information about bus routes in local newspapers
19. IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR CYCLING!
20. Train bus drivers properly. eg teach them patience, politeness and respect.
21. Make the visitor parking permit available to all parts of the Borough
22. If there were more cycle lanes then more people would be confident to cycle in the borough

**Summary**

**Once again cycling is the most popular comment with regards to improving transport accessibility such as improving routes to and parking facilities at public transport interchanges. Through the annual local transport fund we allocate funding to increase on street cycle parking based on customer feedback and available road space. This year we were one of the first boroughs to install cycle parking hoops on sign posts where the footway is too narrow for additional furniture.**

**The second most popular answer was to declutter and make our footways smoother and wider. Our annual programme of investment seeks to achieve this through our well established streetsmart audit approach. To date we have taken out over 1000 pieces of redundant street furniture not including over 2km of pedestrian guard rail.**

---

**Objective 6 – Fair Parking**

The following five delivery actions were offered to support this objective in order of their relative popularity with respondees (98 in total):

<b>The introduction of new parking schemes such as dedicated car club bays to reduce the cost and reliance on private cars</b>	<b>29%</b>
To continue a rolling review of controlled parking zone hours of operation and restrictions	<b>21%</b>
The introduction of flexible charging options for parking	<b>18%</b>
To ensure that the number of parking bays are maximised wherever possible taking safety and accessibility into account	<b>18%</b>
To ensure the appropriate provision for blue badge holders	<b>12%</b>

Twenty-two additional comments were received in response to this objective as below:



### **Do you think anything else can be done to support objective 6?**

1. promote more short stay spaces on high streets. provide 'visitor parking' throughout the borough. eradicate 'red lines' no stopping. (you have enough meter attendants out there to stop people abusing a 5 minute stay policy)
2. To continue a rolling review of CPZ hours of operation and restrictions. The Introduction of flexible charging options for parking. To ensure the appropriate provision for blue badge holders.
3. Introduce Parking Restrictions on Sundays - those who cannot or do not drive are disenfranchised by those who drive and park willy-nilly and therefore hold up the buses.
4. Consider installing 10-min 'quick-stop' parking bays (where appropriate) by local shops - for passing traffic.
5. The focus should be on a reduction of car ownership as this is the only long-term solution as the population increases. Therefore any schemes encouraging alternative transport or the use of shared resources (car clubs, bus etc) should be the first line of attack. Don't increase private parking provision as this only encourages the problem. H&F is not the countryside, it's possible to live without a vehicle for many people in the borough.
6. Strongly opposed to any measures to limit parking. In general object to CPZ's. Support a review, provided it is targeted at removing restrictions. Reduce unnecessary delays to traffic, for example traffic signals. Increase road and parking capacity as much as possible.
7. Residents need visitor permits for their visitors
8. We need to also consider encouraging reasonable short-term parking facilities (ie 20 or 30 minutes) wherever possible for shops or we may damage the local economy and reasonable convenience for some residents who may have disabilities or young children which makes shopping via buses and public transport very difficult. In areas like Uxbridge Road at some times of the day it is practically impossible to pop into the shops if you are passing by car. Or if you are looking for a particular item and need to visit a number of shops and time is short.
9. Publicise visitor's permits scheme better. Stop excessive match day restrictions - restrictions should be at max two hours either side of a game.
10. Fewer disabled spots, they are always empty.
11. Discourage car ownership and especially ownership of oversized cars...
12. Please don't assume that all customers and users of services arrive by car. Look at Kensington High Street in your neighbouring borough - lots of successful shops, hardly any parking directly outside them, and the central reservation is full of (well-used) cycle parking. You may draw your own conclusions ...
13. If possible, our streets should be as free as possible from parking cars. Channeling outside visitors to car parks (eg Westfield) would ease congestion.
14. Have dedicated short stay parking bays for business customers.
15. The number of parking spaces should be reduced to facilitate more space for dedicated cycling lanes and associated infrastructure. Reducing the number of cars on the roads, e.g. King St, would improve the streetscape and potentially be advantageous to business in the borough.
16. I both live AND work in the borough, but my home is not eligible for parking permits, and my business isn't either. This certainly doesn't seem fair to me (I have to lease a private parking space). Businesses pay substantial rates, and should be given at least limited parking rights. Rather than zoning some households as car-free, as you have mine, which is very unfair, you can simply set up a market in residents permits. All residents should be entitled to (buy) a permit, but if they waive that right, they get some kind of incentive like a bicycle subsidy. Increase the cost of residents permits in areas close to public transport hubs.
17. Clamp down on misuse of blue badge misuse that derauds councils of legitimate revenue, denies genuine users of appropriate spaces and cause residents severe inconvenience.
18. Worth reviewing CPZ hours of operation and restrictions but they should be kept. Residents must be able to always have space to park and non-residents must be charged to prevent them from dropping their cars off and taking up spaces residents need, and clogging up the borough's roads. Residents' needs must be taken into account first and beyond those of non-residents who wish to park in the borough.
19. IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR CYCLING!

- 20. Have limited free parking with a disc system like they have in Harrogate
- 21. Promote alternatives to car ownership and use.
- 22. Standardise restricted parking hours throughout the borough where ever possible not as it is at present.

**Summary**

**The most popular suggestion was for the increased implementation of short stay or shoppers bays at our many commercial areas and town centres. So far we have installed these on Goldhawk Road and Askew Road and are planning to install more over the next three years**

**The remaining comments were fragmented and often contradictory with some wishing to see a lighter touch with regards to enforcement and a lessening of restrictions. However other responses called for tougher enforcement, especially on blue badge matters, and to increase enforcement activities.**

**We are well aware that parking is an emotive topic and that everyones needs are different. It is because of this that we will continue to engage as much as possible with our stakeholders in developing and designing parking solutions that meet the needs of the communities we serve.**

**Objective 7 – safer streets**

The following six delivery actions were offered to support this objective in order of their relative popularity with respondees (148 in total):

<b>To continue to provide free cycle training to all schools in the borough</b>	<b>20%</b>
To promote sustainable and active modes of travel through a tailored ‘smarter travel’ programme of initiatives	<b>18%</b>
To review annual casualty data across the borough to advise and prioritise highway investment programmes	<b>18%</b>
To enforce traffic restrictions effectivley using innovative methods where appropriate	<b>16%</b>
To continue to provide free cycle training to adults who work, study or live in the borough.	<b>14%</b>
To promote safety improvements to TfL roads (A4, A40 and A3220)	<b>12%</b>

Thirty-three additional comments were received in response to this objective as below:

## Do you think anything else can be done to support objective 7?

1. create more 'cycle lanes' and ensure that they are kept clear for cyclists only. Reduce lengthy road works which clutter roads and encourage people to cross in unsafe places. Time traffic lights to prevent drivers 'jumping' lights
2. To promote safety improvements to TfL's roads (A4, A40 and A3220 West Cross Route). To review annual casualty data across the borough to advise and prioritise highway investment programmes. To continue to provide free cycle training for adults who work, study or live in the borough. To continue to provide free cycle training to all schools in the borough. To promote sustainable and active modes of travel through a tailored 'smarter travel' programme of initiatives.
3. improve pedestrian crossings on busy roads.
4. Reduce traffic volumes and speeds outside trunk roads. Provide better crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. Segregated cycle lanes down major roads to ensure that cars, bicycles and pedestrians are properly separated!
5. 1) Simply reduce the number of cars, vans, etc on the roads. This can be done by: - Re-instating the congestion charge and include the area west of Holland Park Rd and the Shepherds Bush roundabout. - Introducing more cycling paths and cycling super highways and giving more space to cyclists - Installing more pedestrian crosswalks - particularly in areas such as the Goldhawk Rd enabling people to go via foot- currently it's virtually impossible to cross that road safely. Just count the zebra crossings or crosswalks from Paddenswick Rd to Shepherds Bush Green. The cross walks are too few. Cars rule that road.
6. Discourage risky modes of travel, especially P2W + cycling. Promote young driver training in schools.
7. Better cycling facilities especially at key junctions.
8. Educate pedestrians and cyclists on the dangers, particularly those who walk / cycle whilst listening to music / talking on mobile phones.
9. Segregated pedal cycle lane allowing bikes to travel West along the northern side of Hammersmith Broadway gyratory. The current arrangement – where bikes heading from Hammersmith Rd towards King St must travel around 3 sides of the gyratory with lane changing traffic - is dangerous and unnecessary. Extend eastbound cycle lane on King St all the way to the gyratory, allowing a more direct route for cycle traffic heading East.
10. Better bicycle routes and more of them - which can also be used as traffic calming measures.
11. Have suggestions that will actually deliver improvements not skirt around the problem. Better road safety education for children. Bigger fines for dangerous litter droppers, drunk drivers, inconsiderate cyclists and daft pedestrians who walk out glued to their phone or iPod. Consider banning them from council facilities and privileges such as discounts.
12. Provide pedestrian training too - according to a wider London survey, more casualties happen to pedestrians - mainly because they do not look both ways. Have staff at peak busy points demonstrating & encouraging people to look both ways and be careful of hazards (e.g. crossing on a red man, cyclists coming down the side of a bus)
13. How many ARE killed and what number do you want to achieve? Bit of a wishy washy target.
14. Ensure new developments prioritise cycling and pedestrian safety over traffic speeds. Enforce rules on driving e.g. speeding, using mobiles while driving
15. Reduce "crunch areas", where bus lanes and cycle paths abruptly end and merge with car traffic. Shepherd's Bush Green is a big accident waiting to happen....
16. Make more shared space streets.
17. try harder to keep roads in a reasonable condition to reduce dangers to cyclists
18. Reduce speed limits and prevent cars parking in cycle lanes.
19. Enforcement is the key work here: if the Police across London cannot be bothered to support enforcement (I have lots of experience of a "this is not important" approach) then it's not going to happen. Why stick to 20mph (no-one's there to stop you)? Why not use your mobile (no one stops you)? Who cares about cyclists (knocking one over doesn't lead to investigation let alone prosecution)? Why observe yellow boxes (no one stops you)? Why observe forward cycling boxes (even the police stop in them)? Can I challenge "continue to provide free cycle training for

all schools in the borough" please? Neither of my (private school) kids have been offered this: clearly their safety does not matter. If you're only trying to save the lives of state school kids, why not be honest and say so?

20. I don't really feel the roads in the borough are that dangerous.

21. Help promote walking in the Borough.

22. Road safety initiatives are important. Traffic restrictions should be enforced effectively as long as they actually are there for road safety and in the interests of residents.

23. Make cycling safer - you need to talk to cyclists. Schemes are often ill thought out and can feel dangerous to use - could be so much better without extra cost

24. No idea of the extent of the 'problem'. Statistics/facts please.

25. IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR CYCLING!

26. Make sure there is film in speed cameras to deter drivers from speeding. Higher fines for speeding.

27. Introduce / improve cycle routes segregating them from motor traffic wherever possible and ensuring they do not abruptly end at roundabouts / other junctions

28. I've seen scooters: riding across Lyric square, going up one way streets the wrong way and taking shortcuts across the pavement at the Worlidge Street/Hammersmith ridge road. PCSOs only seem concerned about cyclists riding on pavements, but quite often there is no safe alternative convenient. Try going from Tesco in Shepherds Bush road to Frank Banfield Park and you'll see how unhelpful the recommended cycle routes really are. You need to get a cyclist to review your cycle lanes. A half mile detour in a car is easy. On a bike in the middle of winter a half mile detour is a lot less appealing. King Street is a hazard for cyclists. Heading East the cycle lane only goes half way before diverting you off your route. Heading West there is no cycling provision. Only a road that randomly gets wider and narrower, an unnecessary danger for cyclists.

29. more widespread use of 20mph limits together with appropriate enforcement will not only cut the number and severity of crashes but also enhance the relative attractiveness of cycling and walking... and the more people that cycle and walk instead of taking the car for a short journey, the safer it becomes to walk and cycle for everyone, this is a virtuous circle to exploit, it's high time the massive dominance of the motor car and its intimidation of all other road users was challenged - it is simply not an appropriate vehicle for most journeys in an urban environment

30. Promote cycling as a major form of transport in the borough, and increase traffic calming measures to discourage excessive speeding and to reduce the number of HGVs passing through.

31. Better road safety education in preference to speed cameras. Parents must take responsibility for their children who just seem to run into traffic when they feel like it

32. Promote reduction in car use and impose restrictions on goods vehicles at peak times.

33. Free cycle training?? never heard of this excellent idea - perhaps those involved should shout about it a bit more!

## **Summary**

**Improving the cycling routes in the borough featured highly again along with increasing the continuity of cycle routes. Cycle superhighway 9 and 10 are proposed to be delivered in the next three years which will provide continuous, segregated and high profile cycle facilities for all levels of user.**

**The second most popular response was request for increased enforcement of the various restrictions on the road; from red light running to parking in cycle lanes. Enforcement, along with education (3<sup>rd</sup> most popular response) and engineering (see above) form the cornerstone of any road safety strategy, and one which we have embedded into our annual programme of investment.**

---

Ten responses were received outside the web consultation which included the response from the disability forum who listed their main priorities as:

1. High Speed rail link and Crossrail - provided there are good bus links from all parts of the borough to these accessible services
2. Improvements to bus services (including tackling congestion to improve bus priority; accessible bus stops/shelters/frequency etc) because we cannot see much improvement in stepfree access to either the underground or overground after 2015
3. Improvements to the pedestrian environment both to make pavements, dropped kerbs and crossings accessible to disabled residents but also to increase the numbers of people walking. We are disappointed that there are no targets for increasing walking in the borough.
4. Ensuring blue badge holders can park where they need to in the borough..

- **Stage 3 consultation**

The final stage of consultation is submission of the Cabinet approved consultation LIP2 on 20 December 2010. Parallel to this, the full document was published on the council's website and comments were requested from stakeholders in the same way as at stage two.

The consultation draft LIP2 was published on the council's web site on 11 January 2011 and comments were sought from stakeholders for six weeks. During this time fifteen responses were received; five from individuals, eight from organisations and two from other local authorities. A full record of all responses received and the borough response is included below. Most of the responses do not require changes to the document but consist of detailed points which will be taken on board as part of our integrated transport programmes. The one change we have agreed with TfL in response to the consultation is to increase the cycling modal share target for 2031 from 5% to 8% as respondents thought that the previous target was insufficiently ambitious.

## **1. Tony Boys – King Henrys Reach Residents Association**

It's encouraging to see some importance given to improving road efficiency, by setting it as objective 2. The roads are the component of the transport infrastructure which has the most effect on people overall. However I don't see any metrics for road efficiency in the performance management schedule. Can some be added ?

As I'm sure you know, residents just trying to get to and from their homes in LBHF on the rare occasions when we need to travel by car often face huge queues and gridlock in this area and several times we have had to abandon our cars back at Chiswick or Ravenscourt Park and walk the rest of the way home, then go back and collect it in the early hours once the traffic has died down. Obviously this is completely unacceptable. I would suggest the following initiatives.

Red Routes - Of course the great success of the Westfields Shopping Centre has had the expected impact on North-South traffic. Surely the Fulham Palace Road and Shepherd's Bush Road as well as Hammersmith Broadway must now be made Red Routes ?

WEZ - Although the Western Extension Zone has been scrapped the congestion charge system overall works extremely well. Can we support the idea of a slightly more sophisticated road pricing approach to congestion charging for West London which discourages through traffic but not residents?

I imagine that you will support the Mayor's initiatives on plating and lane rental for improved control of road works, but is there anything that can be done to accelerate and reinforce these sorts of measures in LBHF? As I'm sure you know, we have had a really torrid couple of years with road works and it would be nice to get them back under control again.

I'm not sure how much you can influence the types of taxis on our roads, but I'm amazed that we are so far behind the many cities I visit which mandate hybrid taxis. By contrast our cronky old diesel powered taxis are noisy, dirty and smelly. How long before we can migrate them all to electric or hybrid ones? Are you supporting any initiatives in this direction ?

## 2. Andrew Jones - resident

I am writing to provide feedback concerning LBHF's draft Local Implementation Plan. I am an IT professional who lives in W12, works in the City of London, and travels daily by bus, underground, foot and bicycle through and around the borough. I am particularly interested in schemes which benefit pedestrian and cycle movement, and have a general interest in the urban realm and the development of cities into more liveable places, in particular the area in which I live.

I was pleased to read that cycling and walking are regarded highly by LBHF, but somewhat disappointed to see that despite the various problems faced by the borough which can be positively addressed by higher levels of active travel, the LIP actually does very little to promote either. In addition, I find the targeted modal share increase for cycling from 4% to 5% by 2031 to be extremely un-ambitious, considering the role that cycling can play in mitigating the many problems with transport in the borough. Comparing the draft LIPs of Hammersmith & Fulham and Hounslow boroughs strongly highlights the difference in approach between the two neighbours, as Hounslow repeatedly identifies increasing active travel (and particularly cycling) as a key part of its overall strategy, and discusses this in far more detail.

### ***Transport problems in the borough***

The relevant transport problems (as outlined in the Objectives document) are listed below:

- The congestion of road traffic and the overcrowding of rail services, particularly at peak times and particularly on the limited number of north-south road and rail routes in the borough
- The recent and predicted future growth in the demand for travel
- The environmental consequences of transport use, notably air quality, noise and visual intrusion
- Insufficient car parking supply to match increased demand (both on and off-street)
- Public transport service performance and provision
- The economic impact of transport/traffic conditions
- The impact of air travel on the borough
- Unpleasant or unsafe road conditions for vulnerable road users, i.e. pedestrians and cyclists.

This list shows the particular issues which be positively impacted by increasing the level of active travel, and particularly cycling, in the borough (in conjunction with the resulting decrease in other modes, including decrease in car ownership). Given that the list contains ***eight of the nine problems*** that the borough has outlined as negatively affecting transport, it would seem that cycling should be given a much higher priority.

### ***Advantageous characteristics of the borough***

The special characteristics of LBHF lend themselves uniquely to high levels of cycling. The following statements in the Objectives document are relevant to this topic.

*Nearly half of the population (45%) is between 19 and 40 years old. The borough has the second highest proportion (54.7%) of single adults in England and Wales. Four in ten (40.3%) households consist of one person. (Source 2001 census)*

Such a high proportion of young, single households is extremely conducive to high cycling rates, given appropriate conditions and encouragement. Car ownership and use can be extremely low within such a demographic, and this should be encouraged by ensuring that the alternatives are workable and attractive.

*Because transport links tend to be east-west in the borough, each town centre serves its local area.*

The existence of localised town centres for shopping, entertainment etc is perfect for bicycle use due to the shorter journeys involved. People are therefore able to avoid or minimise the use of major roads (given appropriate alternatives) which would be necessary for longer distances and which are a barrier for many potential cyclists.

*Smaller firms have become more important: 76 percent of businesses have fewer than five employees.*

While clearly much employment for residents lies outside the borough, the high number of smaller firms inside the borough brings opportunities to work closer to home. This contributes to the shortening of the "commute distance" which facilitates both walking and cycling to the workplace.

*Some of the busiest road junctions in London are located in the borough at Hammersmith Broadway, Shepherds Bush Green and Savoy Circus and the borough suffers disproportionately from the effects of through traffic*

High levels of through traffic, which are largely unavoidable, emphasise the need to get local users off the major roads. This is a role which cycling can easily play, due to the high number of very short (< 2 miles) journeys currently being made by car (or bus).

*The borough's residents are highly dependent on the Underground, with 36 percent of residents using it to travel to work.*

The Underground will always be a primary people-mover to transfer people to central London. As not everybody in the borough lives within easy walking distance to an Underground station, there is potential to move people off buses and onto bikes for this "to the tube" journey. In my personal experience (having made the same shift) this can not only reduce overall commute time, but provide more choice as to which Underground line to use as more stations are then within striking distance. While this may not help LBHF directly it does provide for more efficient transport overall and improve quality of life for LBHF residents.

Due to the above factors, I believe that actively pursuing a pro-cycling policy can result in a larger increase in modal share in LBHF than the modest targets would suggest. In my opinion



this can, and should, be viewed as an achievable way to help meet the objectives of the LIP, as well as provided unrelated benefits such as health improvements.

### ***Borough Transport Objectives***

The advantages of cycling can also be viewed in terms of the following Borough Transport Objectives.

*1. Support sustainable population and employment growth in the five regeneration areas - White City Opportunity Area, North Fulham Regeneration Area, Hammersmith Town and Riverside, South Fulham Riverside and Old Oak Common and Hythe Road area.*

To achieve any sort of growth without additional congestion, a “zero traffic growth” environment must be the goal for any regeneration or development. The schemes involved in the regeneration of these areas provide an opportunity (despite funding challenges) to provide facilities to encourage active travel and discourage motorised traffic if congestion is not to be significantly increased by the additional population and employment. There is virtually no mention of cycling in the Delivery Plan section related to this objective, despite the statement of setting “challenging targets”.

*2. Improve the efficiency of our road network*

While this is not directly related to cycling, I note the inclusion of the plan to improve cycling conditions on the A4. This is presumably one of the two options for CSH9, but like many cyclists in the borough I would encourage LBHF to strongly consider the A315 instead as it will allow us to directly reach many more useful destinations.

*3. Improve the quality of our streets*

By most measures, this will benefit from an increase in active travel and a decrease in motorised traffic. As seen in the proposal for Goldhawk Road, such plans on major roads do not have to result in a reduction in traffic flows and I look forward to seeing the plans for the scheme. In particular, I hope that real consideration will be given to improving conditions for cyclists who do not wish to cycle with the traffic to enable this corridor for casual cycling.

*4. Improve air quality in the borough*

Improved with less motorised traffic. I support the push for active travel to businesses and particularly to and from school, and hope that funding will be allocated to improve infrastructure to enable cycling to be undertaken in a manner which is perceived as safe by parents. This will also assist other potential cyclists who do not wish to cycle among traffic.

*7. Reduce the number of people injured and killed on our streets*

Improving safety of cyclists and pedestrians should be a goal in any event (and appears to be). While real safety should not be compromised, any measures taken to reduce the KSI of cyclists and pedestrians should also look at subjective safety to see if this can be increased at the same

time (ie the *feeling* of being safe, not just the reality). This will assist in encouraging those modes of travel as much as increasing actual safety.

I have some concern that adult cycle training is seen as such a significant component of achieving this. Presenting cycling as a sport-like activity which requires participants to dice with traffic with special training is not going to significantly increase modal share. While training may help with a minority of cases of “footpath cycling”, the root cause is the unpleasant on-road cycling experience on major borough roads, and this needs to be addressed rather than just trying to train people to “cope”. The majority of potential cyclists will never find cycling on-road on major routes desirable, unless traffic volumes and speeds are drastically reduced. It should be noted that the largest factor increasing safety for cyclists is an increase in the number of cyclists, and any measures which actually discourage cycling may end up having an adverse effect on overall safety.

On the other hand, training for children is essential and the continued funding by the borough should be applauded.

### ***Increasing cycling in the borough***

I believe that increasing cycling numbers in the borough, should be a priority, and that this can be achieved using the following measures:

- Produce a cycling strategy, integrated with neighbouring boroughs, which drives major schemes and is consulted to ensure that any local schemes will assist “the big picture”. This should be primarily focused on allowing local residents to cycle quickly and safely to and from transport hubs, entertainment, dining and shopping facilities, and should not exclude “everyday cyclists” who might not be prepared to cycle amongst heavy, fast-moving traffic.
- Ensure that cycle access to new developments (or redevelopments, such as Shepherd's Bush Market) is not only possible but as pleasant and safe as possible. Cycling parking should also be mandated.
- Embrace the young, single demographic and encourage them to increase their cycling rates; at the same time continuing to pushing children to walk/cycle to school.
- Accept that on-road cycling (on major routes) will always be the domain of the “brave few”, even with training, and where possible provide safe, segregated space for the rest of the population to cycle. Quiet back routes are also essential but should not be viewed as an alternative to proper direct routes.
- Ensure that whatever cycling infrastructure is in place is continuous and as useful as possible (eg the contra-flow on King Street which falls short of its potential due to where it stops)
- Support the TFL in the provision of the cycle super-highway through the borough and in particular, make decisions which help to prioritise cyclists over vehicles in terms of segregated space, mandatory lanes and/or parking restrictions.
- Implement a 20mph speed limit borough-wide on residential streets
- Implement permeability measures designed to reduce rat-running through residential streets (ie blocking through-roads to cars only). This has the advantage of creating quieter alternative routes for less-confident cyclists.

- Fund improvements to the area around stations to allow efficient cycle access. Encourage cycling to the station to help normalise cycling for daily use, where special clothing/showers etc are not required.

### ***Conclusion***

As mentioned earlier, I believe that the modal share target of 5% by 2031 is very low. I believe that LBHF should be aiming to have at least a 10% cycling modal share at that time. As LBHF already has a *relatively* (compared to other parts of London) high cycling modal share, this should be viewed as a good base on which to build, rather than a sign of success.

I would encourage the borough to consider incorporating the following changes into the LIP to reflect the role that cycling could potentially have in solving the transport problems of LBHF:

- Identify an increase in cycling (and active travel generally) as a primary objective of the LIP
- Increase the modal share target to at least 10% by 2031.
- Undertake the measures listed above (under section Increasing cycling in the borough) to try to achieve this modal share

Obviously the LIP is about far more than walking and cycling, and measures to improve road efficiency and public transport are essential. However I believe that the gains to be made by a concerted attempt to increase cycling can be both significant and extremely cost-effective and for this reason should be prioritised.

### **3. Keith Nethercott – Hurlingham District Residents Association**

I refer to clause 2.7 'Borough Transport Objectives' and refer in particular to two of the objectives 'improve the quality of our streets' and 'improve the air quality in the Borough'.

I also refer to 3.6 pages 40 'Neighbourhood Investment Programme' where it states 'our neighbourhoods are primarily places where people live rather than travel through'

In both of the above paragraphs there are key and reasonable objectives BUT nowhere in the plan is there reference to attempts to carry out the pledge. For instance reducing the level of through traffic (rat running) in the 'neighbourhoods where primarily people live' would achieve your claimed objective.

The Plan accepts the high volumes of vehicle through traffic but the Plan does not address the problem. No consideration is given to introducing traffic calming or any reference to, for example 20MPH schemes as in Walham Grove or proposed by Road Safety campaigners. There is no attempt at introducing one way systems that would further discourage 'through traffic in Residential streets.

The absence of any attempt to address the problem is very disappointing. It is clear that the problem is simply being ignored and the claim to improve the 'quality of our streets' and neighbourhoods is just a broad goal. Until the 'neighbourhood roads' have fewer 'rat runners' passing through at speed an increase in cycling will remain hazardous in what should be a calmer environment. Air quality will remain the same.

I would like the Council to adopt a more imaginative and positive approach to this problem as opposed to the benign position it has taken. We shall pursue this cause.

#### **4. John Griffiths – H&F cyclists**

I am pleased that the Draft LIP contains some measures to promote cycling, but in order to really address congestion, pollution, climate change, health and obesity issues a much more adventurous and less conservative approach is needed.

We responded to the first part of the LIP consultation in writing to Chris Bainbridge on 4 August 2010 following a meeting with Chris on 19 July 2010. I and Gerhard Weiss had a further meeting with Chris and Cllr Nick Botterill on 15 November 2010 explaining our suggestions for the LIP.

None of our previous suggestions were taken on board for the draft LIP, just our input was noted in the Community Involvement section of the draft LIP.

Our suggestions would help promote cycling and reduce pollution, congestion and climate change. They would create a safer and more pleasant environment for cyclists and pedestrians. Perhaps more significantly some would also save / generate money and help get H&F moving.

Since August 2010 three things have happened.

The first is that the Manual for Streets 2: Application of the Wider Principles has been published. It encourages design favouring pedestrians and cyclists. I hope that this will be reflected in the LIP

The second is that we have carried out an email survey of cyclists crossing Hammersmith Bridge. 92% would like to see a 20mph limit over the bridge. The responses to the open-ended questions show how horrible this experience can be for some cyclists. Having a 20mph limit or no overtaking of cyclists at the narrow points would not only help cyclists, but would reduce the number of cyclists using the footway. The results of this survey are attached as several pdf files.

The third is that you have launched the Get H&F Moving campaign.

Some of the points we made in our August response to the LIP would both save money and also help to get the traffic moving in H&F. These win-win points are

**There should be a 20mph speed limit on residential roads.**

By having a default speed limit it saves money which would be spent on installing separate zones. Making the streets more pedestrian and cyclists friendly would reduce the number of cars in the school run.

**There should be action to reduce illegal parking in cycle lanes.**

This would really help get the traffic moving. Employing more wardens is a tactic used by Westminster which also generates further revenue. Extending the hours and areas where traffic flow is restricted by parking at the moment would also help to get the traffic moving.

The full list of the 7 points we made are as follows and explained in the attached document, LipResponse04082010.doc

- 1] There should be a 20mph speed limit on residential roads.
- 2] Making Hammersmith Bridge less dread inducing and safer for cyclists
- 3] There should be action to reduce cycle theft.
- 4] There should be action to reduce illegal parking in cycle lanes.
- 5] Performance Indicators
- 6] Action should be taken pro-actively.
- 7] The bus priority scheme on the South side of Hammersmith Gyrotory.

## 5. P and J Richardson – H&F Friends of the Earth

We would like to make a few points on the plan:-

\* we would appreciate a definition of the 'smarter travel' plan which appears to be a core part of the council's strategy. What is it, how is it to be promoted and how will it be implemented?

We note that only £300,000 is to be allocated to this scheme, in marked contrast to the £11million allocated to 'maintenance'.

\* the targets for increasing walking and cycling from the baseline to levels targeted for 2031 appear disappointingly modest.

The target for reduction in CO2 emissions is rather more ambitious but there is little indication how this is to be achieved.

\* we would appreciate information on how air quality is being measured at present, how improvements will be measured and what targets are set.

\* we would advocate maximum use of planning regulations to enforce low/no parking for vehicles in new developments

\* residents who have more than one 'green' vehicle should receive a reduction in the permit charge for a second 'green' vehicle as well as the first. In these difficult financial times this can be financed by a small increase on the charge for more polluting vehicles.

\* specifications for contractors' vehicles which are working to council contracts should mirror specifications for the council's own vehicles. We note that when new vehicles are ordered/leased by the council the smallest, cleanest engines will be specified and that they will be Low Emission Zone compatible and compliant with EU standards. Contractors should also be required to use cleaner and more efficient fuels.

## **6. Mary-Louise Jennings – Resident**

I may have missed a reference to the speed of traffic in Goldhawk Road, and from there in Stamford Brook Road. Vehicles speed up after the junction of Goldhawk Road and Stamford Brook Road and travel at great speed down both streets, particularly Goldhawk Road. The zebra crossing on Goldhawk Road opposite 'The Brook' is very dangerous as it is immediately after a blind corner from the north and east. Additionally, cars coming up Goldhawk Road at speed often find it difficult, or fail, to stop at the zebra crossing on the side by 'The Brook'. There is no road crossing between the zebra crossing and the pelican crossing outside Stamford Brook Station and with the redevelopment of the old Queen Charlotte's Hospital site and many more people living in the area between Goldhawk Road and Ravenscourt Square, and with a new and large doctors' surgery on that site, the zebra crossing should be moved. Additionally this might slow down the traffic going north and south. Any other measures to slow this traffic would be valuable.

My second, and much smaller point is on Streetsmart. The bus stop on the north side of Stamford Brook Road, outside the St Mary's Church block of flats, has two large illuminated advertising signs. The two houses immediately opposite open straight on to the pavement and are disturbed by these signs. As there are no illuminated signs on the bus stop on the south side of the road, nor on the two bus stops around the corner on Goldhawk Road, and as this is a Conservation Area with a number of Grade II listed houses, could these illuminated signs please be removed



## **7. Tommy Komulainen – Resident**

### **Fulham Palace Road**

Regarding north-south traffic flow on Fulham Palace Road, have you considered closing off most of the side roads to motor traffic? I'm thinking if local motor traffic were restricted to merge, or the very least turn right, only at very few points, say Silverton Road and Bishop's Park Road it would be strong incentive for local residents to be Fulham Palace Road as little as possible leaving most of the road capacity for through traffic.

Having said that I also believe said side roads should be left open for bicycles in order to encourage cycling by making it just a little bit more straightforward and convenient. This shouldn't cause noticeable delays on Fulham Palace Road traffic considering people on bicycles could merge to bus or cycle lane without disrupting the rest of the traffic.

### **Budget**

Regarding funding would you mind elaborating how much of the budget is earmarked for improving cycling, and how much that is per resident? As cycling mode share is at 4% I'd expect budget to be set at about the same level, even higher considering the target is to increase the amount of cycling, and also that for every pound invested in cycling there's a return of about three pounds in health benefits so it makes for a good investment.

If the budget does not meet the mode share targets I'm looking forward to learning how you rationalize the difference.

### **Signs**

You mention plans for wayfinding and pedestrian signs. I trust this includes cycle route signs as well?

One of the big issues I've noticed with cycle routes in general is that you can't really navigate relying on them, you can never really be confident you're still on the route. The routes just seem to disappear without warning. Or where they continue if they stop only for a while.

One specific example is LCN 44 and Hammersmith gyratory. While (having seen the signs) I know the cycle route exists both on Hammersmith Bridge Road and Hammersmith Road currently it is 1) impossible to follow unless you know beforehand where it continues (compare with signs for cars) and 2) far from clear just how exactly is one expected to get from one side to the other with a bicycle.

As a numbered route I'd expect it to have even higher standards than regular routes.

Some suggestions:

1. Whenever there's a cycle route sign to a destination, ensure that one can follow the signs to the end without a map or local knowledge - reaffirm people on bicycles are still on the right track after junctions (see also 3) and ensure they are aware of which turns to take - before the junctions - especially if it's a right turn requiring changing lanes, not at the junction or afterwards when it's too late
2. Add an 'end of route' sign when there are no more signs to expect rather than letting people think they just got lost (though preferably see previous point)
3. Add signs or otherwise make it more clear when entering / intersecting a cycle route - it makes navigating with bicycle much more pleasant when you can be confident you'll recognize signed a cycle route as soon as you approach the appropriate junction - it's much easier to keep in mind in which direction the route is than it is to also try to remember all the street names. Sadly, currently this quality seems to be a privilege reserved for cycle superhighways only, for all other routes it's "if you reach the Thames you'll know you missed your turn"

On related note. While there are several (more or less) clearly signed routes towards Central London (LCN 38, 44, Lillie Road) *while in Hammersmith and Fulham* those routes just disappear pretty much as soon as you leave the borough. I've seen LCN 38 on New King's Road and Ebury Street, but I don't know how it's supposed to go in between. For all I know it pops down to Battersea Park. Now, while technically I suppose it's not your problem due to some random lines drawn on a map, I find that rather an excuse for passing the buck and was wondering if you could ensure the cycling routes leaving the borough actually reach their destinations?

### **Segregated cycle paths**

I would urge you to consider more dedicated and/or shared cycle paths as opposed to on riding on the road amongst fast moving motor traffic. While bicycles may be cause for concern for pedestrians, cars and lorries are a cause for much serious injuries for people on bicycles. I'm fairly certain even *\*with\** training cycling amongst cars is more dangerous than without training away from cars. On that note having to say "you really need to read this gazillion page document in order to survive cycling" isn't exactly encouraging, is it?

Especially in light of the "bike to school" scheme I'd imagine safe cycle paths avoiding cars, or joining / crossing safely if not possible, would be much desired. One simple thing that I believe would make cycling safer would be to make cars

give way to children on bikes on those cycle paths, not the other way round. With great power (100+ horsepower) comes great responsibility, right?

If there's safety in numbers and dedicated cycle paths bring in more people on bicycles, then I'd argue there's safety in more dedicated cycle paths. As long as they're built properly. Some of the cycling infrastructure I've seen in London can be considered a bad joke at best.

In any case, for any cycling infrastructure improvements you do choose to implement I implore you to implement them properly, or not at all. It doesn't benefit anyone to have "facilities" like <http://homepage.ntlworld.com/pete.meg/wcc/facility-of-the-month/December2010.htm>

### **Encouraging cycling**

You wrote about "encouraging" cycling. What I couldn't see is how exactly were you planning to do achieve that? Other than providing bit of training and cycle superhighway I failed to see anything concrete. For all I can tell "traffic smoothing" just means inviting more and faster cars on the roads, and "cycle superhighway" is just a bit of paint on the road.

I'd like some assurances that the plans actually include also slowing down and reducing motor traffic (as at least on Fulham Palace Road the plan seems to be exactly the opposite!) I'm quite confident it would be beneficial for everyone involved to elaborate these points.

When adding traffic calming, pinchpoints, speed humps, etc. allowing bicycles to get through straight on would make cycling more attractive. Bicycles aren't going fast in the first place, so traffic calming designed for cars is going to be inconvenient at best, and lethal at worst. Pinchpoints that squeeze one riding a bicycle into the lane with car traffic going twice as fast are quite stressful - sure, while in theory car drivers should be aware and considerate to let you merge in smoothly, are you really willing to bet your life on it in light of current statistics?

On similar note I think you should audit the safety of existing cycling infrastructure, and not just blindly accept minimally legal, designed primarily with cars in mind solutions, but also take into consideration how "encouraging" people riding bikes find are finding them.

While encouraging cycling will you be ready to *discourage* car driving as well, even just a little bit? Say close off a side road (see Fulham Palace Road earlier), or make a road oneway only (twoway for bicycles), or pedestrianise a road, or make a road bicycle street (cars allowed but give way for bicycles), remove on-road parking from busier roads? Or are we talking about just "as long as no car driver notices"? Either way I think you should make it clear in the plan.

When synchronising traffic signals, would you consider synchronising them to slower - closer to cycling - speeds to both encourage slower speeds on roads and also make cycling more attractive?

The point I'm trying to make is that it's not going to be terribly encouraging to leave the car and use a bicycle instead when you know and see it'll always be at least a little less inconvenient than driving. It'll never be more convenient if while on the road one mustn't inconvenience the cars - on the road or parked in abundance, and there are no dedicated, more direct, less stressful alternatives.

Surely in order to encourage people to reduce congestion street design should accommodate that such that modes of transportation are affected relative to how much they are contributing to congestion? And conversely the mode of transportation contributing least to congestion should be most convenient? Buses, small cars, motorcycles, bicycles, ...

### **Enforcing**

I noticed in [www.lbhf.gov.uk/getmoving](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/getmoving) you're making promises to motorists. Where are the promises for people riding bicycles? Why are you giving motorists preferential treatment in the first place? Surely such campaign should be aimed at all road users collectively, with few focused points for each group if relevant? It would make the whole "encouraging cycling" message more credible, I'd think. As it stands the message you're projecting is that you talk about encouraging alternate transports, but when it comes to money it's for motorists only.

In any case I trust you'll be as vigilant when it comes to enforcing road works, pot holes, parked cars, etc. on cycle paths. Here would be a good and simple opportunity to encourage cycling by making sure that cycle paths are not disturbed unless absolutely necessary. Currently cycle paths seem to be treated as places to park the maintenance vehicles or to unload the tools. That's not encouraging, that's contempt.

Another simple act to encourage cycling would be to do more than just the bare minimum, and occasionally consider advisory cycle lanes more like they were mandatory and encourage cars to keep off of them when not necessary.

I don't know if it's in the scope of the LIP, but are you intending to make it less convenient for car drivers to kill, injure, and threaten people riding bikes? I admit I haven't done too much research on the subject, but the impression I get is that the penalty for killing, injuring, or threatening someone is a slap on the wrist and maybe a point or two off your driver's license - as long as you do it with a car and make some effort to come up with an excuse. Use a knife and get sent to prison. When there's a car-car or car-pedestrian collision, police act on it. When there's a car-bicycle collision or assault somehow the word of the motorist is automatically accepted over the word of the person on bike without any corroborating

evidence, or even in presence of evidence *against* the motorist - the police doesn't seem to be as much interested in finding out what actually happened rather than coming up with excuses to avoid inconveniencing the motorist. The disconnect is mind boggling. It also isn't very encouraging. (I'd be happy to be proven wrong, but the trend I see in news seems pretty clear.)

On related note have you considered making fines for traffic violations relative to income - the higher the income, the higher the fine, a scheme similar to Finland?

### **Metrics**

While measuring mode share, would you also study more closely the reasons people aren't cycling? Is it because the roads feel too busy or unsafe, or there are no good routes, etc. The results ought to provide immediate tasks needed for meeting the mode share goals.

When measuring mode share, in addition to residents would it be useful to also take into account through traffic and trips where the borough is the destination? For example I'd expect the number of trips on what are considered main cycle routes in or through the borough ought to be at least suggestive of how the encouragement for cycling is working in practice.

### **Maps**

On final note, when changes are made to the infrastructure I'd like to suggest those changes to be submitted to <http://openstreetmap.org/> as well. I believe cooperation with openstreetmap would result in some monetary savings in medium term and greatly benefit the residents as well as visitors. And seeing the Walking and Cycling routes map distributed in the borough website was last updated in 2004 it would also help getting more recent maps more frequently.

## **8. Martin Carr – commuter**

I have this evening read through the draft transport plan for Hammersmith and Fulham. I am not a resident of the borough but frequently travel there for business and leisure.

H&F is a very busy borough I realise. Your aims are laudable, and I wish especially to comment on cycling and walking, as these are the most green, healthy and sustainable modes of transport within the borough. Increasing journeys by these modes will create a better borough, one which is greener, healthier and safer.

Where I feel the plan is lacking is in specifics. How will you encourage cycling, for example? Petitioning for the extension of the mayor's cycle hire scheme into the borough would be one way forward. Or creating better cycle lanes across the borough, with a consequent decrease in the road space given over to motorised transport. The plan clearly indicates a desire to reduce journeys by car, but I see no firm pledges on limiting parking, reducing speed limits or giving preferential access to travel on foot or by bicycle to back up this aim. These should be considered.

Therefore I urge the borough to be more ambitious. These are the aims I would like to see included in the plan:

1. A firm commitment to increasing journeys made on foot and by bicycle. Specifically this would be by bringing cycle hire to H&F, by giving over more of the public realm to cycling and walking, with a reciprocal decrease in road space for motor vehicle, and improving safety by lowering traffic speeds and enabling better flow of pedestrians and bicycles within the public realm.
2. A commitment to decrease journeys made by motorised transport. This could be by limiting parking, or charging more, by giving over more kerb space to cycle parking, and by enhancing facilities for pedestrian movement.
3. Enabling easy transfer between modes of sustainable transport. Underground and Overground stations in particular should be equipped with excellent cycling and pedestrian access to enable onward journeys to be made with ease.

## 9. Brian Cuthbertson – Church of England

I write as the Head of Environmental Challenge for the Church of England Diocese of London, which covers the geographical area of your local authority, among 18 altogether north of the River Thames and West of the River Lea. The Church of England seeks to take a lead on environmental matters with its national *Shrinking the Footprint* campaign [www.shrinkingthefootprint.org/](http://www.shrinkingthefootprint.org/).

As part of this, we in the Diocese of London have initiated a number of programmes to mitigate our environmental impact, and in particular our contribution to carbon emissions and climate change [www.london.anglican.org/Shrinking-the-Footprint](http://www.london.anglican.org/Shrinking-the-Footprint). This affects our own buildings and activities, and those of the Church's members and the communities which we serve. Among the areas where effort is needed to reduce our impact is our use of transport.

We therefore take note of the Mayor's Transport Strategy, and the draft LIP for your borough, and wish to make the following general observations (recognising that some of these will come within the responsibility of the boroughs, and some within those of the Mayor):-

- The need to reduce carbon emissions to a tiny fraction of their current level is the paramount imperative. Every policy and investment decision should be evaluated for its influence in these terms. The Diocese of London encourages its members to include the carbon content of all journeys in a planned reduction of their fossil-fuel based energy use, and to consider every journey in terms of a hierarchy of priorities – foot, cycle, tube, national rail, bus, motorcycle, car or taxi as last resort. We commend this approach to Londoners as a whole.
- Car and taxi journeys should wherever possible be shared – if they are needed at all. The use of electric power for journeys within London at least should continue to be encouraged, whilst recognising that electric vehicles are not (as often claimed) 'zero carbon' – unless and until the electricity is generated renewably – and they contribute little to tackling congestion. We urge a continuing roll-out of charging points, with continuing measures to encourage increased micro-generation sites around London, yielding increased feed-in to the grid at a rate at least sufficient to displace fossil-fuel based generation to the recharging network.
- We are keen to encourage cycling as it is carbon neutral, non-polluting and brings added health benefits. The continuing hazards to cyclists from vehicles are well known and need attention, while encouraging responsible behaviour in turn from all cyclists. RoSPA is a suitable 'Big Society' agency with which to engage on safety – so long as the risks *from* vehicles and cyclists *to* others especially pedestrians are a key part of the message, not just the need for each of them to mitigate hazards *to* them

*from* others. We welcome the very successful bicycle hire scheme, and urge its continuing wider extension.

- Health risks from air quality to anyone not sealed in an air-conditioned cabin are also a major concern. We welcome the forthcoming strengthening of Low Emissions Zone rules. However it is limited to reducing particulates. While recognising the health risks from particulates, emissions of greenhouse gases and toxic pollutants should also be further tackled. The need to improve air quality around major arteries – for example, the Marylebone and Euston Roads, but there are many others around the Capital – should continue to be given due priority.
- The decision to cancel the western extension of the Congestion Charging zone has been taken. The impacts of this in terms of congestion, noise and pollution – not just its supposed benefits to residents and traders – should continue to be monitored, with the possibility left open of revisiting the decision in due course.
- The emissions consequences of infrastructure maintenance and improvement should also be taken into consideration in every investment decision. This applies not only to engineering construction and materials – minimising the use of concrete for example, cement manufacture being a major greenhouse gas emitter in its own right. Opportunities for new green-tech options, whether on a large or small scale to begin with, should be borne in mind as they arise (a topical example is the development of the 'PaveGen' technology to generate electricity for street lighting from pedestrian footfall).
- The safety and comfort of pedestrians on pavements, islands and crossing points, especially the vulnerable including blind or partially sighted persons, the elderly and infirm should be of overriding importance in the detailed design and regulation of any changes; eg to timings of lights, and the introduction of innovative solutions such as (to mention only two) diagonal crossings as at Oxford Circus or pavement free streets as at Exhibition Road. We welcome the consideration already given to this aspect in these particular schemes, which we urge should continue in these and others in any borough.



## **10. Andy Flood – LB Wandsworth**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Hammersmith and Fulham's draft second Local Implementation Plan. We consider LIP content and priorities to be principally a matter for individual councils. While identifying no areas of concern, we would reserve Wandsworth Council's position on any schemes or projects arising that might affect us, though I am not aware of any past issues. Otherwise, we have only a few specific comments, as below.

We welcome proposals to improve journey times and reliability on Fulham Palace Road, as this forms an important link to/from Putney Bridge and can affect traffic travelling into and out of our borough. We hope this will result in better reliability for bus services such as the 220 and 295 which serve Wandsworth as well as your borough.

We also note your concerns regarding crowding on the District Line (Wimbledon branch). Wandsworth residents and businesses rely heavily on this route and we would be pleased to support lobbying transport providers to ensure that the planned, necessary improvements are delivered in a timely fashion.

## **11. Ian Davies – Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea**

We broadly support your draft objectives which are highly compatible with our own. We also broadly support your proposals and, in particular;

Table 2.8 page 20 – we share Hammersmith and Fulham’s desire to see the restoration of the direct link from the West London Line to Gatwick Airport (Para 3.3.11 of our draft LIP).

Para 3.10 page 48 – we look forward to continued joint working on road safety and sustainable travel initiatives and campaigns.

Para 3.16 page 56 – we look forward to continued partnership working in general and further opportunities for sharing resources / contracts and collaborative procurement opportunities such as our established joint Engineering Consultancy Services Framework.

In addition it would be helpful if your Plan could state its support for the provision of new pedestrian / cyclist links between the two boroughs across the West London Line tied in to any future redevelopment of the White City Opportunity Area. (Para 3.3.5 of our draft LIP).

We have no further specific comments on your proposed objectives, plans and targets and wish you all the best in seeking Mayor of London approval.

## **12. Justin Bennett – Metropolitan Police**

I am writing in reply to your letter dated 10th January 2011, regarding LIP2.

As you are aware, I am your police contact for matters relating to traffic management. I have limited my response accordingly. If the Council has not done so already it may be appropriate to consult with the local police station regarding crime and anti-social behaviour, our Commercial Vehicle Unit regarding the Council's involvement in the Freight Operators Recognition Scheme and our Olympics traffic planner in support of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. I can provide you with individual contact details if required.

Whilst I have no particular observations to make regarding the Transport Plan I would like to take this opportunity to point out my interest in the following subjects included in the plan and my desire to continue working in partnership with the Council:

**Reduce the number of people injured and killed on our streets**

**Unpleasant or unsafe road conditions for vulnerable road users, i.e. pedestrians and cyclists**

**Improve the efficiency of our road network**

**School travel plans**

**Better control of street works**

**Cycle super highways**

**Enhancing streetscapes**

**Improving road safety**

**Making bus stops accessible**

**Traffic smoothing and the review and removal of traffic signals**

**De-cluttering the road network**

**The Streetsmart highways design guide**

**Neighbourhoods investment programme**

**Accessible road design**

**Cycling and HGV awareness campaign.**

### **13. Fulham Society**

#### **Difficulties encountered when trying to access the Northern part of the Borough from the South The Borough's Transport Plan.**

In a recent circular, the Council stated that the following 7 objectives for local transport had been identified from the Mayor of London's transport goals and the Council's own core strategy –

- √ 1. To support sustainable population and employment growth in the five regeneration areas - White City, Earl's Court/West Kensington, Hammersmith Town Centre, Fulham Riverside and Old Oak Common.
- √ 2. To improve the efficiency of our road network.
- √ 3. To improve the quality of our streets.
- √ 4. To improve air quality in the borough.
- 5. To make it easier for everyone to gain access to transport opportunities.
- 6. To support residents and businesses by controlling parking spaces fairly.
- 7. To reduce the number of people injured and killed on our streets.

The Fulham Society presents herewith some recommendations for easing the flow of traffic in the Borough.

#### **The Situation**

The Borough is dissected along the North/South divide by a major thoroughfare, the A4. This is the responsibility of Transport for London, rather than the Council itself. Although this trunk road offers the residents of the Borough the enviable situation of easily accessing the A4, M4, Heathrow and the West, it puts an excessive strain on intra-borough traffic. This is compounded by the fact that the borough is heavily used, over a 24-hour period for "through traffic" to the west. The A4 effectively severs the traditionally seamless connection between the different areas of a Borough necessary for day-to-day access to homes, shops, services, schools and, importantly in H&F's case, the Town Hall. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that anyone attempting to cross from South to North is limited to only 3 access points all of which have, as a result, turned into bottlenecks which are shown on the following map. These are:

- A. Fulham Palace Road through Hammersmith roundabout,
- B. Barons Court, and
- C. North End Road.

#### **A. Hammersmith Broadway.**

The Society notes, and applauds, the Council's recently announced plans for easing the bottleneck at the top of Fulham Palace Road.

## **B. Barons Court.**

At the Barons Court junction of the A4, traffic can do two things: 1. access the A4 (but only in a Westerly direction), AND 2. drive to and fro across the Borough giving the residents of Fulham access to, for example, the Town Hall.

However when the traffic lights on Palliser Road are green, the lights which cover the pedestrian crossing on Talgarth Road turn red. So, the traffic wanting to turn left onto Talgarth Road is held up and this then blocks cars trying to go straight across Talgarth Road into Glidden Road in order to gain access the rest of the Borough. It is not unusual – especially in the morning and evening rush hours – for cars to have to wait for several light cycles before being able to cross because cars attempting a left turn onto the A4 block the intersection because of the lights and the pedestrian crossing.

At Barons Court the pedestrian crossing on the western side of the crossing is indeed necessary as it is on the same side of the road as the Tube station and is a key access to the West London College. No one will dispute its necessity and therefore while a case for moving it slightly west could be made, we will make no recommendation in this regard. However we do make the following recommendation:

**1. Consider limiting any access to the A4 only to Hammersmith Broadway and North End Road only by prohibiting a left turn onto the A4 from Barons Court, thus making the crossing at Barons Court solely for use by residents needing to access the rest of the Borough.**

## **C. North End Road.**

The westerly pedestrian crossing at the top of North End Road similarly prohibits cars from turning left onto the Talgarth road. This pedestrian crossing is not on the same side of the street as the Tube and is not providing access to a college or anything similar.

In fact, as any casual observer can see, this crossing is barely used by pedestrians. One must remember that all you need is one individual using it to create disruption. The risk/reward analysis is massively skewed to the downside at this crossing.

The following two photographs were taken randomly on October 19<sup>th</sup> 2010 just after 8am which confirms this fact. In it, on the left can be seen one pedestrian using the left hand side crossing, while on the right many pedestrians are using the easterly crossing and rightly so, as it is on the same side as the entrance to the West Kensington Tube station. In the picture, the traffic light is red and will, in the next minute prohibit traffic from taking a left turn onto the Talgarth road. Traffic will back-up thus blocking the junction and prohibiting residents from crossing the A4 to access the rest of the borough. (Please note that this same pattern has been observed on many subsequent occasions).

We therefore make the following recommendations:

**2. Propose to Transport for London that the Westerly pedestrian Crossing across the A4 on the North End Road be either removed, re-located to the East, or restricted to use only in the rush hours.**

**2. Enforce Loading Restrictions:** Ensure lorries do not unload at the Co-op at the top of NER during restricted peak times. The following photograph shows a lorry unloading at 8:14 in the morning on October 15<sup>th</sup>. Trucks are routinely parked there at this time.

**3. Improve Signage:** Put up some signage to encourage traffic to make full use of the three lanes available to it when turning left on to the A4 at North End Road and thus 'stacking' more efficiently. (Often the outside two lanes are empty!)

**4. Adjust the timing of the Pedestrian Lights on the North End Road.** Often these lights turn red just as the light at Talgarth road turns green and therefore does not maximize the throughput of cars.

## 14. Jane Wilmot – HAFAD

### 1. Introduction

Hammersmith and Fulham Disability Forum (DF) is a non statutory consultee on transport issues. The DF is a user led group of disabled residents facilitated by Hestia Housing and Support (Hestia) and funded by Hammersmith and Fulham council. The main contact is through the Chair, Jane Wilmot and also through Hestia.

Contact details: [wilmotjane@gmail.com](mailto:wilmotjane@gmail.com)

**Jane Wilmot**

**9 Palgrave Road London W12 9NB**

There are no contact details for Hestia at the present time as continuing funding is still to be agreed by the council and Hestia may also move to cheaper office accommodation as an efficiency measure.

The Disability Forum meets from time to time at Hafad to discuss borough and London wide transport issues. We respond to major Hammersmith and Fulham Council transport consultations; liaise with the Highways Department on selected local projects as well as doing our own investigations. We are informed about the many neighbourhood consultations on transport proposals and occasionally respond to these depending on capacity and availability of members to investigate specific proposals.

### 2. DF relationship with Hafad (Hammersmith and Fulham Action on Disability).

Hafad is a statutory consultee on transport issues as the borough organisation of disabled people. The main contacts are Maria Brenton Chair of Hafad and Kamran Mallick, Director of Hafad.

Contact details: [mariabrenton@safeserve.com](mailto:mariabrenton@safeserve.com); [Kamran.mallick@hafad.org.uk](mailto:Kamran.mallick@hafad.org.uk)

**Hafad (Hammersmith and Fulham Action on Disability)**

**The Greswell Centre**

**Greswell Street**

**London SW6 6PX**

The DF often hires meeting space from Hafad for its meetings.

### **Executive Summary**

We welcome

- A shorter second local implementation plan for transport (LIP2) 2011 – 2031 for the borough which makes it easier to identify key transport issues.
- the council's commitment to improving transport opportunities for disabled and older people.

However, we need the council to ensure that all actions in fact remove barriers that prevent disabled people from moving around as easily as non disabled people. Equality Act 2010 places a legal obligation on the council to anticipate difficulties that might be faced by disabled people.

The Disability Forum response is based on issues raised by members over the years and our positive experiences of working with officers on Local Area Accessibility projects that preceded the new LIP neighbourhood and corridors programme. DF values its constructive relationship with Highways.

The response includes recommendations, corrections and a summary of what we expect from various policies and delivery actions as our contribution to assisting the council to meet its legal obligations in relation to disabled people and older people.

### **Recommendations:**

- Introduction: correct name for Hafad as statutory consultee (Recommendation 1)
- higher profile for accessible pedestrian environment in LIP2 (recommendation 2 )
- stepfree access on all river passenger services and terminals within the borough (Recommendation 3)
- Availability of consistent stepfree pedestrian access at road works (Recommendation 4)
- Goldhawk Road and extensive consultation... (Recommendation 5)
- Streetsmart Highways design guide: The council to consult Disability Forum on revised edition. (Recommendation 6)
- monitor availability of parking spaces for blue badge holders in shopping areas (Recommendation 7)
- availability of 50% discount for SMART visitor parking permit and electronic blue badge permit (Recommendation 8)
- availability of disabled parking bays and designated disabled parking bays (Recommendation 9)
- availability of mobility training for blind and visually impaired people so they can take advantage of the many transport improvements across the borough. (Recommendation 10)
- Amendments to equality impact assessment (Recommendation 11)
- include Hammersmith and Fulham Disability Forum as non statutory consultee (Recommendation 12)
- availability of funding to maintain and improve pedestrian environment assets (Recommendation 13)
- Check references to tables, maps and diagrams so they relate back to relevant text to ensure they are easy to find. (Recommendation 14)
- Ensure maps and diagrams are legible and larger so they are easier for everyone to read. (Recommendation 15)



### 3. Chapter 1 Introduction

#### **Recommendation 1:**

P6 Consultation: 3<sup>rd</sup> para

Delete Hammersmith and Fulham Action on Disability (HAFAD) and insert current legal name

- *“Hafad (Hammersmith and Fulham Action on Disability) and add to list*
- *Hammersmith and Fulham Disability Forum”*

### 4. Chapter 2 Borough transport objectives

#### **Recommendation 2:**

Higher profile for an accessible pedestrian environment issues in residential areas throughout LIP2

P16 options to include

- *Securing access improvements for all in the pedestrian environment, particularly people with disabilities as part of neighbourhood and corridor LIP programmes and annual footway maintenance programme.*

### 6.1. Expectations

#### **Para 2.8: *How the MTS Goals can be achieved in the borough***

**We list the expectations of disabled people from this section to provide a record of key issues for disabled and older residents. We are aware of funding constraints but we do not believe this means we should lower our expectations.**

#### **P21 Bringing all assets to a state of good repair.**

Council and TfL where appropriate to maintain and improve footways, pedestrian crossings, dropped kerbs, to remove loose or uneven paving on the footway. e.g. our evidence is that compliant gradients and smooth level of dropped kerbs deteriorate over time. The result is that some wheelchair users cannot use the dropped kerbs on the footway so use the road which is not safe. We advised the council when it consulted the DF in June 2010 on the 2010/11 LIP programme that it should review dropped kerbs in every neighbourhood and corridor LIP programme and upgrade the worst offenders. We also encourage members to report problem dropped kerbs and loose and uneven paving.

#### **Recommendation 3**

#### **P21: Enhancing the use of the Thames for people and goods**

LIP2 council promotes and secures stepfree access on all river passenger services and terminals within the borough.

#### **Improving public transport customer satisfaction**

Height of every bus stop to be level with the bus; bus shelters with a variety of seating; countdown at every bus stop as well as stepfree routes to bus stops, underground and overground stations.

#### **Improving road user satisfaction**

Management of highway works includes ensuring providing alternative step free routes where necessary consistently not some of the time.

#### **Reduce public transport overcrowding**

Increased stepfree capacity helps disabled people but more radically promotion of 2 wheelchair spaces on buses will help more wheelchair users to get around the borough at a time when step free investment in the underground is halted due to funding constraints beyond 2015.

#### **Enhancing streetscape, “better streets” etc**

We expect level and smooth pavements, pedestrian crossings and appropriate location of street furniture (rubbish bins, telephones, broadband cabinets and ATM machines) that do not discriminate against any disabled person; well maintained dropped kerbs that are safe and easy to use; tactile paving and raised entry crossings that meet the needs of blind and visually impaired people.

#### **P22 Protecting the natural environment**

We expect the council to ensure that tree roots do not discriminate against wheelchair users or blind people trying to negotiate the footway.

#### **Improving air quality**

We expect the council to ensure electric vehicle charging points are not a hazard to wheelchair users or blind people negotiating the footway between the vehicle and the electric charging point.

#### **Facilitating increase in walking to improve health impacts**

We expect the council together with its health partners to monitor the increase in walking by disabled and older people as part of its new responsibilities for public health and reducing health inequality under current proposals for the NHS. We understand that disabled and older people who walk regularly reduce pressure on health and social care budgets.

#### **Improving perceptions of personal safety and public safety**

We expect:

- disabled people to feel safe when using pedestrian crossings and dropped kerbs
- loose paving on the footway replaced so disabled and older people can walk safely on the footway
- Blind and visually impaired people to feel confident in navigating the borough following transport improvements from neighbourhood and corridor programmes. In addition to free cycle training and free school travel training we believe the council should offer free mobility training to

blind and visually impaired people so they can take advantage of the many transport improvements across the borough.

**P23 Improving physical accessibility .. improving access to services**

We expect every bus stop, pedestrian crossing and dropped kerb to be accessible to disabled people as well as smooth, level and step free routes to all bus, underground and overground stations.

**Supporting wider regeneration**

We expect every bus stop, pedestrian crossing and dropped kerb to be accessible to disabled people as well as smooth, level and step free routes to all bus, underground and overground stations in the five major regeneration areas.

**Maintaining the reliability of transport networks**

We expect an appropriate response from the council and other partners to ensure that isolated disabled and older people who may not be eligible for support under current eligibility criteria for home care are not forgotten in extreme weather conditions. The recent cold weather before Christmas meant many disabled and older people were unable to leave their homes for several days because it was not safe or impossible to use the footway.

**Olympics and Paralympic Games**

We expect that these events also run smoothly and efficiently with minimal disruption to disabled and older residents and visitors.

**7. Chapter 3 Delivery Plan**

**P24 3.2 potential funding sources and accompanying table**

We believe the council will want to ensure that the figures are consistent with each other and take account of the latest information available. E.g. contribution from 3<sup>rd</sup> party sources is £6.3 million in the text and £15 million in the table.

**P 26 Para 3.4 Objective 1**

- **Improvements to bus and rail travel**

We welcome the ideas for improving both underground and overground transport but we expected similar ideas in LIP2 for improving bus services in the 5 regeneration areas otherwise the heading is misleading.

- **Promoting high speed rail**

We expect the council to work on plans for **improved** public transport not just public transport. We would only be able to support high speed rail etc if plans included good bus links from all parts of the borough. (see our response on p21 of Appendix 2).

- **Transport studies to support regeneration**

We expect these studies to include reviewing bus networks and pedestrian environment to encourage more people (including disabled and older people) to

use buses and/or walk across the borough to their destination or as part of longer trips. These tie with other objectives such as reducing obesity and health inequalities.

## **Objective 2 to improve the efficiency of our road network**

- **Coordination of road works para g)**

We welcome this initiative as it is long overdue including reference to minimising inconvenience to disabled people. We expect alternative accessible stepfree routes at road works should be provided every time and not sometimes.

### **P 32 Recommendation 4**

We recommend that the permit operation committee (mentioned in 1<sup>st</sup> para on page 32) should monitor whether alternative accessible stepfree routes were provided throughout the duration of works. Should this be included as part of the inspection regime?

## **Objective 3: to improve the quality of our streets**

### **P35/36 case Study 1 Goldhawk Road**

We are very surprised that the council is seeking to model the makeover of Goldhawk Road on recent cases such as Exhibition Road and Ashford. We can understand decluttering but not the introduction of shared surfaces including removal of the kerb. This is not acceptable for 2 reasons:

- Shared surfaces discriminate against blind and visually impaired people if they cannot detect where the footway ends and the road begins.
- Removal of kerbs discriminates against people with mobility impairments because the gap between the vehicle and the footway is too wide to get on and off easily and for wheelchair users to use the ramp. At Exhibition Road the kerb is being built up at bus stops as a solution arrived at to accommodate buses and taxis that serve Exhibition Road. (source: Keith Gray Chair of Exhibition Road Access Group)

### **Recommendation 5**

Council also consults blind and visually impaired people as well as the Disability Forum before introducing shared surfaces in the borough as required in MTS (Mayor's transport Strategy).

- **Extensive consultation for road improvements** is welcomed subject to the Disability Forum finding enough members willing to be involved!
- **Decluttering our road network** is welcomed but on a practical level, care is needed to ensure that no
  - guardrail is removed if it acts as a guide for blind and visually impaired people or

- cycle racks placed where they are a hazard for blind and visually impaired people or impede wheelchair users
- street furniture such as new telephone boxes, ATM, broadband boxes and rubbish bins discriminate against blind and visually impaired people as well as wheelchair users and people with buggies who need to get past them on the footway.

- **Streetsmart Highways design guide**

p.40 This has been useful in raising standards for new work even if the Disability Forum did not agree with all design standards. We welcome the standard that installation of double yellow lines are a requirement for every dropped kerb.

### **Recommendation 6**

The council to consult Disability Forum on revised edition.

- **Neighbourhood investment programme**

We expect every dropped kerb, formal and informal pedestrian crossings to be reviewed against current design standards and the worst non compliant kerbs and crossings replaced. Street trees with overgrown roots are a safety hazard for blind people and visually impaired people and should be pruned or replaced..

### **Objective 4 to improve air quality in borough**

- **Car clubs and electric vehicles**

We welcome the policies and suggest that LIP2 provides the address of the 2 electric charging points and car club locations beside the relevant map. .

### **Objective 5 to make it easier for everyone to gain access to transport opportunities**

We expect the council to clarify that the council will lobby for stepfree access to bus, *underground and overground stations* rather than rail stations which we feel is ambiguous.

### **Correction**

It is not correct to say that Hafad is consulted on all highway works. The Disability Forum is informed of all highway works.

If the council needs to consult Hafad as the statutory consultee then we recommend that it addresses consultations to Kamran Mallick, Director of Hafad. Contact details: [Kamran.mallick@hafad.org.uk](mailto:Kamran.mallick@hafad.org.uk)

**Hafad (Hammersmith and Fulham Action on Disability)**  
**The Greswell Centre**  
**Greswell Street**  
**London SW6 6PX**

If the council needs to inform Hammersmith and Fulham Disability Forum (DF) as a non statutory consultee then the best way is email : [wilmotjane@gmail.com](mailto:wilmotjane@gmail.com) and post hard copy to:

**Jane Wilmot**

**9 Palgrave Road London W12 9NB**

(I pick up mail at Hafad at irregular intervals so this is not the best way to contact me by post)

- **Accessible road design**

**Correction**

The council has a good working relationship with *Hammersmith and Fulham Disability Forum* not Hafad.

- **High quality pedestrian environment** see above for our expectations

- **Better bus stops and stations**

We strongly supported the council's ambition to ensure that every bus stop is level with the bus to make it easier for people to get on and off the bus quickly.

We would like to know which named bus stops in each direction on which bus routes meet TfL standards for being level with the bus and have this information available on the council's website so disabled residents can give feedback on named bus stops.

- **Accessible neighbourhoods**

**Correction**

Officers work closely with *Hammersmith and Fulham Disability Forum* on proposals etc.... we discuss ... at *Disability Forum* meetings. We welcomed this when we worked on the area accessibility improvement programme that covered a much smaller area than 2010/11 neighbourhood and corridors programme. Members with mobility impairments found a large area such as Wendell Park neighbourhood area too large for a site visit before reporting back to officers.

We will have to see how the Disability Forum can work with officers on the 2011/12 neighbourhood and corridor programme. I will give this some thought.

**P45 3.9 Objective 6 - Controlling parking spaces fairly**

- **Controlled parking zone review programme**

We expect the council to tackle blue badge fraud by monitoring disabled parking bays and inspecting blue badges so people do not abuse scarce parking space. Ensuring that vehicles do not park at bus stops has a very high positive impact on the ability of bus drivers to park close to the kerb which benefits disabled and older people.

However, with CPZ we understand that there is a consequential reduction in single yellow lines in shopping areas. We receive reports that blue badge holders

are not able to park close to their destination because there are no spaces available in either parking bays or on single yellow lines.

#### **Recommendation 7**

The council monitors impact of scarce parking space in shopping areas on blue badge holders and consults them on the most efficient use of parking space.

- **Flexible charging options**

p.45 The council mentions the SMART Visitor Permit but not the 50% discount for disabled residents. The council is currently operating electronic residents parking permits in 3 CPZ areas. We supported the council's original proposal to introduce electronic blue badge parking permits to reduce blue badge fraud.

#### **Recommendation 8**

LIP2 should include both initiatives.

- **Special parking spaces**

p.46 The council policy of providing disabled parking bays at residential addresses has a positive impact on blue badge holders.

The council also piloted designated disabled parking bays for specific blue badge holders in areas of high parking stress. This is granted where the resident blue badge holder could not return home because the disabled parking bay was consistently occupied by another blue badge holder. This has a very high positive impact on eligible individual badge holders.

#### **Recommendation 9**

LIP2 should include both initiatives.

#### **Objective 7 road safety**

p.48.49 Ref: free cycle training: Mobility training for blind and visually impaired people is severely rationed and difficult to access.

#### **Recommendation 10**

With so many changes and improvements across the borough we recommend that the council consults blind and visually impaired residents on

- the impact these improvements have on them and
- whether mobility training would be a cost effective way of ensuring blind and visually impaired people can take advantage of the many transport improvements across the borough.

#### **p 53 para 3.15 Major Schemes**

##### **Goldhawk Road**

We commented on the Goldhawk Road Major scheme above.

##### **Fulham Palace Road slip road proposal**

We support any initiative to speed up buses on Fulham Palace Road at both the junction with the gyratory and at Lillie Road. We expect the Council and TfL to ensure the safety of pedestrians (including disabled and older pedestrians) crossing the road to get to King Street and all Hammersmith bus and underground stations from all directions. A diagram showing the proposed walking routes on the *Get H & F Moving website* would be very helpful.

#### **8. Chapter 4 Performance Management Plan**

We are confident the council will delete references to the PCT and replace it with something to capture the fast moving agenda for health and 3 borough working

#### **9. Appendix 1: Equality Impact Assessment**

We note the approach taken in preparing the EIA but we believe that the council missed several opportunities to identify all positive and negative impacts of LIP2.

#### **Recommendation 11**

The council amends its Equality Impact Assessment to take account of issues below.

#### **Objective 2: to improve the efficiency of our road network: TfL signal timing review etc**

There is great anxiety among disabled and older residents around the TfL signal timing review and rationalization programme. They believe that shortening signal crossing times or removing traffic signals will have a **very high negative** impact on disabled and older people who cannot get across the road quickly or before the lights go red.

We expect the council to consult not only Hafad but also the Disability Forum and the Consultative Forum as well as local residents on any specific proposals for altering traffic signal timings or removing pedestrian crossings. This may involve additional meetings funded by the council.

#### **Objective 3: to improve the quality of our streets**

Insert additional positive impacts

- *Double yellow lines across each dropped kerb prevents cars parking across them and improved sightlines has a high positive impact on people with buggies, families with children as well as disabled and older people*
- *Replacing the most severely deteriorated dropped kerbs has a high positive impact on wheelchair users and people with buggies.*
- *Replacing loose paving has a high impact on ability of disabled and older people to walk in safety and comfort*
- *Good signage for pedestrians and Legible London way finding has a positive impact on encouraging disabled and older residents to walk.*



- *If funding is not available to maintain and improve the pedestrian environment it will have a negative impact on disabled and older people with mobility impairments.*
- *If shared surfaces are introduced in the borough it will have a high negative impact on blind and visually impaired residents*

**Objective 6: to support residents and businesses by controlling parking fairly**

Insert additional positive impacts

- *Our 50% disabled discount for the SMART Visitor permit has a positive impact on disabled residents on low incomes who rely on visitors to reduce isolation.*

We were disappointed that LIP2 does not refer elsewhere to the council's *disabled bay parking policies* for disabled drivers and passengers who qualify for blue badges and disabled parking bays. See recommendations 7 to 9 for details.

**10. Appendix 2: Statement of Community Involvement Correction**

There is an error on the first page of the Statement under Preliminary Engagement and LIP2 should correct it.

Chris Bainbridge met with the Consultative Forum on 29 April 2010 at the Irish Centre not with Hafad. The meeting was attended by both disabled and older residents and I attach the minutes of the meeting for information. Please delete Hafad and replace with "*the Older People Consultative Forum*". We would expect LIP2 to respond to issues raised by members at this meeting.

**Recommendation 12**

There is an omission under Stage 1 consultation/Consultation strategy on page 2. We recommend that LIP2 inserts *Hammersmith and Fulham Disability Forum* to the list of non- statutory consultees.

P21: We were pleased that LIP2 quoted extensively from the Hammersmith and Fulham Disability Forum response to the Stage 2 consultation but we were disappointed that there was no formal response to the priorities identified. These priorities were not always addressed in the main text.

**Appendix 3: strategic environmental assessment...  
P17 – 18 Material Assets**

LIP2 has a clear maintenance strategy and reports on the asset condition of the borough's road network. We do not consider that LIP2 has an equally clear

maintenance strategy on how it complies with its statutory duty to maintain and improve its footways. We are not clear how often footways in each street is inspected for asset condition or how often the whole borough is reviewed. LIP2 reports that it expects that LIP neighbourhood and corridor funding to cover each ward over a 3 year period. We cannot see that reliance on LIP funding will completely address the backlog of footway maintenance within 3 years.

The council has made great strides in improving the footway in town centres. When it comes to residential neighbourhoods we are not sure whether available funding for improving the road, pedestrian crossings and the footway is always sufficiently in favour of pedestrians as opposed to motorists. We are aware that this may be the result of consultation at local level.

**Recommendation 13**

We recommend that if the council wishes to exceed its walking targets and encourage many more disabled and older people to walk across the borough (or as part of longer trips) then it needs to ensure that funding to maintain and improve the pedestrian environment and the footway is protected

**Recommendation 14**

Check references to tables, maps and diagrams so they relate back to relevant text throughout LIP2 are to ensure they are easy to find.

**Recommendation 15**

- Ensure maps and diagrams are legible and larger so they are easier for everyone to read.

I also attach a table setting my understanding of who does what!

**Jane Wilmot**

**Chair: Hammersmith and Fulham Disability Forum: February 2011**

## 15. Brian Mooney – Resident

I'd like to provide some feedback on the draft Borough Local Implementation Plan (LIP) in a personal capacity. I hope that 9am on 28 Feb is as good as midnight on 25 Feb in practical terms, as the document is very substantial.

1. Overall the tone is far more enlightened than the previous LIP; it recognises that many residents need to use a car and favours persuasive rather than coercive measures.

I also welcome the spirit of the separate Drivers' Charter, and the intention to fix potholes quickly. Both as this will increase safety for all road users, and will save more expensive repairs later.

2. The idea of building a slip road at the top of Fulham Palace Road to improve throughput is a novel one, and I wish LBHF well with the experiment. Perhaps because I managed to read most but not all of the LIP, I missed a reason as to why the road will involve substantial investment - I would ask why the council could not just use the existing slip road outside the 'Golden Fry' parade of shops at the Broadway, and just remove the No Entry sign?

The slip road was used in a northerly direction before the previous Council changed this.

The restaurants on the parade are a local asset, and the parking places there are useful to delivery vans, collecting post vans and takeaway customers. If the spaces were lost, nearby spaces should be provided to make up for this.

Perhaps these questions are answered separately, and I shall come back only if I cannot readily find the information,

3. There is a serious clanger in the LIP. p44, talking of 'From 2005 to 2007, we invested over £5 million in our three town centres, .... creating three high [quality?] pedestrian environments.'

In 2005, the Gazette reported that the 'smarter borough project' cost the local taxpayer £2.4 million in respect of the King Street 'improvement'.

I feel that the widening of the pavement at King St by the previous administration was a disaster; another anti-motorist measure dressed up as improving the quality of life.

Apart from losing a third road lane in King St, which must have intensified congestion by the Broadway, the remaining two road lanes don't look particularly wide and slow up traffic, particularly when a bus stops outside Marks & Spencer.

I visited King St on an evening in July 2005, and observed vehicles cornering the-then roadworks on the Broadway very uneasily; a lorry actually hit one of the metal guards - what if that had been a pedestrian? The roadworks added to tailbacks on the eastbound A4 well outside the rush hour period. As traffic piled up on the A4, it aggravated the risk of frustrated motorists trying to leave the queue, making a collision on the A4 more likely.

The 'benefits' of the widened pavement on King St are minimal, and the pavement of the Kings Mall side becomes very slippery in wet weather.

I am told that there was also road narrowing at Fulham Broadway, again slowing traffic down. Again, council taxpayers' money could have been better spent.

4. On p29, someone mixes up the A4 Great West Road with the A40 Westway!

5. On 'Flexible charging options' (p45), I feel that the SMART visitors' permit should be made more flexible to not demand a minimum of five hours' payment.

6. Also, it is irrational to limit visitors to one hours' parking near a football ground on a match day. If, say, Fulham FC played at home at 3pm on a Saturday, this would inconvenience those who had a visitor - say a tradesman who might arrive at 9am and be gone by 12 noon - well before football supporters start arriving.

A bit of common sense also helps.

7. On p46, again on matchday parking, the LIP notes 'We have had no reports that the system is misunderstood by motorists and disputed cases on PCNs to date'.

Really? In August, a visited friend received a PCN for parking near my house. He believed that the football season would start the next day with the Community Shield, and had no idea that Fulham were playing a 'pre-season' friendly that Saturday.

In the absence of floodlights being on, or seeing any crowds or football scarves, he treated it like a normal Saturday and paid to 5pm. He was shocked to receive a PCN, and even though he put in a written appeal, it was rejected on a technicality. The road was practically empty of cars.

## **TfL's Response**

The consultation draft LIP2 was submitted to TfL on 20 December 2011 and formal comments were received back on 25 February. TfL considered the draft LIP2 to be inadequate and their comments are summarised as follows;

- This is a good, concise first draft although there are a few revisions which are needed to make it adequate for Mayoral approval. These are summarised below but should not be too onerous or time-consuming for the borough to achieve.

### **Summary:**

- more detailed information regarding how the SRTP (Sub Regional Transport Plan), SCS (Sustainable Community Strategy) and SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment) have influenced the LIP objectives and demonstrable links between the two former elements and the local objectives need to be included
- timelines need to be added for the local objectives
- more detailed information is required regarding some types of intervention (smarter travel, bus/bus priority and road safety engineering)
- more/up to date funding information is required
- tables 3.3 and 3.5 could not be found and it is assumed that these comprised the programme of investment, these must be included in the final draft
- more details regarding the High Priority Outputs is required

- more information regarding the proposed major projects is required
- should include the programme investment plan (spending submission) in the document
- amend the total casualty target so that it is based on an absolute number of casualties rather than a casualty rate.

Amendments to the LIP have been made to take on board these points, and TfL approved, in principle, the revised LIP on 1.6.2011.