

**LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT****Executive - 15 August 2005****Report from the Director of Environment and Culture**

For action

Wards affected:

ALL

**Report Title: The Local Implementation Plan**

Forward Plan Ref: E&amp;C-05/06-006

**1.0 Summary**

- 1.1 The Local Implementation Plan (LIP) is a statutory document that every London Borough is in the process of preparing for submission to the Mayor in 2005. The document details how the Borough plans to implement the relevant priorities, policies and proposals included within the Mayor's Transport Strategy. This includes broad programmes of physical works that the Council will continue to progress over the course of the plan. The LIP process was reported to the 15<sup>th</sup> February 2005 Executive and officers were instructed to report back to the Executive on the results of the consultation with a recommended 'Final' LIP document.
- 1.2 The Transportation Unit has now prepared the Final LIP, following the submission of a Draft LIP document to Transport for London and detailed consultation which has been ongoing between March-July 2005. This final LIP is expected to be completed and ready for submission to the Mayor in September 2005. The Mayor's Office (the GLA) requires 100 days to approve the Local Implementation Plan, and wants all London LIPS to be in place (approved) before the end of 2005.

**2.0 Recommendations**

- 2.1 Approve the Draft Local Implementation Plan (LIP).
- 2.2 Note the submission arrangements / timescales for submission of the Final LIP;

- 2.3 Note that the Council has not received the official feedback report on the Draft LIP from Transport for London, to this end, instruct the Director of Environment upon receipt of this official feedback report to make any necessary non significant or minor amendments to the draft LIP, prepare the Final LIP and subject to no material representation or objections being received from Transport for London submit the Final LIP to the Mayor of London for approval;
- 2.4 Instruct the Director of Environment not to submit the Final LIP to the Mayor of London for approval and to report back to Executive for approval of the Final LIP should the official feedback from Transport for London or the result of the borough wide consultation require significant or major amendments to the Draft LIP;

### **3.0 Detail**

- 3.1 The preparation of a LIP is a legal requirement of the 1999 Greater London Authority Act. This demands that every London Borough prepares a transport plan that sets out how the relevant priorities and policies included within the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) will be delivered.
- 3.2 The LIP details how, subject to future funding, the Council will respond to the priorities, policies and proposals of the MTS. It also includes broad programmes of physical works that the Council will continue to progress over the course of the plan (e.g. installing bus lanes, safety schemes, cycling facilities and 20mph zones).
- 3.3 The Transportation Unit prepared a Draft LIP document which was subject to detailed public consultation from March through to July 2005. A copy of the Draft LIP will be available for members inspection at the meeting and an Executive Summary of the Draft LIP is attached to this Report as **Appendix A**. The outcome of this consultation (which closed on July 17) is summarised in **Appendix B** attached to this report.
- 3.4 The LIP Guidance Document issued to all Councils in July 2004 strongly recommended that all boroughs follow a fixed structure/content. Resultantly, Brent's LIP adopted the recommended structure and includes the following chapters:
- 1) Local socio-economic / demographic context;
  - 2) Local transport context;
  - 3) Borough Policy Statement;
  - 4) Equality Impact Assessment;
  - 5) LIP proposals for Mayor's Transport Strategy priority areas, targets and Appendix C;
  - 6) Road Danger Reduction Plan;
  - 7) Parking and Enforcement Plan;
  - 8) School Travel Plan Strategy;
  - 9) Performance measures;
  - 10) Consultation results;

- 11) Borough core capacity statement;
- 12) Funding implications.

3.5 Chapter 5 forms the core part of the LIP, and must include 83 'Action Points', these are:-

- Mayor's transport strategies, national policies and local policy framework;
- National rail;
- Buses;
- Streets;
- Car user;
- Walking;
- Cycling;
- Freight;
- Accessible transport;
- Integration.

3.6 In reflection of the fact that the LIP required detailed information in support of the aforementioned structure/areas from across many Council departments, a LIP Working Group was formed and convened its first meeting in December 2004. Since then, the group convened on four further occasions, agreeing the content of the 'Draft LIP' in July 2005. The group proved to be an inclusive, well attended and effective means of collating and developing the required information.

The Working Group (of which there were two) comprised of various officers from Environmental Services, Social Services, Housing, Education, Community Safety and a representative from the voluntary sector.

3.7 The Draft LIP was sent to Transport for London for approval on Friday 4<sup>th</sup> March and their official feedback report is still awaited as of 21 July 2005. Subject to the official feedback received from Transport for London, officers anticipate that the Final LIP will be in the form of the Draft LIP. It may be necessary to amend the Draft LIP and it is proposed that the Director of Environment is authorised to make minor and non substantive amendments if necessary to the Draft LIP, prepare the Final LIP (based on the Draft LIP) and submit the same to the Mayor for approval.

3.8 However the Director of Environment will not submit the Final LIP to the Mayor of London for approval if substantive amendments or major amendments are required to the Draft LIP following Transport for London's official feed back or the result of the borough wide consultation and the Director of Environment shall report back to the Executive for approval of the Final LIP prior to submission of the same to the Mayor of London

## **4.0 Financial Implications**

- 4.1 Transport for London provided the Council with £70,000. This included £50,000 for the last (2004/05) financial year and a further £20,000 for the current financial year. This was to be used for staffing resources, consultation, printing and publication in successfully delivering the LIP. The majority of this money was used for consultation purposes, one element which included the printing and delivery of over 100,000 leaflets to residents and other stakeholders borough-wide.
- 4.2 The production of the LIP was undertaken primarily by officers from the Environmental Services Department and supported by other departments within the Council. An external design and printing service was used to produce the Consultation Leaflet, support materials and the Draft LIP Document. However, it is expected that associated costs will be covered by the TfL financial allocation.
- 4.3 As the LIP is predominantly comprised of policies and broad programmes of works there is no requirement for the Council to provide additional Capital or Revenue resources. The annual (Borough Spending Plan) bid that is submitted to Transport for London will continue to be the main source of Capital Funding for transport related infrastructure projects, and to this end, will support the delivery of the broad proposals contained within the LIP.

## **5.0 Legal Implications**

- 5.1 The Greater London Authority Act 1999 (The Act) requires that the London Local Authorities must implement the Mayor's Transport Strategy published in 2001. This Strategy sets out the transport policy framework for London.
- 5.2 Brent Council must submit a LIP for the Mayor to approve before the end of 2005. The Mayor cannot approve a LIP unless he considers that:-
- It is consistent with the (Mayor's) Strategy;
  - That the proposals contained in the LIP are adequate for the purposes of the implementation of the Strategy; and...
  - That the timetable for implementing the proposals and the end date by which the proposals are implemented are adequate.
- 5.3 The Mayor has extensive powers to prepare the LIP if an Authority fails to prepare one that is in the Mayor's opinion adequate. The Mayor can recover the cost of doing so from the Local Authority in question as a civil debt. Also, where the Mayor considers that the Local Authority has failed 'or is likely to fail' to implement any proposal within the LIP, he can exercise on behalf of the Local Authority its powers and recover the cost of doing so.

5.4 The Act states that a Local Authority may revise its LIP at any time and must consider the need to do so when the Transport Strategy is revised.

## **6.0 Diversity Implications**

6.1 The LIP fully supports the Mayor (and the Councils) policies on diversity and social inclusion. For example, LIP 'Priority V' is "Improving accessibility and social inclusion on the transport network". Plans should have regard to safety and security for women and vulnerable users. The LIP will also consider the findings the Council has made into pioneering road safety research into why children of Afro-Caribbean origin are over represented in road traffic casualties in some areas of the Borough.

6.2 Boroughs must demonstrate how the LIP will meet the equality and inclusion objectives set out in the Mayor's Transport Strategy and include proposals responding to the requirements in the LIP Guidance. Brent's LIP does this wherever possible.

6.3 The LIP should address the transport barriers for equality target groups (as defined by the GLA and other groups):

- Women;
- Black and minority ethnic people;
- Older people;
- Disabled people;
- Lesbians, gay men, bisexual and transgender people;
- People from different faith groups.

6.4 In reflection of the above, boroughs are "strongly recommended" to undertake an 'Equality Impact Assessment' (EQIA) to demonstrate that the LIP does not have a negative impact on a particular equality target group, or that any adverse impacts identified have been appropriately mitigated. Brent's LIP includes such an EQIA.

## **7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)**

7.1 The production of the LIP has been undertaken mainly by existing staffing within the Council, some temporary staff have also been employed and have assisted with the LIP process.

## **8.0 Environmental Implications**

- 8.1 The LIP carries important Environment Implications, particularly those that underpin the Mayor's Transport Strategy, namely, encouraging increased use of bus and rail travel, 'year on year improvements' in walking and cycling, and a reduced reliance on the private car. The document affords the opportunity to include aspirations relating to town and district centres / public spaces, proposed rail, light rail, tram and bus route improvements, and proposed improvements to key strategic walking and cycling corridors.
- 8.2 As well as having regard to the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy, where appropriate the LIP makes important linkages to the recommendations of the Council's Air Quality Action Plan. It also clearly states our policies with respect to traffic and transport related noise and relevant borough activities relating to reducing traffic and transport related traffic noise. The LIP also makes reference to how the Council seeks to encourage the movement of waste by rail or water or otherwise reduce the impact of the transport of waste material.
- 8.3 To ensure the LIP fully complies with recent environmental legislation, the Council appointed an independent consultancy to carry out a 'Strategic Environmental Assessment' (SEA). SEA is a requirement of European Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, also known as the 'SEA Directive'.
- 8.4 The objective of the SEA Directive is 'to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans ... with a view to promoting sustainable development' (Article 1). This is broadly consistent with Government policies and is reflected in other transport planning and appraisal guidance.
- 8.5 The SEA Directive applies to plans and programmes, and modifications to them, whose formal preparation begins after 21 July 2004. It also applies to plans and programmes whose formal preparation began before that date, if they have not been adopted (or submitted to a legislative procedure leading to adoption) by 21 July 2006.
- 8.6 A Summary of the Environmental Report, or the full report, is available should Members wish to inspect it.

## **Background Papers**

Detail of documents includes:-

- "Interim Local Implementation Plan" – 2001 – Brent Council;
- "Borough Spending Plan 2005-2006" – 2004 – Brent Council;
- Transport Strategy – 2001 – Greater London Authority (GLA);
- Economic Development Strategy – 2001 – GLA;

- Spatial Development; the “London Plan” – 2004 – GLA;
- Biodiversity Action Plan – 2002 – GLA;
- Municipal Waste Management – 2003 – GLA;
- Air Quality – 2002 – GLA;
- Ambient Noise – 2004 – GLA;
- Culture – 2004 – GLA.

### **Contact Officers**

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Adrian Pigott, Transportation Service Unit, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor East Brent House, 349-357 High Road Wembley, HA9 6BZ. Tel: 020 8937 5168.

**Richard Saunders**  
**Director of Environment and Culture**

## **APPENDIX A – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.**

The Mayor of London is responsible for setting out the Transport Strategy for London and for strategies for spatial development through the London Plan, economic development, air quality, biodiversity, noise, waste and culture among others. The London boroughs (of which Brent is one) have a key role to play in planning for and developing these improvements, including the management of the 95 per cent of roads for which they are responsible.

Brent's Local Implementation Plan is a statutory document that sets out how the borough proposes to implement the Mayor's Transport Plan in its area, taking into account the local context. Detailed policies and proposals are set out in detail for the first five years of the plan period which mirrors that of the MTS, with a ten-year horizon from 2001-2011.

The plan represents a progressive approach to transport policy which on implementation, the Transportation Service Unit is confident will deliver, on balance, the wishes of locally elected members and everyone who lives and works in the borough. The plan also sets out how the Council will seek to deliver and indeed develop the statutory targets set out in the MTS, including time-scales and resources.

The Council is also responsible for ensuring that its Air Quality, Biodiversity, Lorry Ban Exemption and Local Development Framework, together with other relevant policies and strategies, are linked to the higher-order strategic policies set by the Mayor, notably in the London Plan.

Brent Council is pleased to be working in partnership with Transport for London to deliver the policies and proposals set out in this Local Implementation Plan. Individual scheme and project proposals are set out in the annual Borough Spending Plan funding bid, which is based upon the strategic proposals set out in the LIP.

### **Structure of the Local Implementation Plan:**

#### **Chapter 1: Local Socio-economic / demographic context**

Chapter 1 provides a demographic and geographical description of Brent. It is intended to assist in understanding the context of the policies and proposals contained in the LIP.

The borough is home to a population of 263,464 residents (2001 Census), an increase of 27,000 from 1991, and is one of the two most diverse and ethnically inclusive boroughs. Brent is also a youthful borough: almost 40 per cent of the borough's population is aged between 20 and 39 years; its population is predominantly below the age of 40.

Parts of the borough, predominantly in the south (Harlesden / Stonebridge) areas of Brent, are some of the most deprived in the UK. The symptoms of this include overcrowding, health-related problems and relatively high unemployment. Concurrent with these issues is the fact that these areas are predominantly situated in areas of poor air quality.

Brent is also one of the larger London local authorities, covering almost 17 square miles. It includes relatively dense Victorian suburban development to the south of the



North Circular Road and lower density suburban development to the north, comprising of the major town centre of Wembley, Wembley Stadium, major employment and retail areas and housing dating from the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.

The borough has an extensive public transport network, with 48 daytime and 12 night time bus routes and 26 rail stations served by National Rail and Bakerloo, Metropolitan, Piccadilly and Jubilee Line Underground trains.

Surveys of local travel habits show that the most popular single choice of mode for travel to work is the private motor car or van, with just over a third of people travelling by this mode as driver or passenger. However the sustainable modes are most popular when taken together: Almost two thirds of travel to work journeys are made on foot (6%), cycle (1.6%), public transport (45%) or taxi (0.4%) (not all modes included). Just under 10 per cent of people work at home.

Over a third of households in Brent do not own a private motor car. This translates to about half of the population of the borough not having access to a car all of the time (based on a borough average of 2.62 persons per household), meaning that there is considerably greater reliance on the sustainable modes than household car ownership figures alone would indicate. Nevertheless, an increasing proportion of households have two or more vehicles.

The chapter provides an indication of areas in which the Council needs to work hardest: to reduce the need to travel, and where travel is necessary, to increase the proportion of journeys walked and cycled and reduce demand for car-borne travel in the context of an increasing population, relatively low household car ownership; the environmental, social and economic impacts of unsustainable patterns of travel; and pressures on the road and public transport networks.

## **Chapter 2: Local Transport Context**

The Local Implementation Plan guidance suggests that Chapter 2 should contain background information on local transport services, problems and opportunities including those that result from local infrastructure, land-use developments and regeneration. In the Final Local Implementation Plan contextual base maps will be used to provide this information and the existing text of Chapter 2 will be used to support Chapter 5.

## **Chapter 3: Borough Policy Statement**

Chapter 3 sets out how the Local Implementation Plan policies are supported by corresponding Council policies across a range of work areas. It also includes Common Statements from Park Royal Partnership, London Lorry Control Scheme, London Bus Priority Network, London Cycle Network and SWELTRAC.

A summary of the Council's supporting policies are set out in a table which summarises each relevant policy or action and links it to individual policies from the Mayor's Transport Strategy. The policy documents are as follows:

- The Unitary Development Plan (adopted 2004) will be superseded by the Local Development Framework, a suite of land-use planning documents that will increasingly reflect the policies of the Local Implementation Plan. The UDP contains strategic and local policies for transport and land use development in the borough and is the main material consideration in the development process;

- The Crime and Disorder Strategy sets out targets to reduce the amount of crime in the borough. It has considerable relevance to the Council's transport policies, particularly with regard to personal safety and the development of area-wide schemes that are designed to address public realm and crime issues.
- The Air Quality Action Plan provides a key context to the development of sustainable transport policies in the LIP. The borough's defined Air Quality Management Areas are key to the identification of local priorities for transport investment, together with other considerations including indices of multiple deprivation. Transport is a major net contributor to poor air quality and associated poor health and climate change; it is therefore imperative that the Council contributes robustly to improving the quality of the borough's air.
- The Regeneration Action Plan sets out the Council's spending priorities and investment mechanisms for regeneration in the borough. Many of the objectives in the plan are indirectly or directly transport oriented, from reducing danger on the roads to providing accessibility for mobility and inclusion groups.
- The Community Consultation Strategy sets out a framework for consultation in the borough. Brent Council is committed to developing innovative methods of community involvement in its policies, increasingly by moving away from 'theatre' style 'them and us' methods and towards engagement of the public in the future of the borough.
- The Biodiversity Action Plan sets out how the Council will biological diversity across the borough, including on transport routes. The Action Plan also sets out how the Council will enable the public to have access to parks and other spaces to enjoy their environmental quality.
- Brent Community Plan is the culmination of engagement with stakeholders in the Brent Strategic Partnership. The plan establishes a set of key priorities relating to environment and transport that are of strategic importance to the Local Implementation Plan.

Common statements have been provided by a number of organisations as follows:

- Park Royal is the largest remaining industrial area in London and is identified in the London Plan as a strategic employment area. The industrial area is host to 1,900 businesses with a total between them of some 40,000 employees.
- The London Lorry Control scheme common statement is aimed at restricting the movement of heavy goods road vehicles to a defined exempted network. The environmental controls, enforced on behalf of the boroughs by the ALG, are intended to reduce the impact on Londoners caused by lorries of over 18 tonnes laden weight.
- London Bus Priority Network is project managed by the London Borough of Bromley. Its aim is to maximise bus priority across the network and to free operators from the effects of motor traffic congestion.
- The London Cycle Network Plus is project managed by the London Borough of Camden. The 900km network is one part of the London Cycling Action Plan's commitment to increasing the amount of cycling in London.
- The West London Transport Strategy (WLTS) is a joint public-private funding venture including six London boroughs including Brent. The partnership provides a voice for the sub-region in the interests of its economic, social and

environmental well-being. The Common Statement shows how the WLTS is committed to achieving sustainable transport and compatible land use planning policies across the sub-region.

- SWELTRAC (South and West London Transport Conference) is an organisation comprising ten London Boroughs and Surrey County Council, Spelthorne Borough Council, TfL, the SRA and National Rail. Its common statement sets out the organisation's aim to reduce car dependency and travel demand, and promote investment in and the use of the sustainable modes in order to achieve safe and efficient movement of people and goods.

#### **Chapter 4: Equality Impact Assessment**

Chapter 4 summarises the key outcomes and actions arising from the Equality Impact Assessment of the LIP. The purpose of an Equality Impact Assessment is to improve the work of the Council by ensuring that it does not discriminate against any group. The Council's work should also promote equality and inclusion and fulfils the Council's duties under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000.

Broadly, the Chapter concludes that investment in schemes that reflect the policies and proposals contained in the Local Implementation Plan will be of benefit to the whole community, provided that sufficient funding can be secured to deliver the MTS locally.

#### **Chapter 5: LIP Proposals for Mayor's Transport Strategy Priority Areas**

Chapter 5 sets out the Council's own policy response to the Mayor's Transport Strategy policies and proposals. The chapter is divided into 12 sub-sections, dealing with overall strategies, public transport, streets, modes, accessible transport, integration and major projects. The chapter demonstrates clearly that the LIP is a corporate document, with contributions from many service units who are members of the LIP working group.

Each sub-section provides a wider policy and transport context, outlining supporting national, London-wide and local policies. There is also a local transport context in each subsection which provides a background on local transport services, problems and opportunities, including those that result from local infrastructure, land-use developments and regeneration. Key topics include:

- Buses: The borough has an extensive public bus network, however there are 'holes' – areas which are not within TfL's aspirational standard that no household should be more than 10 minutes' walk of a bus stop. Recent investment has resulted in a surge in bus usage, meaning that existing services need to have increased capacity and providing opportunities to develop new and innovative bus services, including guided bus or enhanced priority routes. The borough's orbital bus network needs to be strengthened to provide realistic alternatives to the private car for more journeys. To this end, the Council is currently developing plans to improve links between the Park Royal and Wembley regeneration areas where connectivity is currently poor, with the 'Wembley Transit' proposal.
- Rail: Three Train Operating Companies run services in Brent, and whilst the Council does not have direct financial input into service and network improvements, it has nevertheless identified several areas where there has been

close co-operation on funding of rail projects over several years. The Council wishes to take every opportunity arising, for example from re-franchising, the formation of TfL Rail, the launching of partnerships and the development of initiatives such as Orbirail, to raise standards of service and infrastructure in the borough. The Council also sees opportunities for improvements to local Underground infrastructure and services on the Piccadilly, Bakerloo, Metropolitan and Jubilee lines.

- Streets: The Council has a backlog of work arising from many years of under-investment in maintaining and improving the borough's streets. The Local Implementation Plan provides the opportunity to reverse this situation, in a way that is consistent with the progressive policies of the road danger reduction principles set out in Chapter 6 and the policy responses provided in Chapter 5.
- Private cars: Some wards in the south of Brent have lower car ownership levels compared with the national average, yet motor traffic is increasing. This growth and continued car dependency are having unacceptable economic, social and environmental impacts, particularly upon the urban realm, quality of life and health. Much of the Borough is now covered by an Air Quality Management Area, presenting opportunities to reduce the pollution impact of motor traffic and encourage more widespread use of more sustainable modes.

Against this background, the Council has developed policy responses to the Mayor's transport strategy. Broadly, the Council's response is as follows:

- Environment: The Council is concerned about the long term environmental, social and economic impacts of increasing dependency on private cars in particular and seeks to promote modal shift by choice. The Council's policies have therefore focussed on meeting the high order objective of sustainability by promoting modal shift. Taken together, the policies and proposals perform well against the assessment criteria in the Strategic Environmental Assessment. These policies include:
  - The Air Quality Action Plan, which sets out policies and actions for the Council to follow with regard to reducing the impact of motor traffic, especially in the areas defined as 'Air Quality Management Areas' and the Low Emission Zone. The Action Plan has been very influential with regard to the development of policies and proposals in the LIP.
  - The Biodiversity Action Plan, which the Council will have regard to in an increasing proportion of its transport projects.
  - The Strategic Environmental Assessment, which whilst not a policy document, does provide useful guidance on how the LIP can be improved and used to direct the implementation of projects.
- Walking: The Council seeks to promote walking and overcome the barriers that prevent people from walking more often. In particular, the Borough should become more accessible to disabled people, including people with sensory impairments, and the elderly and children travelling independently. This can be achieved in part by identifying pedestrian desire lines, increasing the number of pedestrian crossings and by improving the condition of footways. The Council will promote London-wide and local schemes such as the Capital Ring strategic walking route and metropolitan walks.
- Cycling: The Council seeks to promote cycling and improve conditions for cyclists to travel wherever it suits them. Chapter 5 sets out policies that are intended to

Executive Date 15.08.2005	Version V.1.2 Date 21.07.2005
------------------------------	----------------------------------

lead to the delivery of the London Cycle Network Plus, local 'permeability' links and improved conditions on the borough's principal and busy road network. The Council also intends to deliver excellent cycle training to residents and to promote cycling through travel awareness, working in partnership with cycling stakeholder groups.

- **Public Realm:** The Council seeks to support its infrastructure development by improving the quality of the public realm. This is particularly true of when it comes to the management of town centres, biodiversity and land use development. The Road Danger Reduction Plan provides more detail on how the Council will invest in infrastructure to a high standard of design and environmental quality. This will be developed further in the Streetscape and Road Danger Reduction Design Manual. Reducing the fear of crime and actual crime are important if the Council is to promote modal shift and social inclusion. The Council supports TfL's Safer Travel at Night scheme and targets to reduce the incidence of crime.
- **Public transport:** The Council seeks to support the London Bus Priority Network and to improve journey times, reliability and bus stop accessibility. The Council also seeks to work in partnership with TfL, TfL Rail, the Train Operating Companies and London Underground to improve service and infrastructure quality. Proposals include a new Wembley Transit service linking Wembley and Park Royal.
- **Integration:** The Council is committed to maintaining and promoting the highest possible level of integration of local public transport services, walking and cycling. The TfL Interchange Plan lists the interchange stations in the Borough. However, the Council does not support the development of park-and-ride facilities within the Borough boundary because of their implications for sustainable transport and traffic management.
- **Accessible transport:** Ensuring that all sections of the community have access to transport is a key aim of the Council which seeks to ensure inclusivity in its transport policies. Initiatives include transport provided by Social Services, demand-responsive and semi-timetabled bus services and seeking funds to invest in measures to make bus stops, stations, buses and trains more accessible to disabled people.
- **Freight:** The Council supports the London-wide Lorry Ban exemption scheme. We also support the retention and development of opportunities for rail and water-borne freight carrying.
- **Motoring:** The Council seeks to improve conditions for those making essential journeys by private motor vehicle, in part by promoting walking, cycling and public transport use in order to reduce the number of car-borne trips that can be made in other ways. The School Travel Plan strategy together with other restraint and travel awareness measures and initiatives will assist this work area. The Road Danger Reduction Plan (Chapter 6) seeks to reduce the amount of danger that motor vehicles cause for vulnerable road users in particular whilst promoting modal shift.
- **Traffic Management:** The Council regards all modes as 'traffic'. A traffic manager will be appointed to oversee the effective management of the existing road network for all of its users and to meet the Council's Network Management Duty obligations under the Traffic Management Act 2004.

## Chapter 6: Brent Road Danger Reduction Plan

From January 2000 until the end of December 2003, there were a total of 4347 recorded personal injury collisions in Brent. Of these, 560 (13%) were serious or fatal and 74 of the of the serious or fatal injuries were children.

Brent Council takes this issue very seriously. For each person killed or injured on the Borough's roads, there may be many other people who are also affected — their families, friends and near communities, and not least, the person(s) who caused the crash.

The chapter proposes that the traditional approach to 'road safety' where a fairly 'broad brush' approach to addressing perceived causes of accidents has been taken, should be reviewed.

The Road Danger Reduction approach offers a new way forward for Brent It sets out ways in which the Council can progressively lower the number of casualties (particularly among vulnerable road user groups), raise the quality and amenity of the borough's public spaces, promote the modes (walking and cycling) which impose the least 'costs', including danger, on other people and on the environment, and in the process improve the health and wellbeing of the borough's citizens.

For example, the solution to remedial measures implemented at a junction which currently experiences higher than average levels of pedestrian casualties might not necessarily involve introducing more guard railing with the intention of limiting a pedestrians movements / ability to cross the carriageway.

The plan treats the objective of road safety as a means to reduce the amount of danger on the Borough's roads by addressing danger at source and at the same time to increase people's willingness and choice to walk, cycle and use public transport more often and to use their cars for fewer journeys.

The plan is a tool to develop wider sustainable policies for planning and transportation and to change the design and appearance of the borough's road network. The plan is divided into four parts:

- Part 1 sets out the main principles for road danger reduction in the Borough. It states the Council's commitment to the Road Danger Reduction Charter and to the Hierarchy of Road Users, which places vulnerable road users at the top. It commits the Council to playing its part in developing the science that is important to help reduce the amount and perception of danger on the Borough's roads. The road user hierarchy and Road Danger Reduction Charter are as follows:

---

Road user hierarchy	The Council adopts the Hierarchy of Road Users as follows:
---------------------	--

1. Pedestrians and disabled people;
2. Cyclists
3. Public transport
4. Freight access
5. Business motorised vehicles
6. Private motor cars

---

Road Danger Reduction Charter	The Council adopts the Road Danger Reduction Charter, which is a pledge to:
-------------------------------	---

1. Seek a genuine reduction in danger for all users by
-

---

identifying and controlling the principal sources of threat;

2. Find new measures to define 'danger' and attitudes and perceptions of 'risk' on our roads. These will more accurately monitor the use of and threat to benign modes;
3. Discourage the unnecessary use of private motorised transport where alternative benign modes or public transport are equally or more viable;
4. Pursue a transport strategy for sustainable travel based on developing efficient, integrated public transport systems. This would recognise that current levels of motor traffic should not be increased.
5. Actively promote cycling and walking, which together pose little threat to the environment or other road users. This will be achieved by taking positive and co-ordinated action to increase the safety, priority and mobility of these benign modes.
6. Promote the adoption of this charter as the basis of national and international transport policy.

- 
- Part 2 provides a summary of the policy context for the plan. There is much in National, London-wide and Local policy literature to support the development of road danger reduction principles, though the general thrust of the policy context still leans towards a continuation of traditional solutions. By advancing the boundaries of road safety policies and their implementation, Brent Council may be seen as a leading light for other authorities to follow.
  - Part 3 sets out a framework for delivering the Road Danger Reduction Plan, covering engineering, enforcement, engaging with the public, modal shift, health, marketing, publicity and education. The framework sets out strategic priorities and policies for engineering and provides strategic design advice that will appear with more detail in Brent Streetscape and Road Danger Reduction Design Manual. This document will form the crucial link between the Council's Transportation Strategy and Traffic Management roles, to translate the policies of this plan into reality.
  - Part 4 distils the framework set out in Part 3 into a list of targets, performance measures and actions. This, together with the Strategic Proposals Diagrams and Streetscape and Road Danger Reduction Design Manual, will guide future bids in the Borough Spending Plan and strategic policies in the Local Implementation Plan.

Brent Road Danger Reduction Plan marks a significant advancement of Brent's approach to transport policy and road safety generally, and the Council is confident that it can be delivered with the support and involvement of the community.

## **Chapter 7: Brent Parking and Enforcement Plan**

The Parking and Enforcement Plan reflects parking policies across the national, regional, London-wide and local policy tiers. Parking management can influence how

and when people travel by car and other transport modes, and therefore affects a wide range of people, organisations and places in Brent. Parking policies, from the national to local level, seek to restrain unnecessary private car travel, particularly for local trips within the borough and promote a shift towards more sustainable transport choices — walking, cycling and public transport. Indeed, parking policies can also influence the decision to own a car.

The Parking and Enforcement Plan (PEP) seeks to achieve a balance between restraining motor traffic levels and encouraging economic and social activity by adopting a hierarchy of parking need. The hierarchy is intended to balance the use of street space in the borough and create a safer and more pleasant public realm.

The hierarchy is as follows:

Hierarchy type	Priority
Road user	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road danger reduction</li> <li>• Disabled pedestrian needs and access</li> <li>• Pedestrian needs and access</li> <li>• Cyclist needs and access</li> <li>• Local disabled resident parking need</li> <li>• Non-local disabled parking need</li> <li>• Local resident parking need</li> <li>• Essential worker in the delivery of a public service</li> <li>• Local business essential parking and servicing need*</li> <li>• Short stay shopper and visitor parking need*</li> <li>• Long-stay shopper and visitor parking need*</li> <li>• Long-stay commuter parking need*</li> </ul> <p>* for cyclists' parking need these have the same degree of priority.</p>
Vehicle type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emergency vehicle</li> <li>• Cycle</li> <li>• Bus</li> <li>• Public service vehicle</li> <li>• Taxi</li> <li>• Shared / pool car</li> <li>• Powered two-wheelers</li> <li>• No-direct emissions private car</li> <li>• Conventionally fuelled private car</li> </ul>

The PEP sets out 32 Parking objectives under the following general headings:

- Meeting the needs of all road users, for example through managing and allocating supply, implementing CPZs and through development control. This includes meeting the needs of disabled people;
- Supporting effective parking management through measures such as co-ordinating on and off street parking; s.106 agreements to meet and ameliorate travel demand; monitoring and reviewing arrangements; and deterring illegal parking on footways and verges;



- Improving sustainable accessibility, including for example: Providing sufficient short-and-long-term cycle parking; promoting car clubs; improving public transport access and priority through parking control;
- Meeting environmental objectives through measures including ensuring that parking management complements the Council's transport policies; encouraging the use of less environmentally-damaging modes and promoting the modes which have the least impact on the environment and society, namely walking and cycling; and having regard to the Low Emission Zone and Air Quality Action Plan.
- Focussing on customer needs by consulting and communicating with stakeholders both internal and external and making available permits to particular groups such as essential services, voluntary services and the disabled;
- Focussing on enforcement through, for example, ensuring an effective, transparent and fair system of enforcement; introducing more camera enforcement; and ensuring the provision and clarity of parking and traffic regulation signage and lining; and ensuring consistency with neighbouring boroughs.

## **Chapter 8: Brent School Travel Plan Strategy**

Schools are an important generator of movement across the borough at peak times. As part of the Council's commitment to reducing road danger and promoting modal shift, the School Travel Plan sets out a framework that will enable schools to develop and monitor their own plans.

The plan describes progress so far and sets out how the Council works with other organisations in a steering group to assist schools in the development and implementation of their plans, in order to meet the Mayor of London's targets. Safety in the vicinity of schools will also be reviewed with a view to developing Safer Routes to School in response to completed, successful travel plans.

School travel plans are supported with a number of resources, including travel awareness (with the TfL Good Going branding) and Council-initiated events such as 'Walk on Wednesdays' and 'Walk to School Week'. Materials have also been developed for dissemination to pupils via the National Curriculum.

The Council regards it as being of key importance that parents, pupils and teachers feel a sense of 'ownership' of their plans. Therefore the schools are encouraged to set out, resource and monitor their own activities with the arms-length involvement of the Council and financial assistance from TfL.

## **Chapter 9: Performance Measures**

The Local Implementation Plan Guidance note published by TfL in July 2004 lists the targets that may be met by TfL in partnership with the boroughs. Performance against the following targets will be measured by the Council; others targets will be measured by TfL:

- Target 1: Safety (numbers killed and seriously injured)
- Target 2: School Road Safety (Progress on school road safety reviews by 2008)
- Target 4: Borough Bus Target

Executive Date 15.08.2005	Version V.1.2 Date 21.07.2005
------------------------------	----------------------------------

- Target 11: Milestone – achievement of compliance with London-wide standard
- Target 14: Roads — share of TLRN and Borough Principal Road Network carriageway lower than score of 70 from UKPMS.

The chapter describes how the Council will measure and deliver these targets.

## **Chapter 10: Consultation results**

Brent Council takes consultation very seriously. We try to engage with people at every opportunity and actually listen to what they tell us, as part of our decision making process.

Consultation on the LIP has involved:

### Qualitative survey

A progressive information leaflet / qualitative questionnaire was delivered to 98,000 households via The Brent Magazine, and a further 15,000 copies were distributed to local businesses, stakeholder groups and other organisations. The leaflets were also made available at events such as the Area Consultative Forums.

We received 377 completed responses from the forms which provided useful information that showed that the public's concerns and aspirations for transport are broadly in line with the policies of the Local Implementation Plan. A statistically significant sample of 120 responses was evaluated when it became apparent that similar responses were being repeated often.

Respondents suggested that the Council take action mainly on poor paving, fear of crime, more cycle provision, road danger, a wide variety of improvements to buses, more railway staff, better and cheaper public transport, tackling the school run using walking strategies and school buses, and moving deliveries into the night or the daytime off-peak period.

Several responses contained additional papers. Of these, Transportation acted immediately on one — by arranging the installation of seats in a local park to enable two disabled residents to visit it more often.

### Area Consultative Forums

These are an important element of the Council's programme for consultation on a range of issues. They are also a means of communicating to the general public the initiatives that the Council is undertaking in a range of areas, and providing contact details for follow-up. Transportation Strategy has used the events to raise awareness of the LIP and to invite members of the public to discuss with staff their concerns and ideas, and to distribute further copies of the questionnaire.

A number of useful suggestions and contributions were made at the forums, including one gentleman's detailed drawing of a raised junction table he would like to see installed near his home.

### Stakeholder and Focus Groups

The Council makes contact with stakeholder groups through its Consultation Services department, which supplies a database of contact details. Consultation

activity is tailored to the needs of people with disabilities and in response to specific stakeholder interests. In addition to meeting groups, we welcome visits to our offices by representatives of stakeholder organisations, such as the Motorcycle Action Group and the local cycling campaign.

#### Other published opinion surveys

The Local Implementation Plan has been influenced by the work of organisations that have carried out consultation work for other projects. For example, in March 2005, Living Streets published the report of its Walkability Project in Harlesden, which has provided useful quantitative information about the way people feel about walking to and within the town centre. The results of this survey are contained in the Technical Appendices, as part of the Walkability Project report.

#### Internal consultation

The LIP has been written using information supplied by members of the LIP working group which includes colleagues from a wide variety of other service units and directorates. This group gathers regularly to discuss progress on the plan and is asked for further contributions where necessary. Members are encouraged to carry out consultation on their own contributions, for example, Social Services may choose to contact client groups to identify potential for service expansion or change. We have been keen from the outset to court the views of colleagues in Traffic Management and Highways Maintenance, on issues such as the Road Danger Reduction Plan which will have a significant influence on the design of future schemes.

#### Meeting the needs of everyone

Brent Council's translation services unit has been asked on a number of occasions to translate consultation leaflets and subsequent responses on request from the public.

The Council has also monitored all of the written responses it has received, in terms of age, gender and ethnic / racial origin. Taken together, responses from Brent's black and ethnic minority groups totalled just under half of all responses.

### **Chapter 11: Core Capacity Statement**

The Local Implementation Plan guidance requires boroughs to summarise the core financial capacities that will be available over the plan period. These resources are:

Tangibles: Organisation and people; Management Systems — hardware and software; Depots, machinery, equipment, etc;

Intangible resources: Plans and policies (these include the Unitary Development Plan, Air Quality Action Plan, and overarching policy documents such as the Mayor's Transport Strategy; Data collection and datasets; Quality Management and Assurance; and CPA Assessment, Charter Mark, Best Value; and ISO14001.

Enforcement revenues can be used for a specified range of investment, usually related to improving enforcement measures. Moving to a decriminalised system has widened the scope of expenditure to a range of projects that have been determined by the Council.

Parking account surplus expenditure is limited to transport-related measures. These are wide-ranging and will contribute to delivering the Local Implementation Plan,

particularly in relation to tackling various impacts of car dependency and illegal parking activity.

The statement is also required to demonstrate the Council's ability to deliver its Local Implementation Plan. It describes the structure and delivery responsibilities of the Transportation Service Unit including its method of planning, implementing and maintaining the Borough's infrastructure in accordance with the policies contained in its Local Implementation Plan.

## **Chapter 12: Funding Implications**

This final chapter of the Local Implementation sets out the amount of funding that is required to deliver its programme of works on an annual or recurring basis under the main Borough Spending Plan bidding headings. It also identifies scope for improvements in other work areas, including accessible transport for disabled people including those with sensory impairments.

The Local Implementation Plan in its draft form includes a total of 68 draft proposals forms. These set out a five year detailed programme of works under a wide range of topic headings, not all of which are consistent with the bidding headings in the Borough Spending Plan. The total cost of funding is programme, from all sources, will be some £38,241,000. Chapter 12 also provides details of how the funding will be sourced over the five years. The range of proposals indicates a need for TfL to review its bidding headings in future BSPs.

## **APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN CONSULTATION.**

This Appendix advises members of the results of the Borough's consultation and lists the relevant consultees including statutory stakeholders, and adjacent boroughs.

### **Introduction**

Giving people a sense of empowerment and 'ownership' of their environment is essential to the Council's delivery of this Local Implementation Plan. By engaging with people in a constructive, non-technical and non-threatening way, the Council will become closer to the community it serves.

When people, as individuals or in stakeholder groups, are involved in shaping their environment they can bring additional resources outside the scope of the council, including democratic participation and accountability; empowerment, environments that are responsive to people's needs; speedier progress, local knowledge and sustainability. [[Nick Wates 2000: The Community Planning Handbook, Earthscan publications](#)]

Public involvement will be crucial to the development and success of the measures implemented both during and following the finalisation of the Local Implementation Plan. In particular:

- The public uses the road network on a daily basis in their localities; they are therefore the best commentators on local conditions and their own sense of fear, safety, ease of travel, desire lines and wellbeing. Disabled people and children are particularly valuable participants, not least because measures that benefit them are highly likely to benefit the wider public too;
- The public can actively help to take forward the policies in the LIP in the planning and design their own environments; this is particularly true in the case of major projects such as streets for people ('home zones') and town centre regeneration schemes. Well-facilitated public involvement tends to result in appropriate schemes that are in tune with what people want and will seek to protect;
- By involving and empowering the public in the LIP and from the outset of resulting schemes, agreement can be reached earlier and costly mistakes and failures can be avoided. Moreover, communities can begin to take ownership of and pride in their areas, leading to a greater sense of community and better local management and maintenance;

- If people are involved then their collective sense of empowerment, confidence, social awareness and capacity builds. Involvement can develop their skills and ability to co-operate in the shaping of their environment. This enables them to tackle other challenges individually and collectively, and represents an investment in educational and personal development for individuals involved; and
- The direct involvement of the public in policies and schemes may be considered an important part of attempting to achieve attitudinal change with regard to what constitutes good driving, sustainability and social awareness.

Public engagement cannot happen from scratch though. A respected framework with parameters needs to be introduced first as a baseline for further work – that is in part the function of the LIP. The draft LIP has been the subject of extensive public involvement, including questionnaire mail outs, workshops and introductions at community consultative group meetings.

Beyond the finalisation of the Local Implementation Plan, the Council wishes to ensure that its policies are linked to the shaping of the Borough's environment. The plan will influence, albeit subtly, the look and functioning of the transport environment – in other words, there will be a clear and unambiguous link between policy and implementation. So the next stage will be to produce a series of 'daughter documents' to the LIP, in particular a local Streetscape and Road Danger Reduction Design Manual, that will form a 'bridge' between policy and implementation.

In this way, the Council will not just produce progressive policies to attract funding from Transport for London as it has done in the past; it will actively pursue the tangible implementation of its policies, and the Transport Strategy (Policy) team will be actively involved in design, in partnership with colleagues in Traffic Management (Design) and Highways Maintenance.

In implementing the Local Implementation Plan, via the annual Borough Spending Plan process, the public will continue to be engaged so that they have an influence on the whole process as indicated in the bullet points above.

## **Brent's programme of Public Engagement**

Dates	Engagement method	Benefits / comments
March-April	Questionnaire	Delivered to 98,000 households via The Brent Magazine; run-on of further 15,000 questionnaires distributed at meetings etc
	Backdrop Stand	Used at events as a focal point for the public to approach policy staff
	Internal consultation	To secure the agreement of colleagues on the implementation 'conveyor' for the policies of the plan and to seek their suggested changes for inclusion.

		Building professional capacity and co-operation via partnership and teamwork to deliver best value.
	Area Consultative Forums and other events; scratchcard icebreaker	To spread the message about the LIP and engage with active citizens on the ACFs.
May onwards	Stakeholder workshops and capacity building	Stakeholder group representatives to work on improving the content of the LIP, to influence its policies within the parameters set by Brent Council and MTS policies and proposals. Establishing long-term relations with groups to take policies forward to implementation. Consideration of new initiatives including Community Transport Champions.
	Questionnaire response analysis	Analysis of qualitative responses. The impact of the responses on the content of the LIP will be recorded; this includes confirmation of policies that match public opinion. Where comments are rejected, reasons are given.
	Internal seminars	1. Seminars have influenced the policies in the LIP – the impact of discussions has been minuted; the minutes are included in the Technical Appendices 2. Seminars have been instrumental for developing the Streetscape and Road Danger Reduction Design Manual and building internal support for this. 3. Taking emerging policies through to implementation as soon as possible. The MTS has been in force since 2001 and many local progressive sustainable policies are pre-existing, so the Council's implementation should begin to reflect policies contained in the LIP straightaway, bearing in mind the likelihood of change to some or many of the LIP policies following public and internal engagement.
May to July	Drafting the 2006/7 Borough Spending Plan	The BSP has been influenced by the emerging Local Implementation Plan. It was considered important that the final document should reflect any changes that were made to the LIP by the engagement process.
July onwards	Finalising the Local Implementation Plan	This commenced as soon as the Borough Spending Plan was completed and marked the end of the engagement

		process. The final document includes in the Technical Appendix, an account of the key changes that were made to the Draft document following the engagement process.
--	--	--

## Methodologies

### Questionnaires

From the outset, the Council has sought to develop and pursue a progressive approach to consultation to involve the public in the development of the LIP, rather than simply present a fait accompli. In order to achieve this, we sought the views of a 'professional stakeholder'. Oliver Schick MPhil provided advice and guidance which enabled us to design a progressive questionnaire that has produced a very good and informative response from the public.

Oliver advised that an effective questionnaire should empower its respondents to set out their general concerns about traffic. The questionnaire should:

1. Establish the Council's vision for transport in relation to how it affects local people and their quality of life;
2. Be very positive about its subject areas, respecting people's transport choices, but also remaining in keeping with the Council's adopted policies and the Mayor's Transport Plan.
3. Provide subtle explanation of the Council's vision for transport with regard to the different subject areas covered by the questionnaire.

The Questionnaire has been the Council's principal form of consultation for the Local Implementation Plan. It has been distributed to 98,000 households via The Brent Magazine; a further 15,000 leaflets were printed for distribution to stakeholder groups and at public meetings.

### Questionnaire Survey Evaluation Methodology

A total of 377 completed questionnaires were received by Brent Council. The style of the consultation was highly qualitative, allowing respondents creative and original answers; they were not limited to preconceived ideas. This resulted in a high diversity of opinions, which the method of evaluation sought to capture as closely as possible.

In order to achieve this, a number of categories were established for each of the questions. This was facilitated by the largely mode-based format of the consultation. Each of the separate points raised by respondents was recorded using standard formulations and a small degree of generalisation, e.g. 'transport police' instead of 'wardens/police on trains', and ditto for other variant formulations. This enabled easy quantification of similar responses and established respondents' priorities.

Executive Date 15.08.2005	Version V.1.2 Date 21.07.2005
------------------------------	----------------------------------



Certain unique and striking comments were also recorded, as well as respondents' comments particular to local areas, bus routes, train stations, and so forth. While the vast majority of responses were quite general in keeping with the spirit of the questions, local knowledge featured prominently and is a vital resource for the Council.

In order to gain a rough assessment of suppressed demand for any given mode, a positive or negative tendency of the comments on the mode was also recorded where possible. As respondents were asked to list difficulties with modes under a number of questions, or reasons why they did not use them, it was important to ascertain whether investment in removing these barriers would lead respondents to take it up and therefore provide a return on the Council's investment. It was found that suppressed demand for walking was particularly high, with evidence of a good deal of suppressed demand for cycling.

Where it was not possible to assess tendency easily, it was recorded as 'unclear'. It was particularly striking that there were far fewer respondents who displayed a positive or negative attitude towards all forms of public transport. Many respondents displayed a positive tendency towards individual private motor traffic, showing fulfilled demand, although growing dissatisfaction with congestion.

A number of respondents attached correspondence about other matters to the returned consultation questionnaire. These have been marked prominently in the survey evaluation data and will need to be processed individually by officers, e.g. correspondence by a resident who was unhappy that a bench, which he had been assured would be installed, had still not been provided.

## **Priorities**

Respondents' concerns were usually focused on one or two problematic areas, so that a clear assessment of their priorities is possible in most cases.

### Walking (Question 1)

The first priority which respondents suggested would make walking better was improved footways—33% of respondents raised this concern. Fear of crime was articulated by 24% of respondents—they said that they felt there were 'no go' areas around the borough. Fear of road danger and a dirty public realm (chewing gum, dog fouling, spitting, etc.) emerged as lesser priorities for walking, nominated by 12.5% of respondents each. The need for better lighting was stressed by 8.3%, as were problems about litter and rubbish. while footway cycling concerned 7.5%.

Other mentions were made, by about 1-6% of respondents, of street clutter, disability concerns, obstruction of footways by parked cars, pollution, lack of visual amenity, noise, the difficulties in getting children to school by walking, problems with tactile paving, problems in winter weather, and double and triple parking.

Finally, about 1-6% each of respondents stressed the need for publicity for walking routes, more green spaces, more trees, visible policing, parking enforcement, more crossings, pedestrian areas, more benches, more public conveniences, more priority for pedestrians, wider footways, public maps, more walking routes, and a better retail environment.

#### Cycling (Question 2)

Respondents' clear priority was better provision of cycle facilities (39%). Road danger was seen as the most significant barrier to cycling (30%). A secondary priority was better cycle parking (12.5%), closely followed by old age being a barrier to cycling (10.83%)—a reflection of the high percentage of senior citizens who participated in the consultation. Poor road surfaces for cycling concerned 7.5%, and theft was also felt to be a strong deterrent (6.7%). A large number of detailed suggestions, too numerous to mention, was made by 1-4% of respondents.

#### Cycle training (Question 3)

It would appear that Question 3 was poorly located within the consultation leaflet, as a very high proportion (nearly 32% of respondents) did not answer it. The following table shows the results:

<b>Reply</b>	<b>Percentage of replies</b>	<b>Percentage of respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of respondents who answered the question</b>
Yes.	22.5	22.5	32.93
No.	22.5	22.5	32.93
Possibly.	20	20	29.27
No, already cycle.	3.33	3.33	4.88
Not answered	31.67	31.67	

#### Buses (Question 4)

Among bus users, priorities were more evenly distributed. This is partly a result of a much higher number of different suggestions than in all other questions except question 5 (see below). It also reflects the importance of bus travel in Brent:

<b>Question 4</b>	<b>Percentage of suggestions</b>	<b>Percentage of respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of respondents who answered the question and raised suggestions</b>
More buses needed	8	18.33	19.82
Timekeeping	8	18.33	19.82
Personal safety	6.91	15.83	17.12
Police on buses	6.55	15	16.22
Countdown	5.82	13.33	14.41
Conductors	5.45	12.5	13.51

Better bus driver training	5.45	12.5	13.51
Bunching	4.73	10.83	11.71
Better bus stops	5.09	11.67	12.61
Lit bus stops	3.64	8.33	9.01
Scrap bendy buses	3.27	7.5	8.11
Parking enforcement	2.91	6.67	7.21
CCTV at bus stops	2.18	5	5.41
More bus lanes needed	2.18	5	5.41

There was a large diversity of more minor suggestions, ranging from 1 to 4% of respondents.

#### Trains (Question 5)

The clear priority for train users is staffed stations, especially at night. Lack of staff, including transport police, guards or ticket inspectors, and neighbourhood police, quite generally is felt to be the main problem for the railways, and a call for more staff comprised 57% of all suggestions made under this topic.

Added to this is the fear of crime cited by 26.6% of respondents, and which is the main reason why more staff is desired.

<b>Question 5</b>	<b>Percentage of suggestions</b>	<b>Percentage of respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of respondents who answered the question and raised suggestions</b>
Staffed stations	14.63	35	38.53
Comments on individual lines or stations	11.5	27.5	30.28
Personal safety	10.1	24.17	26.61
Transport police	8.01	19.17	21.1
Better lighting at stations	5.57	13.33	14.68
More trains needed	5.23	12.5	13.76
Cleanliness	4.53	10.83	11.93
CCTV at stations	3.83	9.17	10.09
Lower fares	3.48	8.33	9.17
Better rail infrastructure	3.14	7.5	8.26
Timekeeping and reliability	2.44	5.83	6.42
Poor week-end service	2.09	5	5.5
Warm waiting areas	2.09	5	5.5
Countdown	2.09	5	5.5

Other suggestions were again not made by more than 4% of respondents.

#### Driving (Question 6)

A relatively balanced set of responses which nonetheless shows clear priorities owing to the very high number of suggestions under 5%. Here are the main points that were made:

<b>Question 1</b>	<b>Percentage of suggestions</b>	<b>Percentage of respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of respondents who answered the question and raised suggestions</b>
Better public transport	12.43	19.17	23.71
Convenience	11.35	17.5	21.65
Doesn't drive	7.57	11.67	14.43
Cheaper public transport	7.57	11.67	14.43
Reduce journeys	5.41	8.33	10.31
Safety	4.32	6.67	8.25
Better enforcement	3.78	5.83	7.22
Comments on individual roads	3.78	5.83	7.22
More parking needed	3.24	5	6.19

Very few advocates for motoring responded to the consultation, but even among those who did not advocate it, convenience was cited as the main incentive for motoring. Better and cheaper public transport was considered the best way of reducing congestion and the number of journeys made by private motor traffic.

#### School run (Question 7)

There was strong support for reducing school run trips made by private car. 84% of respondents provided positive suggestions for promoting the alternatives, and only 8% stressed their need for a car. A further 8% were neutral in their attitude.

Individual suggestions gave the following priorities:

<b>Question 7</b>	<b>Percentage of suggestions</b>	<b>Percentage of respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of respondents who answered the question and raised suggestions</b>
Parents should walk children to local schools	22.13	22.5	36.99
School buses	21.31	21.67	35.62
Walking buses	10.66	10.83	17.81
More local schools needed	5.74	5.83	9.59
Road danger	6.56	6.67	10.96
Personal safety	4.1	4.17	6.85
Better public transport	4.1	4.17	6.85
Children could cycle	4.1	4.17	6.85

Walking received the strongest support, either parents with their own children or in walking buses, closely followed by school buses. Car sharing or more crossing patrols were among more minor suggestions made by under 4% of respondents.

### Deliveries (Question 8)

Strong support was shown for managing deliveries better. 84% felt that they were a disruptive influence in one way or another, while 7% did not feel that they were. The biggest priority for respondents is to move deliveries to off-peak hours or to make them at night (35%). Many different varieties of this type of suggestion were made.

The second priority was for permeability restrictions for lorries, i.e., banning them from certain areas, especially residential streets. This was followed by support for dealing with parking problems (13.3%), smaller delivery vehicles (12.5%), and more environmentally friendly fuel to reduce pollution (11.7%). Alternative ways of transporting goods by rail and waterways were also mentioned (8.3%).

Question 8	Percentage of suggestions	Percentage of respondents	Percentage of respondents who answered the question and raised suggestions
Off-peak or night time deliveries	26.75	35	42.86
Permeability restriction for lorries	12.74	16.67	20.41
Smaller delivery vehicles	9.55	12.5	15.31
Better parking enforcement needed	5.73	7.5	9.18
Environmentally friendly fuel for lorries	5.1	6.67	8.16
Parking restrictions for deliveries	4.46	5.83	7.14
Pollution from lorries	3.82	5	6.12
Use rail for goods transport	3.18	4.17	5.1
Use waterways for goods transport	3.18	4.17	5.1

### Summary

Respondents suggested that the Council take action mainly on poor paving, fear of crime, more cycle provision, road danger, a wide variety of improvements to buses, more railway staff, better and cheaper public transport, tackling the school run using walking strategies and school buses, and moving deliveries into the night or the daytime off-peak period.

### Consultative forum

Consultative forums are an important element of the Council's programme for consultation on a range of issues. They are also a means of communicating to the general public the initiatives that the Council is undertaking in a range of areas, and providing contact details for follow-up. Transportation Strategy has used forum events to raise awareness of the LIP and to invite members of the public to discuss with staff their concerns and ideas, and to distribute further copies of the questionnaire.

	<b>Group</b>
1	Five Area Consultative Forums (Approximately 5,000 people on the ACF databases). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each Area Consultative Forum has its own steering group that could be consulted with independently of the forum.</li> <li>• ACF Chairs &amp; Lead Managers Group</li> </ul>
2	SUCF Chairs & Lead Managers Group Eight Service User Consultative Forums: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children</li> <li>• Youth</li> <li>• Voluntary Sector</li> <li>• Disabilities &amp; Mental Health</li> <li>• Pensioners</li> <li>• Public Sector Housing</li> <li>• Brent Social Housing Tenants Conference</li> <li>• BME</li> </ul> Brent Public Transport Users Forum
3	Brent Citizens' Panel - 2000+ (managed by MORI)
4	Area Housing Boards
5	Tenants & Residents Associations
6	Primary Care Trust (Split into 5 locality areas) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kingsbury</li> <li>• Harlesden</li> <li>• Wembley</li> <li>• Willesden</li> <li>• Kilburn</li> </ul>
7	Local Strategic Partnership
8	Metropolitan Police
9	BRAVA holds a database of small voluntary groups in the Borough and can facilitate workshops and events that bring them together.
10	London Fire Service
11	Brent Race, Health & Social Care Forum
12	Brent Arts Council
13	Various Community Safety Groups PCCG (Police Community Consultation Group) Sector Working Groups X 5 Crime Prevention Panels x 2 Brent Neighbourhood Watch Association
14	Wembley (Various) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business Groups</li> <li>• Regeneration</li> </ul>
15	Brent Refugee Forum
16	Parents Forum
17	Brent Staff Panel
18	Black & Asian Staff Forum
19	Disabled Staff Forum
20	Womens' Staff Forum
21	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Staff Forum
22	Brent Multi Faith Forum
23	Brent Association of Disabled People
24	Brent Transport Users Forum
25	Supporting People Providers' Forum

## Stakeholder and focus Groups

A number of important stakeholder groups exist in Brent, from those representing business interests such as the Chambers of Commerce, to those

Executive Date 15.08.2005	Version V.1.2 Date 21.07.2005
------------------------------	----------------------------------

representing transport interests, such as Living Streets (pedestrians), London Cycling Campaign, Transport 2000, London Transport Users' Committee and the Motorcycle Action Group.

### **Individual stakeholders**

Some individuals have expressed a wish to take part in the LIP consultation exercise. The Council encourages people to talk to officers on a one-to-one basis about issues that concern them or to discuss their suggestions. In the interest of data protection, a list of individual consultees is not included here.

### **Other published opinion surveys**

The Local Implementation Plan has been influenced by the work of organisations that have carried out consultation work for other projects. For example, in March 2005, Living Streets published the report of its Walkability Project in Harlesden, which has provided useful quantitative information about the way people feel about walking to and within the town centre. The results of this survey are contained in the Technical Appendices, as part of the Walkability Project report.

### **Internal consultation**

The LIP has been written using information supplied by members of the LIP working group which includes colleagues from a wide variety of other service units and directorates. This group gathers regularly to discuss progress on the plan and is asked for further contributions where necessary. Members are encouraged to carry out consultation on their own contributions, for example, Social Services may choose to contact client groups to identify potential for service expansion or change.

The most important internal consultees are those on the next part of the 'conveyor belt of delivery of the Local Implementation Plan'. Traffic Management are responsible for the design of the highway network and the effects of the Local Implementation Plan on the schemes that are completed in the borough will reflect the policy guidance provided by the LIP.

The Council recognises that there is a need to develop stronger links between policy, design and implementation so that what appears 'on the ground' bears significant hallmarks that relate to the Council's policies, particularly the Road Danger Reduction Plan. Therefore, Brent Streetscape and Road Danger Reduction Design Manual is being developed to ensure that local schemes tangibly reflect the policies that appear in the LIP, achieving a truly integrated system of delivery and to ensure that colleagues feel a sense of 'ownership' of the process.

Brent Traffic Management unit (design) have been asked to perform a central role in taking the draft LIP to finalisation, subject to the consideration of the views of external and other internal stakeholders.

A series of seminars has been undertaken to update, inform and inspire both transport planners and highway engineers. The Council views these sessions as important continuing professional development that will ensure the delivery of the Local Implementation Plan and the effective involvement of the public in planning and implementation.