

Appendix 1

Draft Local Implementation Plan Consultation Results

This report covers the following:

1. Consultation methodology
2. Consultation comments received with a brief officer response; and
3. Key recommended changes to the report resulting from consultation comments.

1. CONSULTATION METHODOLOGY

1.1 Consultation on the draft LIP ran from the beginning of March until 16 May 2005. A brief summary document of the draft LIP was produced to facilitate the consultation, and because of the length of the draft LIP, over 300 pages. 3,000 of these summary leaflets were printed and distributed along with 150 copies of the full draft LIP.

1.2 Details of the consultation methodology are as follows:

Consultation leaflet distribution

1.3 A mail shot of the leaflets took place on 7/8 March and included the following organisations:

Harrow Stakeholder partnership database including:

- Residents' Associations
- Neighbourhood watches
- Scouts, brownies and guides groups
- Churches, synagogues, mosques etc
- Local Campaign groups
- Emergency services
- Colleges
- Companies
- Hospitals
- Clubs / societies: Youth, sports, women's, ethnic groups, arts, medical, educational etc.
- Housing Associations
- Social service providers / health authorities

Businesses

Bus Companies

TAP members (Transport and air pollution group)

Town Centre forum members

POP (Partnership with Older People) members

Town Centre shops

Schools including private schools

Bus and Rail liaison members

Traffic liaison representatives
Living streets members
NWL Chambers of Trade members
Transportation consultees database
Safer Harrow partnership (*includes all emergency services*)

Estimated total of above is 1800

- 1.4 Additional leaflets were sent to those in correspondence with transportation in the Council or visiting the Council.

Full Draft LIP distribution

- 1.5 200 full draft LIPs were printed and sent out to all statutory consultees. These included:

Neighbouring boroughs
Emergency Services
Strategic Rail Authority
Network Rail
The Highways Agency
London Transport Users Committee
Harrow Public Transport Users Association
Harrow Association of Disabled People
NWL Chamber of Commerce
The Environmental Agency
English Nature
English Heritage
Countryside Agency
Transport for London

- 1.6 Copies of the draft LIP and the Strategic Environmental Assessment were also placed in all Harrow libraries and at the Civic Centre for the public to read.

- 1.7 The full draft LIP was also provided to members of the Environment and Economy scrutiny committee and to all Council officers who requested a copy.

- 1.6 In addition, the full draft LIP was sent to the two local MPs, Tony McNulty MP and to Gareth Thomas MP.

Newspaper advert

- 1.7 A quarter page advert for the LIP consultation was placed in the Harrow Times which is distributed widely throughout the borough. Further adverts were placed in the Harrow Times towards the end of the consultation to remind people to respond in time.

Electronic media

- 1.8 The draft LIP and the SEA were also live on the Internet and the Intranet throughout the consultation, with a direct way of responding provided online.

Consultation equality monitoring

- 1.9 The summary draft leaflet was sent to a wide variety of minority groups in the borough covering all major religions and ethnic groupings. In addition, there were requests to translate the summary document into Urdu and Gujarati and these translations were further distributed to all groups with a Pakistani or Indian connection.

Stakeholder meetings

- 1.10 During the consultation, meetings were held with the following groups:

- Harrow Town Centre management forum
- LA21 (Transport and Air pollution sub-group)
- Cycling representative – LCC
- Living Streets representative
- Harrow Association of Disabled People
- POP – (Partnership with Older People) transport subgroup
- Harrow Public Transport Users Association
- Bus liaison meeting
- Rail liaison meeting
- Traffic liaison meeting
- Voluntary community sector forum
- Safer Harrow Management Group
- School head teachers

In addition a seminar was held for all interested councillors

Feedback

- 1.11 Consultation feedback numbers:

Forms returned	48
Website replies	14

Letters/notes/emails	36
Total attendees at meetings	136
Total number of people contributing to consultation	234

TfL Feedback

1.12 TfL feedback was provided on 26 August. This was a detailed analysis of the document and as for all London Boroughs is 125 pages long.

2.0 CONSULTATION RESULTS

- 2.1 A great deal of the changes recommended by the consultation are simple editorial changes. This is particularly so for comments from TfL. These have not been included in this report.
- 2.2 This report addresses consultation responses in the order of the draft LIP chapters. For each chapter the comments received from the public and TfL are reported separately. All comments have associated officers' recommendations.

Document Introduction

Relevant comments received from the public	Officers' recommendation
1. Include a general transport vision that extends beyond the 4 years of the plan	1. Agree and to be developed based on the local transport strategy.

Chapter 3 Borough Policy Statement

Relevant comments received from the public	Officers' recommendation
<p>General</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove references to the TfL "core" network as no longer relevant 2. Remove policies in support of workplace parking 3. Tax workplace parking to encourage walking 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree, will remove and rewrite relevant public transport policies – see <i>revised public transport policies in key changes section</i> 2. Agree, will remove and rewrite relevant policies – see <i>key changes section</i> 3. Unless done regionally, will have negative local economic impact. Therefore do not include
<p>Joined up Public Policy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilities for motorcycles should be included in planning applications in PE3 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add additional bullet point to PE3 – see <i>key changes section</i> Recommend this is carried forward to next Local Development Framework

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Motorcyclists are of benefit regarding social inclusion because they are so much cheaper to use 3. Motorcyclists should be core element of regeneration 4. Levy a bond on development to pay for the damage they do to the pavements nearby 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Agree 3. Agree and rewrite Joined up public policies 2 – see <i>key changes section</i> Recommend this is carried forward to next Local Development Framework 4. Planning services will look at ways to address this either through development control process or building control data on starts.
<p>Public Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of coordination in public transport closures by Network Rail and LUL (x2) 2. Provide shelters at request bus stops too 3. Include policy to support filling in all bus stop lay-bys 4. Public should be involved in discussions with public transport operators and they should not happen behind closed doors 5. Consider providing countdown information at bus stops 6. More CCTV on board buses 7. Bus drivers should take cash 8. Introduce bus service between South Harrow station and Northwick Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree, and include recommendation to providers for better communication – see new public transport policy in key changes section 2. Considered by TfL on a case by case basis but provided where feasible 3. Current policy is to attempt to do this subject to the impact on other road users. Progress doing this can increase rapidly when cashless boarding operates and bus stopping time is significantly reduced 4. Harrow Public Transport Users' Association are represented at quarterly bus-liaison meetings which also involve TfL and Harrow Council. Also see <i>new public transport policy in key changes section</i> 5. Existing policy supports this 6. Borough has no control of this but should add support for it in final LIP 7. Most do, but this is an issue for TfL 8. This issue will be raised with TfL who

<p>hospital</p> <p>9. Extend buses to RNOH/ASPIRE (x2)</p> <p>10. Provide circular mini bus routes and more bus links between main roads</p> <p>11. Direct bus links are needed from Northwick Park hospital to Mount Vernon and from Northwick Park Hospital to Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital</p> <p>12. Better links to Northwick Park hospital</p> <p>13. Introduce bus linking train and underground stations</p> <p>14. Introduce hopper bus services that get into residential estates</p> <p>15. Buses should be required to admit people at stands at cemeteries, crematoria, hospitals</p> <p>16. Need to review the effectiveness of bus lanes (x2)</p> <p>17. Buses should be required to admit passengers at terminal stands</p> <p>18. Network Rail should not curtail journeys to Brighton at Clapham Junction.</p> <p>19. All stations in the borough should be fully accessible</p> <p>20. Buses drive too fast, too aggressively, drivers have poor behaviour, there are not enough of them, they sometimes drive past stops and the buses do not have enough seats on them</p> <p>21. Don't make zero provision of parking at stations the ultimate goal</p> <p>22. Toilets should be provided at interchanges and should be unlocked</p> <p>23. Don't let motorcycles use bus lane</p> <p>24. Should experiment on allowing motorcycles in bus lanes (x2)</p> <p>25. Should consider person capacity and not vehicle capacity</p>	<p>are responsible for delivery of these services – also see Public Transport PT.13 rewrite in report in key changes section</p> <p>9. As above</p> <p>10. As above</p> <p>11. As above</p> <p>12. As above</p> <p>13. As above</p> <p>14. As above</p> <p>15. As above</p> <p>16. This is planned to be done</p> <p>17. This is TfL issue and policy is unlikely to change due to driver break times</p> <p>18. This is an issue for Network Rail, but recommend LIP refers to benefit of service</p> <p>19. Support for this is already included</p> <p>20. This issue will be raised with TfL but also refer to in final LIP see <i>new Public Transport policy in key changes section</i></p> <p>21. Agree and see revised PE8 in <i>key changes section</i></p> <p>22. In principle agree to support subject to security implications – see <i>revised PT.8 in key changes section</i></p> <p>23. Waiting for TfL results of pilot and guidelines</p> <p>24. As 23</p> <p>25. This is largely done in reviewing signals</p>
--	--

<p>26. Do not support articulated buses</p>	<p>by giving consideration to buses 26. This is an issue for TfL, however the existing network would require considerable work for them to be suitable, though where capacity demands this they should be considered.</p>
<p>Walking</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add pedestrian phases at all signals 2. Upgrade the conditions of all footways/Improve condition of pavements borough wide 3. Develop more walking routes 4. Should improve safety for pedestrians 5. Consider accidents on pedestrian pathways and alleyways 6. Emphasize walking network and across borough and its contribution to healthier living (x2) 7. Link walking to tourism and local economies 8. Review all pedestrian crossings to ensure they are in pedestrian desire line 9. Only guard railing for safety reasons should remain the rest should be 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The LIP includes a timetable for reviews of all signals regarding pedestrian phases. The review will inform future decision. In line with the Mayor's Transport Policy, On 'A' Roads there is a general presumption in favour of distribution. On other roads there is a presumption in favour of access and amenity, particularly for residents, buses, pedestrians and cyclists and where necessary, business access. 2. Programmes are included 3. Already included 4. Already included 5. This is done where reported but underreporting makes it difficult, but will monitor relevant correspondence to identify need 6. Already included but recommend emphasize more 7. Agree and refer to in final LIP 8. This is not considered necessary for all crossings. Can investigate individual cases where particular concerns are raised 9. Agree

<p>removed</p> <p>10. Don't remove safety railing in South Harrow</p> <p>11. Provide better maps for walking</p> <p>12. Use more technology on crossings to tell when walker has completed crossing</p> <p>13. Review signal timings, some of them are too long and delay traffic</p> <p>14. More dog tidy tins</p>	<p>10. Only removing where safety railings are unnecessary</p> <p>11. This has been done and is managed by tourism section in communications</p> <p>12. This is being reviewed as part of signal modernisation programme and roll out of Puffin crossings</p> <p>13. Already included</p> <p>14. Agree, should emphasize providing facilities for tidier environment</p>
<p>Cycling</p> <p>1. Address cycling on pavements, antisocial behaviour, pavement parking and street clutter</p> <p>2. Enforce against cyclists riding on pavements (x5)</p> <p>3. Too much parking in cycle lanes</p> <p>4. Don't encourage children to cycle to school</p> <p>5. Introduce a school cycle day per week</p> <p>6. More parks should be used for cycling/Prohibit cycling in parks</p> <p>7. Hierarchy in policy C5 is problematic and will cause cycling on footways</p> <p>8. Consider bike contraflows (x2)</p>	<p>1. Agree and improve by provision of better dedicated facilities for cyclists and by enforcement through liaison with police – see <i>new policy W18 in key changes section</i></p> <p>2. Agree, should be dealt with by more joint tasking of police – see <i>additional policy W18 in in key changes section</i></p> <p>3. The case for further parking restrictions and/or mandatory lanes will increase when network is more developed and cycle numbers increase</p> <p>4. Currently decision for school head but this is part of Mayor's Transport Strategy</p> <p>5. A cycle day per annum is done as part of Bikeweek. Schools are being encouraged to promote cycling.</p> <p>6. This will be kept under review</p> <p>7. This is only done where pavements are sufficiently wide</p> <p>8. Agreed and currently being considered in North Harrow</p>

<p>9. Only segregated cycle routes should be allowed</p> <p>10. Use more verge areas for parking to allow road to be clear for cyclists (x2)</p> <p>11. Cycling maps should include cycle parking information</p> <p>12. Cycle parking should be covered (x2)</p> <p>13. Offer more training to adult non cyclists (x2)</p> <p>14. Better cycle parking facilities at stations</p>	<p>9. Not practical as insufficient highway width in many locations. Current policy is to segregate wherever possible</p> <p>10. Contrary to borough policy on green environment</p> <p>11. Agree should be done when republished</p> <p>12. Already included</p> <p>13. Already included</p> <p>14. Agree</p>
<p>Car/Motorcycle Use</p> <p>1. Introduce one car free day per week</p> <p>2. Improve traffic signage</p> <p>3. Be more flexible regarding parking permits – e.g. probation service</p> <p>4. Drivers speed too much and have an attitude problem</p> <p>5. Traffic is too fast</p> <p>6. Too many road humps</p> <p>7. Eliminate road humps</p> <p>8. Some road humps are too severe</p> <p>9. Let motorcyclists use advance stop lines as an experiment (x2)</p> <p>10. Should have motorcycling strategy</p>	<p>1. Would impact on local economy and amenity</p> <p>2. Already included</p> <p>3. Need to balance flexibility with objectives of zones and need to limit abuse of permit system.</p> <p>4. National problem– Harrow cannot deal with in isolation although safety programmes seek to address it at specific locations</p> <p>5. As above</p> <p>6. Their unpopularity and disadvantages are recognised but they have actually significantly reduced accidents. In new schemes always look at alternatives</p> <p>7. This would only be appropriate if similarly successful speed reducing safety measures could be provided, if accident reductions are to be maintained</p> <p>8. Will be adjusted during resurfacing</p> <p>9. Needs to be regional or national initiative</p> <p>10. Not required as LIP will be strategy for all transport and motorcycles are</p>

	considered throughout the document
<p>Changing attitudes and behaviour</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extend travel awareness to all public bodies and utility services 2. Refocus travel awareness to providing information needed for visitors 3. Should clearly state car access to town centre is undesirable 4. Link between congestion and air pollution should be emphasised 5. Offensively loud stereos in cars 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will refer to travel plans for all companies but difficult as utility services are not major local employer in Harrow 2. This is included as part of travel planning 3. Need to consider economics of centres 4. Agree and to be better emphasized in final LIP 5. Police issue but noise is referred to in LIP
<p>Accessibility</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include accessibility policies 2. Rt350 Harrow to Watford should take Freedom Pass (x2) 3. Cost effectiveness of freedom pass should be reviewed 4. Integrate accessibility improvements with station access improvements 5. Fund travel training of people with learning disabilities 6. Do not lower trip numbers for taxicard too far (x2) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree 2. Not borough responsibility but should include reference to it and support. Council is objecting to Rt 350 withdrawal from Harrow. 3. TfL have been conducting a review, local review not necessary 4. Agree 5. Agree 6. Londonwide review taking place
<p>Highway Management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Road works not sufficiently coordinated 2. Road works need better advertising along with their impact on public transport 3. Improve road maintenance 4. Air quality impact should be done on all schemes 5. Permits should be required for skips 6. Add that motorcyclists cause negligible road damage 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will be addressed better via role of new Traffic Manager under the new duty conferred on all Highway Authorities by the Traffic Management Act 2004 2. Agree, this should be included as part of new traffic manager role 3. Already included 4. Traffic impact is considered for all schemes which is a proxy for air quality 5. This is already the case 6. Yes, but nor do cars

--	--

Other comments relevant to Chapter 3 received from public

Positive	Negative	Other
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pleased to see plan for town centre improvements 2. Pavements are much improved 3. Walking routes are extremely welcome 4. Cycling plans are very welcome 5. Pleased to see expansion to shopmobility 6. Very pleased with plan 7. Pleased with overall policy 8. A good well balanced plan 9. Good we are encouraging walking and cycling 10. Generally an excellent travel plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bus lanes do not work 2. Rising bollards in Wealdstone have not been a success 3. Cycle lanes are a waste of money 4. Most cycle lanes are too dangerous as they are not physically separated –Alexandra Ave is a good cycle lane 5. Short cycle lanes are dangerous especially when parked up 6. Enforcement against pavement parking is piecemeal 7. Document is too long 8. Too much congestion 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Get cars off the road 2. Too many parents driving kids to school 3. School Transport problem needs a drastic solution 4. Don't assist TfL revenue inspectors 5. Rewrite the document to give priority to pedestrians and then to cyclists etc. 6. Do more to educate people about civic responsibility- throwing away rubbish etc. 7. Too much rubbish on the streets, particularly outside Lidl's 8. Too much street clutter outside Debenhams 9. Too much street clutter from shops Current traffic control system used in London does not meet the purpose of making traffic move safely and expeditiously. 10. Reducing road widths is bad for traffic Buses cause a lot of pollution 11. Don't include buses as a form of sustainable travel 12. TfL should make bus survey performance information public

Relevant comments received from TfL	Officer Recommendation
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommend that an additional section be added to chapter 3 to address the direct responses to the several required elements of the Mayor's Transport Strategy. 2. Remove references to TfL delivering a core network in public transport policies 3. Include provision of improved taxi facilities at rail and underground interchanges 4. Ensure local engineering works are coordinated to minimise network disruption 5. State support for targeting illegal minicab operations 6. Mitigate against disruption to the bus service when carrying out highway works 7. Remove information on support for work place parking as no longer relevant 8. Use car parks at stations to encourage people to park and ride on the rail network 9. Provide more information on promoting Safer Travel at Night 10. Provide more information on cycle parking particularly at stations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree 2. Agree – this is no longer relevant 3. Agree and see public transport policy <i>PT.6 rewrite in key changes section</i> 4. Agree and will be included as more details provided on Traffic Management Act and role of new Traffic Manager 5. Agree and see <i>new personal safety policy in key changes section</i> 6. Agree 7. Agree 8. Suggested rewrite of policy is provided <i>in key changes section</i> 9. Agree and see <i>additional public transport policy in key changes section</i> 10. Agree

Chapter 4

TfL suggest some rewrites but this mainly involves providing more details on certain issues

Chapter 5

New Harrow Project

TfL suggested that this information be moved to a separate section in the Final LIP

Chapter 6

West London Transport Strategy

TfL suggested that this information be moved to a separate section in the Final LIP

Chapter 7

LIP programmes

General consultation comments for programmes

Relevant comments received from consultation (excluding TfL)	Officer Recommendation
<p>Public Transport</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bus lane outside Wickes makes a bad situation worse 2. Bus lane at Sheepcote Road causes road rage 3. Improve H9/H10 bus services 4. One way systems are bad for buses, can this be addressed 5. Harrow and Wealdstone bus garage is dangerous particularly in the evenings 6. Improving Alpine Junction is good 7. Priority to improve safety, reliability and service levels of bus services 8. Trams not necessarily best option for future, consider mono-rail 9. Improve security and access via enhancements to pedestrian capacity at Harrow and Wealdstone station 10. Better crossing facilities around Headstone Lane Station 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree but all bus lanes will be reviewed next year 2. All bus lanes will be reviewed next year see 1 3. Will refer to TfL but not borough responsibility 4. The one-way system in Town Centre is due to be reviewed 5. Garage is private property. Council continues to liaise with operators regarding adjacent highway issues. Need to go back to this issue at the quarterly liaison meeting and agree a joint programme of action by the property owner. 6. Agree 7. Agree 8. This is an issue for TfL not Council. The Council is not a public transport operator. The choices between various modes of transport in the future is complex and beyond the scope of the LIP. 9. Has just been upgraded and this is responsibility of Network Rail. Any outstanding issue will be considered as part of any improvement programme identified by NORP (North Orbital Rail Partnership) studies. 10. Agreed and included
<p>Traffic</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We should prioritise pedestrians and roundabouts make it difficult to cross the roads 2. Introduce yellow box junction at London Rd/Marsh Lane junction and at Elm Park/Church Rd junction 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Problems are recognised. Roundabouts not normally favoured where pedestrian flows are high. 2. First one has been done and 2nd has been investigated and <i>keep clear markings</i> will be implemented

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Kenton Road/Kenton Lane needs a right turn filter 4. Do not revert scheme by road widening at Kenton Road – re right turn 5. Mini-roundabouts could replace signals at many places 6. Enforce speed restrictions by cobble stones as in Poland 7. Introduce speed cameras at Clamp Hill to slow down drivers 8. Too much speeding along Whitchurch Lane (x2) 9. Introduce speed restrictions in Abercorn Road, Stanmore 10. Introduce speed restrictions along High View in Pinner 11. More red light cameras <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Particular problem is Stanmore Broadway crossing 12. Introduce a local congestion charge 13. Too much congestion at Fat Controller (x2) 14. Deal with congestion at Eastcote Lane, Northolt Road, Bessborough Road 15. Too much traffic congestion around Uxbridge Road/Hatch End 16. Tailbacks at Uxbridge Road Hatch End and at Grimsdyke Road junction 17. Move to one side of street restrictions to aid traffic flow (x2) 18. Improve traffic in Stanmore 19. Consider Sudbury Hill/Greenford Road junction as congestion hotspots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Being reviewed and scheme to be included in final LIP 4. Being reviewed and included in final LIP 5. Roundabouts are less suitable where pedestrian or cycle flows are high 6. Not recommended on grounds of cost, disruption due to maintenance and generate noise 7. Location does not meet DfT criteria 8. Speed camera is being investigated 9. Traffic calming not appropriate on distributor road and does not meet speed camera criteria 10. Not considered a priority in view of good accident record 11. Will be investigated to see if meets criteria 12. Could have significant adverse impact on local economy. Not current policy 13. Will be addressed as part of parking and loading review 14. Northolt Road and Bessborough Road being addressed by parallel initiative Problem at Eastcote Lane will be kept under review 15. Being addressed through Local Area Agreement and parallel initiatives. The LAA will address congestion issues on Uxbridge Road and Grimsdyke Road and Grimsdyke school travel related problems 16. Being addressed by Local Area Agreement and parallel initiatives. Double yellow lines to be introduced shortly 17. Can be used where appropriate, programme included in final LIP 18. Key congestion issues are being addressed through parallel initiatives 19. Location is already included
<p>Maintenance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop programme to maintain pathways/alleyways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This will be done as part of Highway Asset

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Should renew pavement between Rugby Close and Leys Close in Marlborough Hill 3. Should be a better No Through Road sign at top end of Middle Road on Harrow on the Hill 4. Should be a better sign at top of West Street as drivers claim they can't see sign 	<p>Management Plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Has been considered and no works required at this time 3. Signage is regulated by Department for Transport. Larger signage causes a conflict with this being a conservation area. Revised signage will be investigated. 4. As above
<p>Travel Awareness</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council travel plan should encourage car sharing 2. Travel awareness needs increased funding 3. Council should set an example and having such a large car park doesn't 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is included 2. Agree and Travel Awareness post is to be made permanent 3. Noted.
<p>Walking</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide more benches/seating particularly opposite war memorial in Tyburn Lane 2. Pavements not repaired well enough particularly around Whitchurch Lane (x2) 3. Need safe crossing at Pinner Road and Station Road near North Harrow 4. Belmont Circle – introduce a bus stop on south side when improving the walking access 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will be considered as part of major redevelopment on former post office site 2. Recent works have addressed this 3. This has been considered but no solutions could be found without significantly increasing congestion 4. Will be considered

Cycling

1. Not enough cycle parking in Harrow Town centre
2. West Harrow Recreation Ground has plenty of room for a cycle route between Rayners Lane and central Harrow
3. Sustrans route 6 should be mentioned in plans (x2)
4. Do not convert roundabout at Eastcote Road – Hillingdon boundary to T junction

5. Cyclists should not use route A404 to Grimsdyke Road
6. Consider using Belmont Trail for cycle route link 87 (x2)

7. Make Mead Road to High St Edgware cycle section mandatory
8. A404 Lowlands Rd/Tyburn Lane/Kenton Rd should be mandatory
9. Courtenay Ave/Harrow View to Hindes Rd should be mandatory

10. Use Boxtree Road and Elms Road instead of A410 Uxbridge Rd between Courtenay Ave and Clamp Hill for cyclists as it is less busy (x2)

11. Bring forward Harrow and Wealdstone to Harrow Town Centre scheme
12. North Harrow Station Road cycle scheme shows a failure to coordinate cycling with other needs

1. Currently being addressed
2. This is planned and is part of Local Cycle Network

3. Agree and to include in final LIP
4. Agree, location will be reviewed for improving conditions for cyclists

5. This is a useful link to the existing cycle network
6. This has been considered but there is a conflict with “green” issues
7. Will be considered in conjunction with Barnet when more of cycle network has been implemented
8. Will be considered when more of cycle network has been implemented
9. As above

10. The cycle route network has been developed on main desire lines and shortest routes. Cyclists can use alternative routes via minor roads without additional facilities.
11. Agree, though programme will be delayed as a result of budget issues
12. The design of this scheme will be reviewed

<p>Accessibility</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Drop off/pick up point at Harrow and Wealdstone station would be helpful 2. There is no room to expand shopmobility in current location but other types of expansion welcome (x2) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Problem recognised but inadequate space at front for formal drop off. Drop off is provided in car park 2. Proposed to expand service not location
<p>Freight</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use rear service road to support businesses on the Broadway – this would reduce congestion 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To be considered when reviewing parking and loading
<p>Environment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How is air quality impact being addressed 2. Provide information on how many meals on wheels vans are “green” 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic is used as a proxy for air quality and is considered before proceeding 2. Agree and will be included in LIP
<p>General</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Better recognise that cars, vans and trucks play a vital part in maintaining a healthy and sustainable economy 2. All cars should be fitted with equipment to enable drivers to be charged when in congestion 3. Need increased police presence near bus station from when schools out 4. Should consult on schemes with people who pass through the borough 5. No programmes introduced unless acceptable to cyclists and public transport users 6. More park and ride with safe transfers to and from vehicles to public transport 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree, will include reference to benefits to economy from cars, vans and trucks 2. This is a national issue 3. Increased safety information will be provided in final LIP 4. Extremely difficult to do so, but all consultations are now done on the internet so some of this information will be captured 5. Cyclists and public transport users are consulted on all schemes but a veto is not recommended. Cyclists and public transport user representatives are also co opted onto the TARSAP to ensure these interests are considered 6. Add policy to consider the local impact of additional parking for park and ride at stations including the impact on the local transport network and air quality. <i>See revised PE8 in key changes section</i>

<p>7. Too many contact points in Council for public to deal with</p> <p>8. Protect pay phones and pre pay ticket machines from vandalism</p> <p>9. Add chapter on transport issues for young people, the elderly, women and the disabled and those without private transport</p> <p>10. Should state intention to reduce car ownership</p> <p>11. Efficiency gains shouldn't be at expense of air quality</p>	<p>7. Not directly relevant to LIP but Council is addressing issue through First Contact initiative</p> <p>8. Increased safety information will be provided in final LIP</p> <p>9. The importance of these groups is recognised but separate chapters are not recommended – see also Equality Impact Assessment in LIP. It will be addressed as part of providing improved accessibility to all.</p> <p>10. Policy is to reduce car use not car ownership</p> <p>11. Agree</p>
---	--

TfL Programme Comments

- 2.3 Several of the programmes require additional detail. Some of the additional information required exists in other Council documents and has to be brought together into this document. The additional information required where no policy or programme decision is required is not mentioned in this report.
- 2.4 **Regeneration / Town Centres**
 Additional information is required on regeneration locations. When the Draft LIP was submitted, TfL had not yet issued their guidance on the types of projects they would fund. This has now taken place. As a result, Harrow town centre, Wealdstone, Rayners Lane and North Harrow town centres fit most closely with the funding requirements from TfL. It is recommended that all of these locations be submitted. This list has been derived following discussions between transportation, Strategic Planning and Environmental Health Services and through considering crime statistics and the overall vitality profiles. To ensure TfL funding, location must be a town centre and crime, access to services and deprivation are all considered.
- 2.5 **Station Access Improvements**
 TfL recommended that we submit a request for station access improvements. This will not commit the borough to doing this work but will enable the borough to do so if desired. The improvements do not have to be done in the next four years but can be identified as stations for later years. To meet TfL guidance for funding, the following locations for station access improvements are recommended: Harrow-on-the-Hill and Sudbury Hill stations. Further stations will be included

based on consideration of the North Orbital Rail Partnership and the TfL station upgrade programme There are very few stations in Harrow where the surrounding areas fit the requirements for TfL funding.

2.6 Streets for People

If the borough were going to introduce additional Streets For People work, this would need to be identified in the final LIP. Benefits of these schemes provide benefits for only a small selection of the population and are extremely expensive. For this reason, no further schemes are suggested.

2.7 Pedestrian Areas

The Borough is required to state the management principles for all pedestrian areas. It is recommended that the final LIP state that Harrow town centre is managed to optimise its attractiveness to shoppers and other management issues are dealt with through a Town Centre Management forum. In addition, following extensive consultation, the council has adopted a town centre development strategy.

Chapter 9 Road Safety

Relevant comments received from consultation (excluding TfL)	Officer Recommendation
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use more travel speed notices 2. Use more speed-activated signals 3. Use more cameras for cars jumping red light signals 4. Introduce more 20mph zones beyond schools (x2) 5. 20mph zones should be treated with caution – some are a waste of money and create slalom courses for all drivers 6. Recommend training courses for college students for motorcycle safety 7. Don't promote motorcycles as they are dangerous 8. Should target non-motorcyclists to make them more aware of motorcyclists 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Repeater signs are not permissible on 30mph roads. 2. Already included 3. Already included 4. Schools are a priority and then other areas can be considered 5. National regulations require zones are physically self-enforcing – agreed that quality of design is important. All schemes are the subject of consultation 6. Safety issues of mopeds/scooters being promoted by TfL scheme of which Harrow is lead borough 7. The borough only promotes safety issues regarding motorcycling 8. The council distribute publicity from DfT

<p>9. Better enforce ALL traffic regulations</p> <p>10. More use of CCTV for safety</p> <p>11. Elmsleigh Avenue needs traffic calming</p> <p>12. Need traffic calming at Harrow on the Hill school</p>	<p>9. Included through additional policing as a result of borough beat</p> <p>10. issue included</p> <p>11. Under review as part of Kenton Park Road closure scheme</p> <p>12. Is being addressed via 20mph zone proposal</p>
<p>Additional comments received</p> <p>1. Pleased to see road safety plan</p>	

Chapter 10 Parking and Enforcement Plan

2.8 TfL consider that the borough is being too strict on reducing the amount of station car park space.

See recommended revised policy PE8 in key changes section.

Relevant comments received from consultation (excluding TfL)	Officer Recommendation
<p>1. Remove information on work place parking as no longer relevant</p> <p>2. Too many cars parked overhang road</p> <p>3. Trucks and cars park on pavements too often</p> <p>4. Too much parking on grass verges and pavementsx3</p> <p>5. New residences should have off-street parking before planning permission granted</p> <p>6. Parking charges vary too much across the borough x3</p>	<p>1. Agree see <i>key changes revised changes to Policies and Financial Measures FM3,FM4,FM6,FM7</i></p> <p>2. Footway parking is enforced, vehicles overhanging footway may be subject to highway enforcement action</p> <p>3. As above</p> <p>4. As above</p> <p>5. Reduced parking provision in areas of high public transport accessibility can assist reducing traffic growth, but should only take place where on-street parking is controlled</p> <p>6. Each local centre is considered on its</p>

7. Car park charges should not start until 9am to reduce parking outside schools. E.g. Chapel Lane car park to West Lodge school
8. Reduce cost of parking with presentation of a valid train or tube ticket
9. Discourage on street parking (X2)
10. Should be a tow away service for obstructive parkers
11. Protect junctions from parking not just in CPZs
12. Even short stay parking should be in lay-bys or in off street areas where possible
13. Enforcement should be aimed primarily where stopped vehicles cause congestion
14. Priority enforcement at bus stops where fast food outlets are adjacent
15. Increase use of service roads, off-highway parking spaces and lay-bys
16. Improve parking enforcement
17. Be more transparent about CCTV policy
18. Use physical measures to encourage self enforcement and reduce need for regulations
19. Should publicise that vehicles parking across driveways can receive PCNs
20. Implement parking signage improvements as a priority (x2)
21. Include commitment to inter agency working
22. Where possible additional motorcycle parking facilities should be provided
23. Needs of motorcyclists should be included in doing CPZs
24. Provide lay-bys for buses and disabled people in streets where there is insufficient space for off street parking
25. Provide secure motorcycle parking
26. Transport interchanges need provision for more motorcycle parking

own merit and charges are set according to demand, usage and space turnover

7. Need to discourage school traffic
8. Difficult to manage with current technology
9. Agreed where practicable but often insufficient alternatives available
10. Scale of non-compliance does not make this justifiable
11. Agree but will tackle area by area in interest of efficiency
12. Agree and being done where feasible
13. Agree and this is currently the case
14. As above when required
15. Agree, this will be addressed through parallel initiatives where affordable
16. Already included
17. Currently is transparent
18. Currently done where possible
19. Agree
20. Agree
21. Agree
22. Agree and being introduced where possible
23. Already included
24. Not favoured by bus operators and lay-bys introduced for cars where feasible
25. Agree and see *revised PE17 in key changes section*
26. Agree

<p>27. Car park at Lidl in Stanmore should be multi-storey</p> <p>28. Include footway parking programme in appropriate congested streets</p> <p>29. Lidl car park should be developed and made useable to ease parking congestion</p> <p>30. Deal with multi storey car park behind “the Broadway” Stanmore – currently closed</p> <p>31. Not enough parking controls around Whitchurch Lane (x2)</p> <p>32. Plans for car parking fees in Wealdstone is just money making</p> <p>33. Serious parking problem at Canons Corner and unsafe parking in Court Drive (x2)</p> <p>34. Concerned about extending CPZ to Tintagel Drive in Stanmore</p>	<p>27. Cost implications must be balanced with need and justification</p> <p>28. Agree</p> <p>29. This is being addressed</p> <p>30. This is being addressed</p> <p>31. Additional controls are proposed this year</p> <p>32. Inaccurate but could emphasize greater transparency regarding fees in final LIP</p> <p>33. Currently being reviewed</p> <p>34. This is no longer proposed</p>
--	---

Chapter 11 School Travel Plan Strategy

Relevant comments received from consultation (excluding TfL)	Officer Recommendation
<p>1. School travel plan should be made clearer</p> <p>2. Problem of parking at Stag Lane school – regulations not properly enforced</p> <p>3. Dangerous parking at Stag Lane schools and not sufficiently enforced</p> <p>4. Stag Lane school needs double yellow lines outside and no parking from 8.30 to 9.30</p> <p>5. Problem of fast traffic running through Harrow on the Hill school must be dealt with</p> <p>6. A crossing is needed in Long Elmes for kids crossing to the school</p> <p>7. Head teachers could share their travel to meetings if this could be</p>	<p>1. Will address</p> <p>2. Recognised problem and to be addressed through School Travel Plan and Safe Routes to School programme</p> <p>3. As above</p> <p>4. As above</p> <p>5. 20mph zone proposed</p> <p>6. This is currently being considered</p> <p>7. This should be organised by education</p>

facilitated centrally

8. A more aggressive safe routes to school plan should be implemented
9. Increased school transport programme required (x2)
10. Increase the number of schools being reviewed for Safe Routes to School per annum
11. Need large scale publicity campaign to persuade drivers not to park on public highway and not to stop in the vicinity of schools
12. Introduce school buses x4
13. Fund schools to buy a school minibus to pick up and drop off kids
14. Parents should not be allowed to bring car within 1km of school
15. Encourage parents to walk with kids to school
16. More bays out of the road line at schools for drop off and collection
17. Some bus routes buses should be sent direct to the school as pupils completely overwhelm buses
18. Parking at school gates should be banned
19. Consider funding cycle purchases, cycle leasing bulk insurance and clothing package for school cyclists
20. Inclusion of school travel plans in school prospectus should be made mandatory
21. Better enforcement of school travel
22. Use ASBOs for parents who drive kids to school
23. School transport should be "green" for School Transport fleet

dept. – will contact them to address

8. Number is limited by how many travel plans that can be produced with existing funding
9. Schools need to address their travel needs. Borough can only facilitate this.
10. Reviewing Safe Routes to School is dependent on schools developing travel plans. Borough is contacting all schools to encourage more to do so
11. Will be writing to all parents in borough to discourage car use and issues are dealt with on a school by school basis
12. Cost implications and it should be noted that the Mayor has introduced free travel for the under 16s
13. As above
14. Not enforceable
15. Done as part of Walk to School week twice a year and school travel plans
16. Conflict with objective to reduce school run traffic
17. This already happens where appropriate – additional services are considered by TfL
18. Being done as part of Safer Routes to School/ School Travel Plans
19. Will raise this issue with TfL regarding safety equipment for school children
20. Recommend to encourage, but can't legally require
21. Already included as part of School Travel Plan
22. Not legal
23. Agree

Chapter 12 Performance Measures

- 2.9 TfL require a target for increasing cycling to be included in the final LIP. The London target is an increase in 80% cycling between 2001 and 2011. It is recommended that Harrow adopt this target.

Chapter 13 Core Capacity Statement

- 2.10 Consultation response suggested statement should include information on whether capacity is sufficient to delivery programme. *Situation has changed since Harrow is entering into partnership agreement for Professional Services.*

3.0 KEY CHANGES TO DRAFT LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (LIP)

- 3.1 This section provides a summary of the key changes made to the final LIP as a result of the consultation. All policy changes and programme changes are considered as key changes. As a result of the Borough Spending Plan award for 06/07 and other changes to programmes, many of the programmes have also been revised.
- 3.2 **Regeneration / Town Centres**
The Final LIP requires additional information on regeneration locations. When the Draft LIP was submitted, TfL had not yet issued their guidance on the types of projects they would fund. This has now taken place. As a result, Harrow town centre, Wealdstone, Rayners Lane and North Harrow town centres fit most closely with the funding requirements from TfL. Therefore these locations have been submitted. This list has been derived following discussions between transportation, Strategic Planning and Environmental Health Services and through considering crime statistics and the overall vitality profiles. To ensure TfL funding, location must be a town centre, as identified in the London Plan and UDP, and crime, access to services and deprivation are all also considered.
- 3.3 **Station Access Improvements**
TfL recommended that we submit a request for station access improvements. This will not commit the borough to doing this work but will enable the borough to do so if desired. The improvements do not have to be done in the next four years but can be identified as stations for later years. To meet TfL guidance for funding, station access improvements are recommended at Harrow-on-the-Hill and Sudbury Hill stations. Further stations will be included based on consideration of the North Orbital Rail Partnership and the TfL station upgrade programme.
- 3.4 **Streets for People**
If the borough were going to introduce additional Streets For People work, this would need to be identified in the final LIP. Benefits of these schemes provide benefits for only a small selection of the population and are extremely expensive. For this reason, no further schemes are suggested.

3.5 Pedestrian Areas

The Borough is required to state the management principles for all pedestrian areas. It is recommended that the final LIP state that *Harrow town centre is managed to optimise its attractiveness to shoppers and other management issues are dealt with through a Town Centre Management forum. In addition, following extensive consultation, the council has adopted a town centre development strategy.*

3.6 Performance Measures

TfL require a target for increasing cycling to be included in the final LIP. The London target is an increase in 80% cycling between 2001 and 2011. It is recommended that Harrow adopt this target.

Recommended Programme Changes following consultation

Existing	Recommended
Cycling <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Do not convert roundabout at Eastcote Road, Marsh Road to T junction Bring forward Harrow and Wealdstone to Harrow Town Centre scheme 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Location will be reviewed for improving conditions for cyclists Agree

Programme consultation comment	Recommend
General Include footway parking programme	Recommend to develop

The table below shows key changes identified.

3.7 The bold highlighting in the table shows where changes have been made.

Policy Changes

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
Joined-up public policies 2 The council will consider the improvement of local access by walking, public transport and cycling as a core element in future regeneration programmes for local centres and employment areas	The council will consider the improvement of local access by walking, public transport, motorcycling and cycling as a core element in future regeneration programmes for local centres and employment areas. <i>(To be carried forward to Local Development)</i>	Request from consultation

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
<p>Public Transport Policies</p> <p>PT.1</p> <p>The council will seek to persuade TfL to concentrate initially on developing a ‘core strategic network’ of reliable public transport services, using existing local rail services as its key radial components, to provide an acceptable public transport alternative to car use within the Borough, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritising the council’s available resources to provide the road space and traffic regulatory / management infrastructure to support the development of the key non-radial bus service links within the “core network” • Deploying as appropriate the full range of available bus priority measures; and, where necessary to secure the required degree of bus priority benefits, seeking to develop and deploy innovative measures • Reallocating road space away from car use – principally towards promoting bus use, but also the use of other sustainable transport modes, when significant progress has been made towards providing an acceptable public transport alternative, or such provision is imminent 	<p><i>Framework)</i></p> <p>PT.1</p> <p>The council will seek to persuade TfL to concentrate on continuing to improve public transport service reliability, using existing local rail services as its key radial component, and bus services as a feeder service to stations and as being the key orbital service. These will provide an acceptable public transport alternative to car use within the Borough, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritising the council’s available resources to provide the road space and traffic regulatory / management infrastructure to support the development of the bus services • Deploying as appropriate the full range of available bus priority measures; and, where necessary to secure the required degree of bus priority benefits, seeking to develop and deploy innovative measures • Reallocating road space away from car use – principally towards promoting bus use, but also the use of other sustainable transport modes, when significant progress has been made towards providing an acceptable public transport alternative, or such provision is imminent 	<p>TfL requested to delete reference to core network as it is no longer relevant</p>
<p>PT.2</p> <p>The council will work with the key regulators and providers of rail, Underground and bus services within the Borough to progressively develop the “core network” of public transport services – to complement the “strategic” public transport</p>	<p>PT.2</p> <p>The council will work with the key regulators and providers of rail, Underground and bus services within the Borough to progressively improve public transport in terms of capacity and reliability.</p>	<p>TfL requested to delete reference to core network as it is no longer relevant</p>

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
<p>network proposed in the WLTS and secure an initial minimum level of provision of 6 services per hour on each core route (see also PT.3 & 9 below)</p>		
<p>PT.3 The council will adopt a 3-stage approach to securing the key non-radial components of the “core network” within Harrow, depending on the outcome of negotiations with TfL by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initially, as the highest priority, adopting six existing bus routes – in a priority order of H12, H10, 186 and subsequently 183, 142 and 140 – and implementing a phased programme of integrated bus priority measures • Subsequently, (in conjunction with PT.6) further developing the “core network”, possibly as a “figure-of-eight” style route – based largely on those same existing bus routes, but operating <i>wholly</i> within Harrow and linking the strategic interchange locations identified in the WLTS • Finally, developing the full WLTS “core” network – either at a Borough-level or at a west London level 	<p>Recommend remove policy</p>	<p>TfL requested to delete reference to core network as it is no longer relevant</p>
<p>PT.4 The council will work with other west London boroughs to secure the implementation of the overall WLTS “core” network</p>	<p>Recommend remove policy</p>	<p>TfL requested to delete reference to core network as it is no longer relevant</p>
<p>PT.5 The council will work, in partnership with TfL (see also</p>	<p>The council will work, in partnership with TfL (see also</p>	

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
<p>PT.9 below), to establish a fully accessible local network of high quality and reliable bus services within Harrow by progressively improving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The “penetration” of local bus services into every local neighbourhood area – either by extending existing routes or, where necessary, by promoting new routes • The quality and reliability of all bus routes serving the Borough on the basis that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Works will be undertaken progressively and, as far as practicable, subsequent to or in parallel with the development of the proposed ‘core’ strategic public transport route network – No measures, having the effect of increasing the overall level of restraint on general traffic movement, will be implemented until such time as the ‘core’ strategic network is able to provide a generally acceptable alternative to car use 	<p>PT.9 below), to establish a fully accessible local network of high quality and reliable bus services within Harrow by progressively improving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The “penetration” of local bus services into every local neighbourhood area – either by extending existing routes or, where necessary, by promoting new routes and subject to evaluating the local impact of any additional bus service • The quality and reliability of all bus routes serving the Borough on the basis that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Works will be undertaken progressively and, as far as practicable, subsequent to or in parallel with the development of improvements to the public transport network 	<p>Need to ensure that lessons from H12 are learnt</p> <p>TfL requested to delete reference to core network as it is no longer relevant</p>
<p>PT.6</p> <p>The council will seek to secure a fully integrated approach to the provision and operation of public transport services within Harrow, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration between bus and rail (including Underground) services – by providing / facilitating direct and convenient personal interchange between strategic Borough-level public transport services • Integration between Borough-level and local-area public transport services – by ensuring that local 	<p>The council will seek to secure a fully integrated approach to the provision and operation of public transport services within Harrow, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration between bus and rail (including Underground) services – by providing / facilitating direct and convenient personal interchange between strategic Borough-level public transport services • Integration between Borough-level and local-area public transport services – by ensuring that local 	

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
<p>bus services, designed to penetrate local neighbourhood areas, are enabled to deliver their services to the appropriate points of access to the strategic public transport network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated passenger access to public transport services – by improving the ease and convenience of approach routes to service access points, and the quality and clarity of the access signing • Integrated and accessible provision of service information – by making current time-tabled and “real-time” operational information readily available to travellers and potential travellers, both within and outside the system • Integrated through ticketing, including for buses, and ease of access to ticket issuing facilities including development of Travelcard and SMART card initiatives covering all public transport modes • Taking account of the specific needs of people with impaired mobility. 	<p>bus services, designed to penetrate local neighbourhood areas, are enabled to deliver their services to the appropriate points of access to the strategic public transport network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated passenger access to public transport services – by improving the ease and convenience of approach routes to service access points, and the quality and clarity of the access signing • Integrated and accessible provision of service information – by making current time-tabled and “real-time” operational information readily available to travellers and potential travellers, both within and outside the system • Integrated through ticketing, including for buses, and ease of access to ticket issuing facilities including development of Travelcard and SMART card initiatives covering all public transport modes • Taking account of the specific needs of people with impaired mobility. • Improved taxi facilities at rail and underground stations 	<p>Consultation comment to include provision of improved taxi facilities at rail and underground interchanges</p>
<p>PT.8 The council will, wherever possible in partnership with public transport service providers and regulators, seek to ensure that all stations and bus stop locations in the Borough are progressively improved to offer a safe, secure and passenger-friendly environment and appropriate ‘state-of-the-art’ passenger interchange facilities – by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying all bus stops and rail (including Underground) stations as one 	<p>The council will, wherever possible in partnership with public transport service providers and regulators, seek to ensure that all stations and bus stop locations in the Borough are progressively improved to offer a safe, secure and passenger-friendly environment and appropriate ‘state-of-the-art’ passenger interchange facilities – by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying all bus stops and rail (including Underground) stations as one 	

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
<p>of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Strategic interchange access points</i> – all locations where stations are served both by local radial rail services and by a ‘core’ strategic bus route, or which are served by two ‘core’ strategic bus routes ➤ <i>Intermediate interchange access points</i> – all other stations and ‘intermediate’ bus stops on the ‘core’ strategic bus routes, i.e. bus stops separated from each other and ‘strategic’ located at intervals of 2 to 3 minutes service running time (i.e. the same overall separation as local rail / Underground stations) ➤ <i>Local interchange access point</i> –all remaining ‘local’ bus stops in Harrow, which will be the usual initial point of access for Harrow residents to the overall public transport network. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensively treating these identified access points, on a hierarchical basis, to provide secure, convenient and efficient interchange between transport modes (including walking) and a safe, secure and passenger-friendly environment, 	<p>of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Strategic interchange access points</i> – all locations where stations are served both by local radial rail services and by high frequency bus routes ➤ <i>Intermediate interchange access points</i> – all other stations and ‘intermediate’ bus stops on high frequency bus routes, i.e. bus stops separated from each other and ‘strategic’ located at intervals of 2 to 3 minutes service running time (i.e. the same overall separation as local rail / Underground stations) ➤ <i>Local interchange access point</i> –all remaining ‘local’ bus stops in Harrow, which will be the usual initial point of access for Harrow residents to the overall public transport network. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensively treating these identified access points, on a hierarchical basis, to provide secure, convenient and efficient interchange between transport modes (including walking) and a safe, secure and passenger-friendly environment, including provision of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Weatherproof waiting area(s) 	<p>TfL requested to delete reference to core network as it is no longer relevant</p>

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
<p>including provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Weatherproof waiting area(s) ➤ Seats ➤ Easy (preferably 'no-step') access ➤ Scheduled and real-time service information ➤ Clear access/interchange information and signing ➤ Emergency, and passenger assistance, telephone links <p>with options for the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Pre-pay ticket machine/s ➤ CCTV coverage ➤ Public pay-phone/s. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsequently utilising these access points, if appropriate, as a basis for developing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A network of limited-stop services as envisaged in the WLTS if or when passenger numbers justify such an enhancement ➤ Fully wheelchair-accessible boarding / alighting points, as a basis for supporting a network of fully wheelchair-accessible scheduled bus services. (See also PT.9 below) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Seats ➤ Easy (preferably 'no-step') access ➤ Scheduled and real-time service information ➤ Clear access/interchange information and signing ➤ Emergency, and passenger assistance, telephone links ➤ Safe road crossing points in close proximity to access point <p>with options for the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Pre-pay ticket machine/s ➤ CCTV coverage ➤ Public pay-phone/s. ➤ Public conveniences and washing facilities where possible <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsequently utilising these access points, if appropriate, as a basis for developing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A network of limited-stop services as envisaged in the WLTS if or when passenger numbers justify such an enhancement ➤ Fully wheelchair-accessible boarding / alighting points, as a basis for supporting a network of fully wheelchair-accessible scheduled bus services. (See also PT.9 below) <p><i>(To be carried forward to Local Development</i></p>	<p>Several comments received regarding difficult crossing locations</p> <p>Requested in consultation – particularly beneficial to elderly and disabled people</p>

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
<p>PT.9 The council will build on existing liaison arrangements with those parties responsible for regulating and operating public transport services in the Borough to ensure effective liaison at three inter-related hierarchical levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To take an overview of public transport provision • To develop the 'core' strategic bus priority proposals of the Strategy • To develop and implement key route-corridor and interchange initiatives. 	<p><i>Framework)</i></p> <p>The council will build on existing liaison arrangements with those parties responsible for regulating and operating public transport services in the Borough to ensure effective liaison at three inter-related hierarchical levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To take an overview of public transport provision • To develop and implement key route-corridor and interchange initiatives. 	<p>TfL requested to delete reference to core network as it is no longer relevant</p>
<p>PT.12 The council will strictly enforce all road traffic, parking and waiting regulations in the interests of improving bus priority – with enforcement priority being given initially to those bus routes within the 'core' strategic public transport network</p>	<p>The council will strictly enforce all road traffic, parking and waiting regulations in the interests of improving bus priority – with enforcement priority being given to those bus routes on the busy bus route network. Where possible engineering solutions will be used to minimise the need for additional enforcement.</p>	<p>Core network no longer relevant</p>
<p>PT.13 The council will seek, in conjunction with TfL and operators, to carry out a fundamental review of public transport services in Harrow to ascertain ways in which current services can more effectively meet requirements, covering all aspects of the concerns raised and particularly those of specific client groups e.g. schools, older people or those with a mobility problem</p>	<p>The council will seek, in conjunction with TfL and operators, to carry out a fundamental review of public transport services in Harrow to ascertain ways in which current services can more effectively meet requirements, covering all aspects of the concerns raised and particularly those of specific client groups e.g. schools, hospitals, older people or those with a mobility problem.</p>	<p>Several requests received regarding better hospital transport access</p>
<p>Recommend new policy</p>	<p>The Council will raise the concerns of public transport users with both TfL and bus operators.</p>	<p>Consultation requested greater contact with bus</p>

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
	This will include bus driving standards, driver behaviour as well as service provision	operators and several comments were made about bus driving standards
Recommend new policy	The Council will work with public transport providers and regulators as well as the Metropolitan Police in promoting Safer Travel at Night initiatives	TfL requested to show more support on Safer Travel at Night
Recommend new policy	The Council will seek to work with public transport providers and regulators to ensure that engineering works and service closures are coordinated to minimise passenger inconvenience.	Comments were received on poor coordination of such works
Recommend new policy	The Council will ensure that all improvements in service are made in conjunction with West London Transport Strategy and neighbouring boroughs in order to deliver an effective and reliable continuous service across boundaries	Required as a result of all <i>core network</i> references being removed
Walking Policies W.14 The council will encourage recreational walking and a special initiative on walking to sport and leisure facilities , linked to health policy, will be set up in partnership with the providers	W.14 The council will encourage recreational walking and a special initiative on walking linked to health policy, will be set up in partnership with the providers	Makes more sense with words removed
Recommend new policy	W18 The council will work with the Metropolitan Police in using their powers of enforcement to deal with illegal cycling on pavements	Several comments were received on this

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
<p>CYCLING C.5</p> <p>In considering individual schemes, the council will seek to provide both for the most direct routes for cycling between places and for the segregation of cyclists from other vehicular traffic by means, in priority order, of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully segregated cycle tracks (from both vehicles and pedestrians) • Cycle tracks fully segregated from vehicular traffic but occupying a clearly delineated part of a footway • Mandatory cycle lanes on local or main roads or a “dual provision” approach to offer choice • Cycle tracks in parks, available at all hours and only where such provision is not practicable consider: • Shared use of bus lanes • Cycle tracks in parks, during park opening hours, together with appropriate diversionary routes at other times • Advisory cycle lanes on local or main roads • Shared use of footways 	<p>In considering individual schemes, the council will seek to provide both for the most direct routes for cycling between places and for the segregation of cyclists from other vehicular traffic by means, in priority order, of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully segregated cycle tracks (from both vehicles and pedestrians) • Cycle tracks fully segregated from vehicular traffic but occupying a clearly delineated part of a footway • Mandatory cycle lanes on local or main roads • Cycle tracks in parks, available at all hours and only where such provision is not practicable consider: • Shared use of bus lanes • Cycle tracks in parks, during park opening hours, together with appropriate diversionary routes at other times • Advisory cycle lanes on local or main roads • Shared use of footways 	<p>This is clearer as original text was confusing</p>
<p>ROAD SAFETY</p> <p>The council will investigate the use of external cycle training bodies to expand the facility to children and also make training available to adults.</p>	<p>The council will investigate the use of external cycle training bodies to expand the facility to older children and also make training available to adults.</p>	<p>Younger children are already covered, so this makes more sense</p>
<p>Recommend new policy</p>	<p>3.8 PERSONAL SAFETY</p> <p>3.9 The council will support the Public Carriage Office and the Metropolitan</p>	<p>3.10</p> <p>3.11 Requested to support</p>

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
	Police Service in targeting illegal minicab operations	clampdown on illegal minicabs
<p>PARKING AND ENFORCEMENT PE3 In considering planning applications for non-residential development the council will have regard to the specific characteristics of the development including provision made for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational parking and servicing needs • Convenient car-parking for people with disabilities • Car parking related to shift and unsociable hours working • Convenient and secure parking for bicycles (and provision of showers and changing facilities for cyclists) 	<p>PE3 In considering planning applications for non-residential development the council will have regard to the specific characteristics of the development including provision made for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational parking and servicing needs • Convenient car-parking for people with disabilities • Car parking related to shift and unsociable hours working • Convenient and secure parking for bicycles (and provision of showers and changing facilities for cyclists) • Needs of parking for motorcyclists <i>(To be carried forward to Local Development Framework)</i> 	Requested from consultation
<p>PE8 Explore the possibilities for reduction in the use of station car parks in the longer term, as other forms of station access improve but in any case not to increase car parking at stations</p>	Consider the local impact of additional parking for park and ride at stations including the impact on the local transport network and air quality.	TfL requested changes as initial policy was contrary to Mayor's Transport Policy
<p>PE9 Promote the use of 'walk-and-ride' in place of 'park and ride'</p>	Promote the use of 'walk-and-ride'	Park and ride statement not necessary and contrary to Mayor's Transport Policy
<p>PE17 In the development of parking schemes, the council will</p>	In the development of parking schemes, the council will	

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
<p>ensure that the following issues are considered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Safety of all road users b. Emergency services c. Projected demands for day-time and night-time residents car parking d. Convenient car parking for people with disabilities e. Convenient and secure parking for cyclists f. Designated parking for motorcyclists g. The balance between car-parking for residents, visitors and local businesses h. Opportunities for and implications for the dual-use of parking spaces i. Convenient parking provision for delivery and service vehicles j. Parking for medical practitioners on call k. Shared use bays specifically to benefit health care workers l. Business permit requirements m. Business permit requirements n. Signage o. Opportunities for and implications for the dual-use of parking spaces p. Restraint on traffic growth by reducing available commuter parking 	<p>ensure that the following issues are considered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Safety of all road users b. Emergency services c. Projected demands for day-time and night-time residents car parking d. Convenient car parking for people with disabilities e. Convenient and secure parking for cyclists f. Designated and secure parking for motorcyclists g. The balance between car-parking for residents, visitors and local businesses h. Opportunities for and implications for the dual-use of parking spaces i. Convenient parking provision for delivery and service vehicles j. Parking for medical practitioners on call k. Shared use bays specifically to benefit health care workers l. Business permit requirements m. Signage n. Restraint on traffic growth by reducing available commuter parking 	<p>Requested in consultation</p> <p>Repeated points</p>
<p>Policies and financial measures FM.3 The council will urge the Mayor and the GLA to introduce a workplace parking levy, only on a consistent London-wide basis, with strictly limited provision for exemptions - at a level of charging in</p>	<p>Recommend remove</p>	<p>Workplace parking levy is no longer recommended</p>

Existing Policy	Recommended policy	Reason for change
<p>outer London comparable across 'competing' authorities, both in and outside London</p>		
<p>FM.4 The council will seek to persuade other responsible authorities that the principle of a workplace parking levy should be extended to other forms of high car-generating development, particularly to shoppers' car parking spaces in large developments, on a similarly consistent and complementary basis</p>	<p>Recommend remove</p>	<p>Workplace parking levy is no longer recommended</p>
<p>FM.6 The council will seek greater detail from the Mayor / GLA as to how central and/or inner London only schemes for workplace parking levies or road user charges will impact on adjacent areas, and how these impacts will be addressed, before considering whether to support such a scheme</p>	<p>Recommend remove</p>	<p>Workplace parking levy is no longer recommended</p>
<p>FM.7 Should workplace parking levies or road user charges be proposed for central/inner London, the council will strongly urge upon the Mayor and the GLA that the costs of ameliorating adverse traffic, environmental and commercial impacts in outer London be a charge on the income generated</p>	<p>Recommend remove</p>	<p>Workplace parking levy is no longer recommended</p>