



Highways Committee 27th July 2011

Report from the Head of Transportation

For Action.

Wards Affected:
ALL

Brent Local (Transport) Implementation Plan (LIP) 2011-14 Final Submission to Transport for London July 2011.

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Mayor for London is responsible for producing a transport strategy for London and for the implementation of policies and proposals to implement that strategy.
- 1.2 All London Boroughs are legally required to prepare a Local Implementation Plan (LIP) in the form of a document setting out how the borough intends to facilitate the local delivery of the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS).
- 1.3 During 2010, officers prepared a draft LIP. The draft adhered to TfL guidance and was informed by Brent's Corporate Strategy and local and sub-regional transport needs and priorities. At their meeting on 14th December 2010 the Highways Committee approved the draft LIP and its' accompanying Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for consultation with the public, partners and TfL in order that a final LIP could subsequently be approved and submitted to TfL in accordance with their requirements.
- 1.4 The consultation on the draft LIP has now taken place and a number of amendments to the document have been made.
- 1.5 This report summarises the background and content of the (amended) LIP and seeks Committee approval to submit the final LIP to TfL.
- 1.6 Once approved by TfL/The Mayor, the LIP will become a statutory document spanning the period 2011-2014 (with longer-term – aspiration - targets and objectives) which support Brent's transport improvements, interventions and priorities and will provide the framework against which TfL will allocate funding to the Council through the LIP process.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Committee notes the work undertaken to communicate the Local (Transport) Implementation Plan process with stakeholders, statutory consultees and the wider community and to engage people in contributing to the final document.
- 2.2 That the Committee notes the requirement to prepare and consult on a Local (Transport) Implementation Plan and to submit an approved Plan to Transport for London by the end of July 2011;
- 2.3 That the Committee approves the submission of the final Local (Transport) Implementation Plan, as set out in Appendix A, to Transport for London.

3.0 DETAIL

- 3.1 The legislative framework of the GLA Act 1999 (as amended) requires the Mayor for London to publish a transport strategy for London. The (second) Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) was published in May 2010 after extensive consultation. It is the principal policy tool through which the Mayor exercises his responsibilities for the planning, management and development of transport in London. It supports the London Plan and his Economic Development Strategy.
- 3.2 The same legal framework places a requirement on all London Boroughs to develop and produce, for the Mayor's approval, a Local Implementation Plan (LIP), in the form of a document setting out how the borough intends to facilitate the local delivery of the MTS. A LIP presents proposals for facilitating the delivery of the MTS and emerging Sub-Regional Transport Plans at a local level. Borough's LIPs include a timetable for delivery and a date by which all the proposals will be implemented. LIPs must provide robust justification based on local circumstances where proposed borough interventions will contribute to outcomes which are contrary to the MTS goals or explain why MTS goals are not applicable.
- 3.3 TfL published a LIP (production) guidance document to coincide with the launch of the Mayor's Transport Strategy in May 2010. The guidance was developed by TfL in partnership with London Councils as part of a strategy to reduce the overly prescriptive and largely onerous regime that developed around production of the first LIPs and meant most boroughs took two years to reach "approved LIP" status.

The TfL LIP Guidance Document suggests that a LIP document should consist of a small number of key sections summarised below.

During 2010, officers prepared a draft LIP. The draft adhered to the TfL guidance and was informed by Brent's Corporate Strategy and local and sub-regional transport needs and priorities.

At the meeting on 14th December 2010 the Committee approved the draft LIP and its' accompanying Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for consultation with the public, partners and TfL in order that a final LIP could subsequently be approved and submitted to TfL in accordance with their requirements.

Officers have amended the draft LIP to reflect the outcome of the consultation process and to reflect TfL's comments.

The document is now in the form of the final LIP and is reproduced at Appendix A.

Those parts of the LIP that have been amended in response to the consultation are highlighted in **yellow** so that the Committee can identify the changes that have been made.

The content of the LIP can be summarised as follows:

LIP Section 1: Introduction:

The introduction includes a foreword signed by the lead member for transportation. It sets the context for the LIP-2 process and presents the structure of the document, summarising progress and achievements that have been made over the course of LIP-1 (2006-2011).

LIP Section 2: Borough Transport Objectives:

Section 2 sets the local/geographical context of the borough and presents evidence based objectives that set the context for the rest of the document. The narrative sets out how the Council intends to work towards the Mayor's six key goals of:

- Supporting economic development and population growth;
- Enhancing quality of life for all Londoners;
- Improving safety and security of all Londoners;
- Improving transport opportunities for all Londoners;
- Reducing transport's contribution to climate change, and improving its resilience;
- Supporting delivery of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games and its legacy

The section then presents the general direction the Council plans to take to support delivery of the 6 MTS goals.

The requirement is to identify a set of locally specific LIP objectives which reflect Mayoral, sub-regional and local priorities, links to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), the boroughs equalities duty and the Network Management Duty (NMD) and take account of the commitments in TfL's Business Plan and Investment Programme.

Councils are not required to provide a detailed response to each of the Mayor's policies and proposals within the LIP. Additionally TfL does not require separate mode or policy-specific strategies and plans to be submitted - where boroughs have these they should simply be referenced..

Section 2 provides the opportunity for the Council to define its wider corporate priorities and set out its local transport needs and aspirations. The section provides the context for, and largely determines, sections 3 and 4 that follow.

Amendments made to Section 2 (following TfL feedback) can be summarised as follows:

Ref:	Comment:	From:	Amendment:
(1)	All local strategies referenced and reflected, including their SEA and EQIA . Delivery Plan addresses the MTS Goals and Challenges, and other local challenges and opportunities but do not clearly address the stated local objectives (see below for more information).	TfL	Addressed as per below.
(2)	The local objectives do not have a timeline attached to them either individually or collectively, at a minimum a statement needs to be added to state that the objectives will be delivered over the timeline of the LIP/MTS i.e. up to and including 2031.	TfL	A statement has been added to this effect.
(3)	The table on pages 62-63 should include a cross-reference to the SRTP Challenges and Opportunities.	TfL	This table is now cross-referenced to the sub-regional transport plan 'challenges and opportunities'.

LIP Section 3: Delivery Plan 2011-14:

This Section comprises an affordable programme of “interventions” (schemes or initiatives), which cover 'Corridors, Neighbourhoods and Supporting Measures (Smarter Travel), principal road highways maintenance and Major Schemes. In accordance with the guidance, this section also identifies how interventions will deliver the Mayor’s higher profile outputs of (in no particular order):

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

This section is consistent with the three year indicative LIP funding allocation (2011-2014) that TfL originally provided the borough with. The delivery plan provides the high-level programme of investment by year for 2011/12, 12/13 and 13/14 and by category across the main (funded) LIP categories, identifying them separately. The delivery plan identifies where project funding will be sourced. The delivery plan identifies which of the MTS goals and outcomes each programme 'category' supports and identifies how delivery of the Mayor's high-profile outputs will be supported at the borough level.

The delivery plan contains a section on “Major Schemes” funding which contains details of the Council’s current major scheme, it's borough 'priority', how it will be funded, when the major scheme "application" is expected and how the proposed scheme would contribute to LIP objectives and targets including the impact on relevant targets and trajectories

Amendments made to Section 3 can be summarised as follows:

Ref:	Comment:	From:	Amendment:
(4)	A description of how the borough prioritises the interventions it uses needs to be included.	TfL	This has been included.
(5)	The interventions list (three year delivery plan) is well presented but needs to be clearly linked to the borough's local objectives rather than the MTS Goals. This could easily be rectified by reorganising the table according to the local objectives, as well as the MST Goals and Environmental Areas.	TfL	The table has been reorganised to meet the TfL requirements.
(6)	The two types of interventions, 'integrated transport' and 'congestion reduction' need to be explained - of which types of intervention do these consist and could be done using a reference note at the foot of the page. It is not clear at the moment whether the types of intervention stated will deliver the 'objective' stated and as such there is a lack of walking and cycling interventions (see above also).	TfL	These have been better explained and clarified.
(7)	As with the objectives above, there are no timescales for either these interventions or the interventions listed in the	TfL	It has been made clear over what timescales the interventions will

	<p>Programme of Investment. Again, a clear statement stating that the interventions will be delivered over the course of the entire LIP will suffice for the 'generic' interventions while specific timescales should be shown in the Programme of Investment (ie 'Complete by xxxx' or 'Ongoing').</p>		<p>be delivered over the course of LIP-2.</p>
(8)	<p>It would be better if all the interventions listed in the Programme of Investment included examples as to what the intervention was, as some have already, rather than just a location reference.</p>	TfL	<p>This has been addressed.</p>
(9)	<p>The amounts shown for spend in the Programme of Investment should be 'indicative', particularly for the Maintenance and Bridge Strengthening programmes as these have yet to be confirmed (the same is true for the Major Schemes going forward).</p>	TfL	<p>An "indicative" comments now feature.</p>
(10)	<p>More information is required regarding the Major Schemes e.g. where is the process of bidding, confirmation etc. are they. This should be done in separate paragraphs either before or after the Programme of Investment. Also thought should be given to any other major schemes that may be bid for during the life of the LIP (for example Alperton is suggested as a priority improvement area), and these should at least be signposted in the Delivery Plan.</p>	TfL	<p>This has been clarified.</p>

(11)	More detail is required regarding the High Priority Outputs. While numbers are only required to be submitted annually at year end for the Cleaner Vehicle Fleets and Street Trees more specific information is required for cycle parking (particularly planned numbers - this is a local target but no data has been provided), cycle superhighways and electric vehicle charging points. Reference to the Guidance (pg 81/82) should be made to fulfil this requirement. However, it is noted that the borough supports the delivery of these outputs by the statements in s.2.	TfL	Clarification has been given relating to High Priority Outputs and local targets.
(12)	A description of how risk is managed and mitigated needs to be included.	TfL	The risk description has been added.

LIP Section 4: Performance Monitoring Plan:

The LIP guidance requires Councils to identify and agree appropriate targets with TfL in various areas. It is suggested that Councils may also choose to adopt and include other additional targets. The Performance Monitoring Plan requires boroughs to agree locally specific targets with annual milestones or trajectories for mode share, bus service reliability, asset condition, road traffic casualties and CO2 emissions.

The guidance states that interim targets should be set for 2013/14 with longer-term targets identified for a future end date when the impact of sustained investment will have had a chance to take effect (e.g. 2020/2021). All boroughs are required to include a completed version of a pro-forma to provide details of each target set, including the base year and baseline data. Councils must set trajectories, with annual milestones, for each of the agreed mandatory target and present each in the form of a simple graph

The guidance requires Councils to demonstrate a clear link between Objectives, the Delivery Plan and the Proposed Targets in the LIP. Each target should have supporting evidence that it is both ambitious and realistic, given indicative funding levels, identifies key actions needed to achieve the target and identifies the principals risks to target achievement and how these will be managed. The LIP must present how the borough proposes to keep progress against targets under review and address areas of over or under performance. To this end, Section 4 of Brent's Final LIP is consistent with the guidance.

Amendments made to Section 4 can be summarised as follows:

Ref:	Comment:	From:	Amendment:
(13)	Mode share: walking. A long-term target needs to be set. It is suggested that a LT target be set to 2026 to correlate with the LT target for cycling.	TfL	A long-term target appears in the Final LIP.
(14)	Mode share: cycling. Is the long-term target for Brent 4.3% mode share by 2026? Note that the baseline is 1.3% rather than 1% as stated and that the target should only be set to 1 decimal place - please therefore revise the ST target accordingly.	TfL	This was clarified and the baseline amended to the correct level and to one decimal place.
(15)	Bus service reliability A long-term target needs to be set. It is suggested that a LT target be set to 2017/18 to correlate with TfL's Business Plan projections.	TfL	A long-term target was set to 2017/18 and this now correlates with TfL's Business Plan.
(16)	Asset condition Note that the baseline is 7.9% rather than 11% as stated (see Travel in London report number 3). A long-term target needs to be set.	TfL	The correct baseline now appears and a long-term target was set.
(17)	Road traffic casualties: killed or seriously injured (KSI): Both the short- and long-term targets are considered to be very ambitious, and it is not felt that the interventions proposed will lead to the reductions sought.	TfL	A more realistic target was set to reflect this comment

	Consideration should be given to revising these targets, possibly to around a 30% LT reduction.		
(18)	Road traffic casualties: total casualties. The targets are considered to be acceptable, though it is not clear why the targets are expected to increase in the short term before reducing again - please provide more information on this.	TfL	This was an anomaly with the data-sets used and the projection. This point has now been addressed.
(19)	CO2 emissions: The LT target is based on a 60% reduction, and is considered to be too ambitious. Refer to the indicative trajectory set out in the advice note that was circulated on 03/08/10 - this suggests a LT target of a 45.3% reduction by 2025 (rather than a 60% reduction)	TfL	The target was amended to the recommended level using the August 2010 TfL Circular.
(20)	Local Indicators: No local indicators were set in the draft document. Officers indicated these would be set in the Final Draft.	TfL	Local indicators have now been set and feature in the final LIP.

4.0 CONSULTATION.

- 4.1 The LIP process has a consultation requirement linked to it which requires Councils to consult with the relevant Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis, TfL, organisations that represent disabled people and other (relevant) London boroughs and any other person required by the Mayor.

TfL have placed a requirement on boroughs to provide evidence that all statutory consultees have been consulted during the LIP preparation and formal statutory consultation period and demonstrate how their views have been taken into account, highlighting additional organisations or groups that have been consulted.

Consultation has been undertaken with the organisations listed at Appendix D to ensure that TfL's requirements have been satisfied.

Consultation on the LIP commenced at the beginning (3rd) January 2011 for a six week period through to 14 February 2011. Officers visited the Council's Area Consultative Forums (ACFs) and discussed the draft LIP with residents at an informal level. Arrangements were also made to publish and publicise the draft LIP and capture responses to the draft. The consultation leaflet used to capture resident's comments – distributed widely at the ACFs - can be seen online at: www.tiny.cc/ay055

All consultation responses were captured and informed amendments to the final draft LIP appended to this report

5.0 SUMMARY

Officers have developed the Final LIP presented in Appendix A in accordance with TfL's guidance. The Final LIP has been informed by the Council's Corporate Strategy and wider priorities as well as local transport needs and aspirations.

Officers have been in frequent communication with TfL throughout 2011 to ensure that the Final LIP is in an “approvable” state and have full confidence that it will be approved by the London Mayor's office if submitted in its' current form.

The submission of a LIP that can be approved by TfL will enable the Council to meet its legal obligations at the same time as enabling it to maximise opportunities for inward investment in Brent's infrastructure from TfL and others.

6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report and the recommendations set out in 2.0. There is, however, a direct relationship between the content of the final/approved LIP and the fixed block of capital funding from Transport for London (TfL) on an annual basis made available through section 159 of the Greater London Authority (GLA) Act 1999.
- 6.2 The funding is allocated to key themes/groups of projects including “Corridors”, “Neighbourhoods” and “Supporting Measures”. Annual funding is also received for (principal) road maintenance and structural (bridges) maintenance. A fund for 'Major Schemes' exists whereby boroughs can bid for funding to progress projects costing in excess of £1million and Brent has secured £3m “indicative” funding from TfL for Harlesden town centre, through the life-span of LIP-2, via the Major Schemes tranche of funding.

Across the Neighbourhoods, Corridors and Supporting Measures LIP funding headings, the amount of funding allocated to each borough is determined through a fixed formula that uses a number of metrics to establish 'need' on a consistent basis across all 33 London boroughs. The funding is provided to boroughs to deliver schemes that address key Mayoral objectives which reflect local priorities.

- 6.3 In accordance with normal arrangements, the Council's proposed programme of LIP funded schemes and initiatives were submitted to TfL for approval in September 2010.

Table 1: Brent Council Transportation Spending 2011-2014.

Funding source	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	Total
----------------	---------	---------	---------	-------

	£	£	£	£
Integrated Transport (Corridors, neighbourhoods and Smarter Travel excluding Maintenance)				
LIP Allocation (Needs-based formula)	2,711k	2,600k	2,229k	7,540k
Third Party Sources				
Developer Contributions	525k	499k	366k	1,390k
Total		3,099k	2,595k	
Maintenance				
LIP Allocation	591k	788k	788k	2,167k
Council Capital/revenue Funding	3,000k	3,500k	3,500k	10,000k
Total	3,591k	4,288k	4,288k	12,167k
Major Schemes				
Harlesden Town Centre: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LIP Major Scheme funding • Developer contributions 		1,500k 150k	1,500k 150k	3,000k 300k
Total		1,650k	1,650k	3,300k
Grand Total	6,827k	9,037k	8,533k	24,397k

Major Schemes: The Major Schemes programme supports larger projects (of more than £1m in value) which meet the principles of the Mayor's *Better Streets* agenda. Funding is awarded through a competitive bidding process.

Borough 'discretionary' budget: Since 2009/10, £100k/borough through the LIP settlement for use at their discretion on transport projects, provided the use is in accordance with section 159 of the GLA Act. The discretionary budget has proved very popular with the London boroughs and it is proposed to retain the discretionary funding at the current level.

- 6.4 The Final LIP that is presented for approval here has been informed by TfL's Business Plan and the LIP allocation process. This presents a framework against which inward investment for transport in Brent by TfL and partners can be maximised. Although there is no reason to doubt that the indicative financial allocation provided by TfL will be forthcoming, members should note that the approval of the Final LIP for submission to TfL and the Mayor's office will not commit the Council to investment from its own resources happen TfL investment, or an element of that indicative investment, fails to materialise.

7.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 As with the previous MTS, the Greater London Authority Act 1999 places a statutory requirement on each London Borough to produce a second LIP demonstrating how the authority will implement the policies, strategies and programmes necessary to achieve the

objectives of the MTS. Consideration must also be given to objectives set out in other Mayoral Strategies throughout the development of their LIP documents.

- 7.2 Brent Council, in common with all London Boroughs, was required to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the LIP under European Directive 2001/42/EC (implemented in England, via the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SI 2004 No.1633). The Council appointed Transportation Planning (International) Ltd. to undertake the SEA on their behalf. Further details are presented in Section 8 - "Environmental Implications".
- 7.3 The word 'required' is used in the (May 2010) Transport for London LIP Guidance Document to indicate the minimum level of information that the Mayor considers necessary to allow him to judge whether a particular submitted LIP meets the requirements of the GLA Act 1999 in terms of content (s 145), consistency with the MTS (s 146(3)) and implementation following approval (s 151). This is done to provide clarity as to what is needed, and to save boroughs unnecessary time and expense in the LIP approval and monitoring process. These are matters where the Mayor might be minded to make a direction under s 153(1)(a) of the Act if the information concerned is not to be forthcoming, although no such formal direction(s) is actually made in the Guidance Document.
- 7.4 Section 143(1). Under s163(3) of the GLA Act 1999, the Mayor cannot approve a LIP unless he considers that:
- It is consistent with the MTS;
 - The proposals contained in the LIP are adequate for the purposes of the implementation of the MTS;
 - The timetable for implementing the proposals (e.g. the three-year Programme of Investment) and the end date by which the proposals are implemented are adequate.

The Mayor has extensive powers to prepare the LIP if an authority fails to prepare one that is, in his opinion, 'adequate' (s147).

8.0 DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken alongside the development of the LIP which helped shape final document. Equalities considerations are central to transportation work. As part of the finalisation of the LIP, officers identified no significant diversity implications from the objectives contained within it. Also, specific diversity implications relating to individual schemes will be identified and addressed as part of individual consultations that are carried out as part of the scheme designs and development, prior to implementation and as part of the Delivery Plan (as detailed in Section 3) of this Report.

- 8.2 The Race Equality Scheme (RES).

As a public body the Council has an obligation to ensure it complies with the Race Equality Scheme (RES) as one of the Council's statutory duties. Guidance from the Commission for Racial Equality states that public bodies should assess the impact on the general duty to promote race equality of any *new* policies as well as any changes to existing policies.

The Scheme must state the public authority's arrangements for:

- assessing and consulting on the likely impact of its proposed policies on the promotion of race equality;

- monitoring its policies for any adverse impact on the promotion of race equality
- publishing the results of such assessments and consultation
- ensuring public access to information and services which it provides; and
- training staff in connection with the duties imposed by the Race Relations Act and the Order.

Officers ensured that Brent's Corporate Race Equalities Scheme / Equal Opportunities Policy was carefully considered as part of the development of the draft and final Local Implementation Plan process.

9.0 STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 There are no significant staffing implications arising from this report.

10.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The proposals in this report have been assessed by way of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) linked to the Council's existing statutory LIP. There are no negative environmental implications of note arising from the funds allocated through the 2010-2011 Brent LIP funding application/settlement.
- 10.2 The Council, in common with all London Boroughs, is required to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the LIP under European Directive 2001/42/EC (implemented in England, via the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SI 2004 No.1633). The Council has appointed a specialist consultant to undertake the SEA and it has been completed.
- 10.3 The overall purpose of SEA is to ensure that the environment is given appropriate consideration when developing the LIP by identifying, assessing and mitigating any significant environmental effects arising from the plans and programmes of the LIP. The SEA is not intended to cover all environmental impacts or issues, nor is it intended to be a replacement for the various Council reports that publish data, targets and monitoring information. In addition, the SEA process and Environment Report are not designed to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment of individual proposals or programmes. It is a strategic assessment of the significant impacts of the LIP as a whole.
- 10.4 The SEA is however, intended to be a process developed in tandem with the LIP document. It is designed to ensure that potential environmental impacts are taken into account at the earliest stages of the plan development. The SEA process was conducted in five discrete stages as presented in the following table:

Five Stages of the 'SEA' Process

SEA Stage	Description
STAGE 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set the scope and context for the SEA, establish the environmental baseline from existing information, identify problems and decide objectives
STAGE 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop policy alternatives • Produce an SEA Scoping Report and undertake initial consultation with environmental bodies
STAGE 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess the effects of the LIP-2 on the environment and

SEA Stage	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> identify and assess potential mitigation options Production of the Environment Report
STAGE 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main consultation on the draft LIP-2 and Environment Report Produce Environmental Statement (post consultation)
STAGE 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine indicators and monitor the significant impacts of implementing the plan on the environment

The SEA Process

- 10.5 The SEA process eventually culminates in the production of a final Environmental Report. A draft of this report, which identifies, describes and evaluates the likely significant environmental impacts of implementing the LIP, accompanies the draft LIP-2 document through the public consultation stage. Before this can be completed however, a Scoping Report summarising the findings of Stages 1 and 2 must be provided to statutory environmental bodies to allow opportunity for comments on the scope and level of detail of the SEA to that stage.
- 10.6 The Scoping Report details the environmental baseline and problems, identifies significant impacts, considers alternative LIP strategies and describes how the significant impacts of the LIP will be assessed. The primary objectives of a Scoping Report are:
- To set the objectives for the SEA;
 - To establish an environmental baseline for the study area;
 - To identify the significant environmental impacts of the LIP-2 for further consideration in the Environmental Report;
 - To summarise the findings of the SEA, through Stages 1 and 2;
 - To summarise the main tasks for the remaining stages of the SEA; and
 - To provide an opportunity for consultation with key environmental stakeholders

Consultation on the SEA scoping report

- 10.7 Consultation is integral to the LIP and supporting SEA process. At an early stage, the Council consulted with the Environment Agency, English Nature, the Countryside Agency and English Heritage on the "Scoping Report". Other local stakeholders were consulted/had the opportunity to feed back when the Environmental Report was made available alongside the draft LIP for the purposes of wider consultation. The purpose of consultation at an early stage was to ensure that key environmental authorities agreed on:
- The scope of the SEA in terms of area and time;
 - The key issues and level of detail to be covered in the Environmental Report;
 - An outline of the approach to assess each issue;
 - Strategic alternatives that are to be discussed further;
 - The role of mitigation;
 - The levels of risk and uncertainty; and
 - Involvement of stakeholders.
- 10.8 The Statutory Consultees had a five week period to respond to the SEA scoping report. No responses/significant issues arose from this process.

APPENDICES.

Appendix A – Final (Brent) Local Implementation Plan 2011/12 to 2013/14;
Appendix B – Example of information/consultation - Brent Magazine advert;
Appendix C – Summary of representations received;
Appendix D – Table of external consultees.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The (London) Mayor's Transport Strategy (May 2010).
TfL LIP (production) Guidance (May 2010).
Report to Highways Committee

CONTACTS

Report author: Adrian Pigott (Team Leader/Principal Transport Planner).
Contact: adrian.pigott@brent.gov.uk or tel:020 8937 5168.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Tim Jackson, Head of Transportation, Transportation Service, Brent House, 349 High Road, Wembley, Middlesex HA9 6BZ, tim.jackson@brent.gov.uk or telephone: 020 8937 5151.

Appendix A: Brent Council Final (2011-2014) Local Implementation Plan.

Circulate as an electronic attachment by Committee Services and table hard copies on the evening of Highways Committee.

Appendix B: Example of communications/consultation work.



Your say on future transport

Brent residents can have their say on the future of transport in the borough between now and the end of March.

The Local Implementation Plan (LIP) confirms the council's support for London Mayor Boris Johnson's key projects such as installing electric vehicle charging points so that people who want to drive a vehicle powered by electricity have a place to charge them close to Brent's town centres.

It also says how the council will help more

people to cycle safely in the borough, join car clubs and use buses, the underground and over ground rail.

Most of the funding to pay for these plans will come from Transport for London.

Officers will attend the council's Area Consultative Forums early in 2011 to listen to people's views on transport.

To have your say visit www.brent.gov.uk/transportplan or contact Adrian Pigott on 020 8937 5168 by 14 February.

Appendix C: Summary of representations received.

Ref:	Name/position/organisation	Representation
1	Resident – anonymous comment – LIP consultation form.	Problem with traffic signals at Kingsbury/Church Lane junction continually revert to cycle phase, holding up traffic unnecessarily.
2	Resident – anonymous comment – LIP consultation form.	Problem with traffic signals at Kingsbury/Church Lane junction continually revert to cycle phase, holding up traffic unnecessarily.
3	Resident – anonymous comment – LIP consultation form.	There is still no pedestrian crossing in Roe Green where Kingsbury High School students have dodged the traffic for over 50 years.
4	Resident – anonymous comment – LIP consultation form.	An “aided” crossing point across Park Lane Wembley at Junction with High Road is needed.
5	Resident – anonymous comment – LIP consultation form.	Electric vehicle charging points are ok for work-based parking, i.e. – Town Hall, Brent House. Why can't Brent offer free places at shopping centres like Brent Cross?
6	Resident – anonymous comment – LIP consultation form.	You mention dropped kerbs but the policy now is “raised kerbs” and “entry treatments” for which I have seen no resident consultation.
7	Resident – anonymous comment – LIP consultation form.	To get to Park Royal (ed - Central Middlesex) we have PR2 but from Kingsbury it is difficult to access. The bus that waits at Honeypot Lane 305 could meet up with PR2 and Asda, go behind the Town Hall and back to Edgware via the PR2 stop at Salmon Street.
8	<p>Alison Hopkins Humber Road Residents Coalition for a Sustainable Brent Cross Cricklewood</p> <p>Formed from 23 residents' associations, local groups and politicians from 3 parties</p>	<p>On page 38, there are a series of references to the proposed Brent Cross "Regeneration". A number of statements are made concerning the traffic impact on the roads west of the A5, including Dollis Hill Lane, Oxcgate Gardens and my own road, Humber Road. Residents in this area have consistently opposed the Brent Cross proposals as they currently stand, particularly with regard to the appalling impact of increased traffic and ill thought out new road layouts. These roads are primarily residential and it is the case that the Dollis Hill area as a whole will, frankly, be ruined.</p> <p>The document makes specific reference to Humber Road and the removal of the current no right turn restriction. This change - allowing right turns into Humber Road - is totally unacceptable. The revised road layout means that Humber Road will be the first right turn from the Edgware</p>

		<p>Road. The developers' own - deeply flawed! – traffic assessment projects an extra THREE HUNDRED vehicles every hour accessing the road, which is the narrowest leading from the A5. This figure is, by the way based on an absurd assumption that no vehicles currently turn left into the road from the A5. In addition, the enormous waste vehicles leaving the proposed waste transfer station will use this road and the other roads leading from the A5. And, the impact of both commuter and retail parking will be substantial and damaging - we do not want to have expensive Controlled Parking Zones imposed on Dollis Hill by a development which is of no value to residents! The references in your document as they currently stand are wholly unacceptable and we, as residents and council tax payers, demand that they be rewritten with proper and due regard to our welfare. We are not willing to be sacrificial lambs on the altar of yet more expensive and unnecessary out of town retail development.</p>
9	<p>Barnet Council Mervyn Bartlett Transport & Regeneration Manager</p>	<p>Concerns that information that was presented in Brent's draft Local Implementation Plan specific to the Brent Cross /Cricklewood redevelopment Transport Assessment, particularly relating to Brent's querying as to the accuracy of projected traffic volume/flow and the effect on areas local to the proposed redevelopment.</p> <p><i>Further comments also provided.</i></p>
10	<p>Harrow Council Ann Fine Transport Planning Consultant</p>	<p>Officers at Harrow Council requested that Brent included support for a "Major Scheme" that Harrow is leading on. This is the "Stanmore to Thames" TfL major scheme step 1 submission. The route identified provides a unique, long radial, green route from the edge of London to the River Thames. The major issue is that the route does not exist in the public's eye and is very fragmented. The route has the potential to be a major walking and cycling route the whole way and also to become a key attraction for those wanting improved access to the natural environment. Brent Council supports Harrow's stance but will not be contributing to the funding of the project as Brent's "Major Scheme" is all committed to the redevelopment of Harlesden Town Centre.</p>
11	<p>English Heritage. Nick Bishop, Regional Planning Advisor. London Region.</p>	<p>Page 19 – Local context: we are concerned that there is currently no mention of the historic environment as part of the geographical</p>

	<p>English Heritage is the Government's statutory adviser on the historic environment. It is an executive Non-Departmental Public Body sponsored by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport</p>	<p>characteristics of the borough. The Borough's historic environment and heritage are important components of its geographical distinctiveness and local identity. It would be worth identifying the historic environment within the Local context because it is vulnerable to transport impacts and therefore worthy of consideration within the transport policy which follows later in the document.</p> <p>Page 28 – Regeneration, Planning, Transport and Successful Place-making: We welcome the provision of guidance and Supplementary Planning Documents to manage change in areas of growth and renewal and we look forward to continued involvement in the production of these documents, and in particular the South Kilburn Masterplan and documents relating to Alperton, Barham Park and the North Circular Road regeneration area.</p> <p><i>Further comments also provided.</i></p>
12	<p>Natural England. David Hammond. Planning and Advocacy advisor.</p>	<p>The aspiration to protect the Borough's environment is welcomed and to be encouraged, and the Council should give regards and consideration to Green Infrastructure and "soft" landscaping where appropriate. Street trees are merely one opportunity to achieve this, and the document does refer to grass strips, sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) and wildlife friendly design into road schemes, (page 110 – 5) (ii) all of which would be encouraged and commended.</p> <p><i>Further comments also provided.</i></p>
13	<p>London Diocesan Fund. Brian Cuthbertson Head of Environmental Challenge.</p>	<p>The need to reduce carbon emissions to a tiny fraction of their current level is the paramount imperative. Every policy and investment decision should be evaluated for its influence in these terms. The Diocese of London encourages its members to include the carbon content of all journeys in a planned reduction of their fossil-fuel based energy use, and to consider every journey in terms of a hierarchy of priorities – foot, cycle, tube, national rail, bus, motorcycle, car or taxi as last resort. We commend this approach to Londoners as a whole.</p> <p>The safety and comfort of pedestrians on pavements, islands and crossing points, especially the vulnerable including blind or partially sighted persons, the elderly and infirm should be of overriding importance in the detailed design and regulation of any changes;</p>

		<p>e.g. to timings of lights, and the introduction of innovative solutions such as (to mention only two) diagonal crossings as at Oxford Circus or pavement free streets as at Exhibition Road. We welcome the consideration already given to this aspect in these particular schemes, which we urge should continue in these and others in any borough.</p> <p><i>Further comments also provided.</i></p>
14	<p>Cricklewood Improvement Programme. Danny Maher The Cricklewood Improvement Programme (CIP) is a group of residents, traders and charities who want to revitalise Cricklewood.</p>	<p>We had been discussing the widening of the Cricklewood Broadway/A5/Chichele Road junction when your draft report confirmed our suspicions that the BXC Transport Assessment (TA) severely underestimates the traffic volume. We strongly support Brent's concerns about the robustness of the TA.</p> <p><i>Further comments also provided.</i></p>
15	<p>Brent Cyclists. David Arditti The Brent arm of the London Cycling Campaign.</p>	<p>Though it contains many things we support, broadly we consider that the draft LIP 2011–2014 is inadequate in its treatment of cycling. Though it says many of the right things, there is a lack of convincing detail and measurable commitments. The whole "plan" reads more like a vague, aspirational strategy document than an "implementation plan". There is a lack of detailed targets and clearly-described schemes or proposals. The document is highly confusing in the way specific subject areas (such as cycling and walking) are covered several times in different places. Where we have pointed out omissions below, this may be because we have not spotted the relevant statements in different parts of the document, in which case we apologise, but it does point up the confusing structure of the Plan.</p> <p><i>Further comments also provided.</i></p>
16	<p>Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. Ian Davies. Principal Traffic Engineer.</p>	<p>We have no specific comments on your proposed objectives, plans and targets.</p>
17	<p>Coalition for a Sustainable Brent Cross Cricklewood Development. Lia Colacicco Co-ordinator</p>	<p>We have severe doubts about the reliability of the Transport Assessment (TA). We strongly support all of Brent's concerns about the robustness of the TA, and admire your insistence in standing up to Barnet in the interest of Brent Residents. "Therefore Brent Council will have to object to the proposals until revised modelling and assessments have been made."</p> <p>Our coalition also includes Cyclists and Friends of the Earth groups, who are particularly concerned about air pollution (as are we all).</p>

		<p>We strongly support your call for revised modelling and assessments. It is clear that in order to reduce the number of cars the mode shifts have been fabricated.</p> <p><i>Further comments also provided.</i></p>
18	<p>The Railway Terraces Residents' Association Marlene Wardle (chair)</p>	<p>The Railway Terraces Residents' Association, Edgware Road, Cricklewood supports Brent's criticism of the traffic modelling and other matters relating to the Brent Cross Cricklewood development. Please continue to challenge Barnet council.</p>
19	<p>Quod Planning Services on behalf of Phil Murphy - Director</p>	<p>Page 38 identifies 9 transport related issues which are summarised from the "Draft Review of the Transport Assessment". LB Brent officers fully interrogated the BXC Transport Assessment over a period in excess of 2 years and thus reference to the Council's "draft" review is clearly out-dated. Furthermore, LB Brent issued a consultation response to the BXC application</p> <p><i>Further comments also provided.</i></p>
20	<p>Michael Guckian - resident</p>	<p>Just a short comment on the local transport plan. Although very positive in many aspects. I would like you also to consider a universal 20mph borough wide speed limit (like Islington), for the sake of road safety. The LCN+ could be improved where it emerges on to main road junctions (when turning right or going straight ahead to follow the routes), by having TOUCAN traffic islands to help both pedestrians and cyclists to navigate these busy road junctions.</p>
21	<p>NorthWestTWO Residents' Association</p>	<p>NorthWestTWO Residents' Association supports Brent's criticism of the traffic modelling and other matters relating to the Brent Cross Cricklewood development. Please continue to challenge Barnet council.</p>
22	<p>Ealing Council Russell Roberts Principal Transport Planner</p>	<p>LB Ealing welcomes the new draft LIP from Brent Council. We particularly appreciate the recognition that 'inter-borough working' will bring benefits, particularly for projects in Park Royal and Willesden Junction plus orbital journeys and the 'Biking Borough' initiatives (especially in Willesden and Park Royal). The inclusion of a map of proposed schemes would be useful to help identify their benefits/impacts. We note the cycle mode share target to increase from 1% in 2008/9 to 1.05% in 2013/14.</p>

		<p>However, we feel that a more ambitious increase would be more appropriate as all relevant boroughs have to contribute to the Mayor's cycling target of 4.3% for Outer London. Ealing's target is to increase cycle mode share from 1.6% to 2% over a similar time period.</p>
23	Sanjit Patel	<p>I feel that (electric vehicle) charging points are better placed in locations of London-wide interest such as Wembley stadium where people will travel from across London (in excess of 20 miles) to visit and stay longer. But even these charging points should be in public car parks and not in the streets.</p> <p>It would be far more sensible if all public car parks were required to provide X number of charging points as in Westfield shopping centre which incidentally <i>is</i> another point of London-wide interest with people travelling and visiting longer.</p> <p>All supermarkets with customer car parks wanting to trade in Brent must provide X no of charging points. The supermarkets would benefit from positive PR as they exploit the green angle.</p> <p><i>Further comments also provided.</i></p>
24	Stuart Smith, Chief Inspector Partnership, Metropolitan Police.	<p>It is an informative and ambitious plan with the vision to improve the lives of people who live and work in Brent.</p> <p>Local surveys demonstrate that specifically for the young residents of the borough routes to and from school are where they feel less safe. There is an opportunity within this strategic plan to really make a difference to safety and perceptions of safety of all public and green transport across the borough.</p> <p><i>Further comments also provided.</i></p>

Appendix D: List of external consultees.

To:	Boroughs (Neighbouring & WestTrans):
Chief Executive	LB Barnet, North London Business Park, Oakleigh Road South, London, N11 1NP.
Chief Executive	LB Camden, Camden Town Hall, Judd Street, London, WC1H 9JE.
Chief Executive	LB Ealing, Ealing Town Hall, New Broadway, Ealing, W5 2BY.
Chief Executive	LB Hammersmith & Fulham, Town Hall, King Street, Hammersmith, London, W6 9JU.
Chief Executive	LB Harrow, Civic Centre, PO Box 57, Station Road, Harrow, HA1 2XF.
Chief Executive	LB Hillingdon, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, Middlesex, UB8 1UW.
Chief Executive	LB Hounslow, Civic Centre, Lampton Road, TW3 4DN.
Chief Executive	Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea, The Town Hall, Hornton Street, W8 7NX.
Chief Executive	Westminster City Council, Westminster City Hall, 64 Victoria Street, London SW1E 6QP.
To:	Emergency Services:
The Commissioner	Metropolitan Police, New Scotland Yard, Broadway, London, SW1H 0BG.
The Commissioner	City of London Police, PO Box 36451, London, EC2M 4WM.
Chief Executive	The London Ambulance Service, NHS Trust, St.Andrews House, St.Andrews Way, London, E3 3PA.
Chief Officer	The London Fire Brigade, 169 Union Street, SE1 0LL.
To:	Health/Care/Disabilities:
Chief Executive	Brent Primary Care Trust, Wembley Centre for Health and Care, 116 Chaplin Road, London, HA0 4UZ.
Chair Person/Director	The Brent Association of Disabled People, Willesden Centre for Health & Care, Robson Avenue, Willesden, NW10 3SG.
Chief Executive	RNID, 19-23 Featherstone Street, London, EC1Y 85L.
Chief Executive	RNIB, 105 Judd Street, London, WC1H 9NE.
To:	Environment/Agencies:
Chief Executive	English Heritage, 1 Waterhouse Square, 138-142 Holborn, London, EC1N 2ST.
Chief Executive	Natural England, 7 th Floor, Hercules House, Hercules Road, Lambeth, London, SE1 7DU.
Chief Executive	The Highways Agency, 123 Buckingham Palace Road, London, SW1W 9HA.
Chief Executive	The Environment Agency, National Customer Contact Centre, PO Box 544, Rotherham, S60 1BY
To:	Campaign:
Chairman	London Travelwatch, 6 Middle Street, London, EC1A 7JA.
Chief Executive	Living Streets, 4 th Floor, Universal House, 88-94 Wentworth Street, London, E1 7SA.
The Chief Executive	The Campaign for Better Transport, 16 Waterside, 44-48 Wharf Road, London, N1 7UX.
Chairperson / Director	The London Cycle Campaign, 2 Newhams Row, London, SE1 3UZ. (and email to Brent Cycling Campaign)
Chief Executive	The Chief Executive, Friends of the Earth, 26-28 Underwood Street, London, N1 7JQ. (and email to Brent Friends of the Earth.