

Appendix C – LIP3 Consultation Monitoring

Consultation Date	Response Date	Consultee's Name	Summary of Response	Action Taken
02/11/2018	14/11/2018	LA21	Views expressed on the existing characteristics of the Borough and concerns expressed over the level of proposed future development in the Borough as previously expressed by the group in their response to the Council's Growth Strategy. The Group reiterated its views over possible new river crossings. Also highlighted that better use of the Thames in terms of river transport of passengers not just freight.	Comments were noted and the text reviewed in respect of river transport and minor text changes made.
04/12/2018	07/12/2018	Historic England	The organisation has no comments to make	No action required
02/11/2018	11/12/2018	Kent County Council	Kent County Council has no comments to make	No action required

Consultation Date	Response Date	Consultee's Name	Summary of Response	Action Taken
02/11/2018	07/12/2018	TfL	<p>Various comments on content of report including items of presentation and level of detail provided. Requested revisions included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General comment - Format of setting out Objectives against MTS 2. General comment - further details and commitment needed on reducing car use 3. Be specific as possible with objectives 4. Outcome 2 Vision Zero - further details required on intended coverage of 20mph zones, motorcycle safety, traffic reduction, unsafe behaviour and coordinating post collision data. 5. Outcome 2 Vision Zero - Update estimates and trajectories. Include text provided. 6. Outcome 3 - Clarify the policies and proposals to achieve this outcome e.g. use of delivery and service management 7. Outcome 4 - Need to outline potential traffic reduction measures in addition to TfL charging schemes. 8. Outcome 5 - Further explain reason for emphasis on river services. 9. Outcome 6 - List the currently inaccessible bus stops and stations which are to be priorities for access improvements. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discussed with TfL - No further action needed 2. Further details added 3. Further details added 4. Further Details added 5. Revisions made 6. Additional details added 7. Details added 8. Details added 9. Details added 10. Further details added 11. Details revised 12. Details added to text 13. Details added 14. Details added 15. Details added/revised 16. Details revised 17. Discussed with TfL No Further Action 18. Revised 19. Details added

Consultation Date	Response Date	Consultee's Name	Summary of Response	Action Taken
			<p>10. Outcomes 8 and 9 - Further detail required on "appropriate circumstances" for car-free and car-lite development in emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>11. General comment - Add 2041 targets against trajectories.</p> <p>12. Borough Outcome Indicator Targets - Target 1a clarify slightly lower target for 2021 activity levels. Cycling investment is mentioned but the cycle infrastructure target has been met.</p> <p>13. Borough outcome indicator targets - Target 2a needs to include a longer-term Vision Zero target for 2041.</p> <p>14. Borough outcome target indicators - Target 3c the rationale for increasing car ownership requires clarification especially as Bexley have forecast kms to stay constant.</p> <p>15. Delivery Plan - Long Term - Further detail required on complementary measures that could be delivered by the borough if long-term major projects go ahead and how these would support/deliver the MTS outcomes in Bexley.</p> <p>16. Delivery Plan - Long Term - A series of junction improvement/capacity enhancement schemes have been included. These are not consistent with the Healthier Streets approach. Further clarification is required.</p>	

Consultation Date	Response Date	Consultee's Name	Summary of Response	Action Taken
			<p>17. Delivery Plan - 3 Year Programme - Table 3.4 could make better links to how programme supports MTS outcomes. It would be good to have more on funding sources.</p> <p>18. Delivery Plan - 3 Year Programme - All but one risk is low likelihood. Please reconsider and expand on mitigation measures.</p> <p>19. 19. Delivery Plan - 1 Year Programme - It would be useful to include more detail as to how the potential interventions were identified and prioritised.</p>	

Consultation Date	Response Date	Consultee's Name	Summary of Response	Action Taken
02/11/2018	14/12/2018	Paul McQuillen	Raises concerns in relation to modal transitions however introduction of river crossings allow for more private vehicle traffic. No mention of traffic calming measures to reduce rat-running. A kerbside strategy is required to manage parking particularly around railway stations. Must recognise and implement more physical measures for healthy streets scheme	Comments were noted and have generally been addressed through the revisions undertaken as a result of TfL's comments above. Parking issues raised will be considered in the preparation of appropriate strategies.
02/11/2018	14/12/2018	Bexley Labour Group	<p>Bexley Labour group is supportive of measures and strategies, in line with the Mayors Transport strategy to improve air quality and promoting better transport links in Bexley to allow better accessibility to jobs, housing and opportunities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Should the Map on page 9, Fig. 2.2 key transport improvements and centres be clearer on the map showing the River Crossing to Gallions Reach, to be consistent with the arrow shown on the same map to Rainham. Why is there no mention of a potential London Overground Barking reach extension to Abbey Wood and potentially beyond into Bexley and Bromley, linking with wider opportunities of a wider London orbital rail network. Table 2.7 (page 16) Should the comments not read on point 2.2.21 'the table show that TFL managed roads are higher in the casualty tables 2.6 and 2.7 which will require the council to work closely with TFL to reduce 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This has been amended in the Final Draft LIP. The MTS does not include this as a firm commitment, only that a feasibility study will be undertaken during the life of the MTS. The LIP must reflect how the current MTS will be delivered locally, and so these longer-term aspirations will be picked up in other Council strategy documents such as the Local Plan review. Agreed. Wording edited in Final Draft This information is not currently available. However, initiatives continue to be developed to encourage more walking with the clear links between active lifestyles and the reduced risk of ill health.

Consultation Date	Response Date	Consultee's Name	Summary of Response	Action Taken
			<p>total casualties in the Borough, TFL roads tend to have higher traffic flows which is likely to be the factor influencing the number of road casualties</p> <p>4. To encourage more walking in point 2.35, could we also show to residents clearly the benefit of the walking steps, how many walking steps from certain locations and the link to better public health outcomes. The tube system shows how many steps from each station, this could be clearly show on public noticeboards.</p> <p>5. Borough Transport Objectives. Should we not include potential of linking Bexley, to the London Orbital rail network, from the London Overground extension, Gospel Oak-Barking line, which is being extended to Barking Reach, this could look at options to extend services further into Thamesmead, Bexley and Bromley, improving North/South borough links. This was also agreed by the Transport Strategy sub group in 2016.</p> <p>6. Point 2.4.17. Table 2.9 shows a table of on-street cycle parking, which is to be welcomed, but it would useful to show clearly on the Council website or in strategic points in the borough where the cycle parking is in the borough and to have clear plan to continually improve cycle provision and parking.</p> <p>7. Point 2.4.24, Point 2.4.68, point 3.6.18. This section should clearly show the aspiration that all 12 stations achieve step free access. It mentions Erith and</p>	<p>5. The MTS does not include a possible Overground extension, crossing the River Thames from Barking Riverside, as a firm commitment, only that a feasibility study will be undertaken during the life of the MTS. As with point 2 above, this will be picked up in other Council strategy documents such as the Local Plan review.</p> <p>6. These points are noted and will be considered during the preparation of appropriate strategies.</p> <p>7. Agreed. Edits have been made in the Final Draft LIP3 relating to Station accessibility.</p> <p>8. This point is noted and will be considered during the preparation of appropriate strategies.</p> <p>9. Noted.</p> <p>10. Consideration will be given to electric vehicles in the future when technology and range improves, and costs of purchase and maintenance reduces. The Street Services team trialled the use of an electric street</p>

Consultation Date	Response Date	Consultee's Name	Summary of Response	Action Taken
			<p>Falconwood, but no mention of Albany Park which has constrained access to both platforms and Belvedere and Slade Green both suffer from lack of cross platform step free access, this should be included to be clear about the borough's aspiration.</p> <p>8. Point 2.4.41 Welcome the support for car clubs on new developments, but the Council could investigate using its car parks as ways of bringing more car clubs to the borough and promoting this as a viable alternative to multi car households.</p> <p>9. Point 2.4.42. Strongly support the Mayors aspirations for Healthy Streets and the strongly support the proposed walking and cycling measures in Blackfen, Belvedere and Northumberland Heath as set out in Table 2.15.</p> <p>10. Point 2.4.47. Could the council where technology allows, encourage more purchasing of electric vehicles in the street services team, like the electric pool car club cars at the Civic Centre.</p> <p>11. Point 2.4.53. In addition to this point, could the council investigate installing where cost effective more electric charging points in all the boroughs car parks.</p> <p>12. Point 2.4.62. As well as stations mentioned at Bexley, Sidcup and Belvedere for better signage, cycle parking, seating and landscaping, stations that could be added to these programmes include Slade Green, Crayford and Falconwood stations.</p>	<p>cleaning vehicle in 2018, however it was not considered for purchase as it was significantly more expensive than current equipment and did not effectively clean the area trialled. The situation with mass produced electric vehicles and equipment will continue to be monitored until such time effectiveness can be proven and relied upon.</p> <p>11. This is noted and will be considered during the preparation of appropriate strategies.</p> <p>12. The stations listed are those currently prioritised owing to synergy with, or being complementary to, current initiatives and may change as other schemes and initiatives come forward. As the priority is subject to ongoing reviews and will be revisited/updated prior to submission it will be more appropriate to replace the list of stations with the prioritisation criteria.</p>

Consultation Date	Response Date	Consultee's Name	Summary of Response	Action Taken
			<p>13. Point 2.4.85. Bexley parking policy could look to influence car usage, ownership and encouraging people to purchase more electric and environmentally friendly cars and developments near railway stations should have car free/car restricted developments.</p> <p>14. Point 2.6.5. Could all the boroughs district and secondary town centres be listed?</p> <p>15. Town centre renewal. Point 3.6.15. Should more specific detail be given on the names of secondary and local centres, particularly near railway stations, that could achieve public realm improvements, sustainable transport improvements: Albany Park, Falconwood, Lower Belvedere, Belvedere Village and Slade Green.</p> <p>16. Point 3.6.16. Stations that will need to closely monitor stations that connect with Abbey Wood station for commuter parking, when Crossrail services start, particularly Slade Green and Belvedere, although Erith, Crayford and Barnehurst could be affected by parking outside present CPZs.</p>	<p>13. This is noted and will be considered during the preparation of appropriate strategies.</p> <p>14. This information has been added to the final draft LIP.</p> <p>15. As with item 12, the secondary and local centres where 'healthy street'-style improvements are considered will be prioritised where they have synergy with, or are complementary to, other schemes and initiatives, and the priority may change as other schemes and initiatives come forward. As the priority is subject to ongoing reviews it will be more appropriate to set out the type of improvements that might be considered as well as the approach taken with prioritisation.</p> <p>16. This is noted and reflected in the current text in the Final Draft.</p>

Consultation Date	Response Date	Consultee's Name	Summary of Response	Action Taken
02/11/2018	14/12/2018	Bexley Cyclists	The road network must be made more appealing so adults and children could walk/cycle to the Borough's green spaces. Across the whole borough, commit to creating Healthy Neighbourhood zones delineated by areas between distributor and main roads and to identify 'rat running' with traffic surveillance. The aim would be to reduce traffic speeds and volumes in these areas with the introduction of modal filtering and 20mph speed limits.	Comments are noted and have generally been addressed through the revisions undertaken as a result of TfL's comments above.
02/11/2018	18/12/2018	LB Bromley	Buses: Bromley are interested in some cross boundary issues, Bexley should state that they are willing to work with other boroughs to improve walking cycling and PT routes/services. Bexley have not included any reference to MTS proposals for "Potential Orbital Expressways" (MTS Proposal 59) which includes a route between Beckenham Junction and Bexleyheath as an Express Bus Corridor (figure 22 of MTS). Cycling: Lack of TfL's Strategic Cycling Analysis (SCA) routes. Bromley's LIP includes support for high quality cycle routes including supporting the development of SCA routes two of which provide links between our boroughs: Orpington to Sidcup via Eltham and St Pauls Cray, Chislehurst to Sidcup. Walking: Bromley would welcome more detail on what is being proposed to improve routes such as the Green Chain. Rail: Clarity around Bexley's position regarding services to London Termini (2.4.75) Bromley believes it is important to plan services to make most efficient use of capacity and ensure a reliable service.	Comments noted and LIP text revised to incorporate items relating to cross boundary working and inclusion of MTS proposals. The Council has already expressed its strong objections to the Government's plans, during the next franchise period, to reduce the choice of central London termini from stations in the borough and will continue to lobby on behalf of local passengers.