

APPENDIX 1: Comments received during the consultation on the Draft Local Implementation Plan 2011- 2014 and the officer responses

The table below summarises the feedback received from various stakeholders on the draft Local Implementation Plan as approved by Cabinet in December 2010. The revised Plan has been amended to take on board as appropriate the comments expressed through this feedback, and consequently explicit paragraphs in the consultees' actual responses, where submitted, refer to the previous draft document.

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
Transport for London	
<i>As the principal sponsors for the LIP, TfL undertake thorough reviews of every one of the 33 submissions across Greater London; officers understand that changes were required for every LIP in London.</i>	
The LIP covers the period up to 2031 whilst the programme of investment only covers the period up to 2013/14	Text and Programme have been adjusted. References to the extension of the Central Line to Uxbridge are included.
Objectives need to provide information and address the MTS Goals and Challenges, the Sub Regional Transport Plan Challenges and the SCS priorities	Objectives have been changed and agreed with TfL
A table is required explicitly summarising the linkages at the end of section 5	Table is included
More information is needed to form the evidence base for objectives	Evidence has been supplied to TfL satisfaction
More information needed regarding the interventions that will deliver the objectives in the long term in the Delivery Plan	Information has been supplied to TfL satisfaction
Potential funding table is required to replace the text setting out the possible funding available to deliver the Programme of Investment	Table is now included
The two major schemes that have not yet had funding committed from TfL should be removed from the Programme of Investment (Hayes Bus/Train Interchange and Ruislip Manor). The text has to reflect that these schemes are currently aspirational	Programme of investment and text have been adjusted accordingly
Various observations made concerning the monitoring tables such as baseline targets and long-term targets. Hillingdon's unique position in respect of being home to Heathrow Airport requires liaison with officers from TfL	Monitoring tables and targets have been amended and agreed with TfL. Liaison concerning Heathrow Airport is ongoing
BAA Comments	
<i>BAA provided a comprehensive submission, the key aspects of which are summarised below</i>	
Important for the Council and the airport to work closely to maximise sustainable travel to the airport	Hillingdon will continue to liaise through the Heathrow Area Transport Forum and arrange further collaboration as appropriate
Some duplication between the LIP and the Council's Core Strategy which could be rationalised in favour of a more concise document	LIP2 is quite separate to the Council's Core Strategy, but the comment is noted
Balance approach to air quality and congestion recognising that problems are principally generated by road traffic from major road	The council's view is that Heathrow is a major contributor to poor air quality, either directly or indirectly.

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
network rather than Heathrow's localised challenges	
[The borough should] take into account [Heathrow's] national significance as the UK's only hub airport and key multi-modal interchange, and the local benefits that derive from the high levels of accessibility.	Heathrow's significance is recognised in the LIP. Local connectivity is an issue which is being addressed.
Advocate a more positive recognition of the significant achievements that Heathrow has made in improving public transport access and mode share,	This is agreed, and further references have been made in the final draft
Heathrow's passenger numbers will only reach 75-77 rather than 80mppa by 2015 as a result of the economic recession. Public transport and road improvements implemented as part of the Terminal 5 development were considered sufficient to manage Heathrow's growth to 90-95mppa. More could be done to improve access to Heathrow but this should be reflected in a more proportionate context	The airport is permitted to grow to 480,000 Air Traffic Movements (ATMs) and a stated growth to handle 85mppa by 2015 and 95mppa by 2030. The permitted ATM levels and recognised levels of passengers will continue to be quoted.
[BAA] challenge that the operation of the airport has significant impacts on local residents in the south of the Borough and adjoining areas in respect of traffic congestion and crowded public transport. Since the opening of Terminal 5, traffic congestion around the airport has reduced considerably to the point that it is easier to travel around Heathrow during peak hours than it is in many other parts of west London and indeed Hillingdon.	There is adequate evidence to support this contention.
The Council may be aware of the jointly commissioned Heathrow Freight Movement Study 2009 which illustrated that Heathrow freight represented only 0.4% of total traffic outside of the airport perimeter within the west London study area, demonstrating that although Heathrow is a major trip generator, it is insignificant compared to total traffic volumes in the wider area	Noted
[The draft LIP] states that significantly high concentrations of NO2 are found around the Borough's major roads and at Heathrow. In so far as this applies to Heathrow Airport, we consider that the word "significant" is inappropriate here since EU limits for NO2 are complied with at the majority of monitoring locations around the airport with only minor exceedances along the northern perimeter.	LIP2 includes a comment that the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy states that "NO2 concentrations are a cause for concern at, and around, Heathrow Airport, with the highest concentrations beyond the airport boundary occurring close to roads in vicinity of the airport" However, traffic impacts of Heathrow are intrinsically linked to the operation of the site
Not only is Heathrow a key gateway to the UK but it is more importantly the UK's only hub airport. It would be pertinent if this was explicitly recognised in this instance	Agreed and noted in new paragraph 3.19
Reference to pressures on the road network and public transport from traffic associated with	Noted although the council's view is that there is pressure on the road network and public

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
Heathrow Airport. This comment should be deleted without any evidence to substantiate it	transport associated with Heathrow.
[A suggestion that] hotels and office accommodation developed in the vicinity of Heathrow are linked to poor air quality.	LIP2 contains no explicit connection between hotels and poor air quality
We are surprised that the recently published West London Sub-Regional Transport Plan does not feature here, bearing in mind that this provides a strategic link between the Mayor's Transport Strategy and Borough LIPs	The draft West London Sub-Regional Transport Plan was published after Hillingdon's Draft LIP2, but has now been explicitly referred to in the latest draft (paragraphs 4.5-4.7)
Whilst we support the improvement of north-south public transport links, we would like to raise a note of caution over the proposed re-alignment of regional bus services through the heart of the borough, as suggested by the document, as such a proposal is ultimately a matter for bus operators, and those funding and supporting such services. We also support any LIP proposals for funding bus priority measures but the Council will need to ensure that such measures are not undermined by realigned bus routes which could have the effect of increasing journey times.	Noted and welcome the support. North-south public transport links are a key issue of concern to the council and its residents, and improvements are being sought with input from all stakeholders. Bus service proposals are ultimately a matter for bus operators.
Whilst we support the objectives of the LIP, the actions in the Proposed Programme of Investment appear to focus on small-scale interventions and appear somewhat lacking when considered against higher level aspirations.	LIP2 refers to three major schemes which are subject to a separate bidding process. LIP2 itself is concerned with a range of well considered smaller-scale interventions in line with higher level aspirations and TfL's Smoothing Traffic programme.
We welcome the recognition of the success of the HATF [Heathrow Area Transport Forum] and the achievements in reducing single occupancy staff car travel to the airport. In respect to the achievement of increases in sustainable travel modes, we consider it important to quantify this by quoting the achievement of Heathrow's 40% target of public transport use by air passengers, thereby ensuring Heathrow now has the second highest level of passenger public transport use among UK airports. We would also suggest mention of the fact that Heathrow operates the largest car share scheme in Europe	Noted; reference has been made to this in paragraph 3.19 of the latest draft
[Suggestion] that the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy attributes poor air quality in Hillingdon areas to Heathrow Airport and major roads. We would emphasise that this is not entirely correct, as the Mayors AQS in fact acknowledges that road traffic is the major contributor to poor air quality and that air quality issues associated with Heathrow Airport are localised and only exceed air quality limits to the north of the airport perimeter. Again, we would draw attention to the fact that traffic associated with Heathrow is only a minor proportion of total traffic on the	Quantified evidence showing that Heathrow traffic only constitutes a minor proportion of the total traffic is lacking. The Mayor's Air Quality Strategy states: "NO2 concentrations are a cause for concern at and around Heathrow Airport, with the highest concentrations beyond the airport boundary occurring close to roads in vicinity of the airport. Modelling results of NO2 concentrations in west London, including Heathrow, clearly show that the highest concentrations are

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
surrounding road network	predicted close to main roads. It is important that airport-related road traffic sources of emissions, including private cars and freight are tackled. However, concentrations of NO2 are also predicted to be high within the airport boundary and it is important to continue to work to reduce emissions from airport operations in order to improve local air quality”.
Taking into account that Heathrow has already achieved its 2012 mode share target of 40% for passengers, it’s questionable whether replicating that target for passengers and staff emanating from Hillingdon is considered ambitious.	Noted and agreed; this target has been deleted
The “HASA” acronym does not align with Heathrow Surface Access Strategy. It would be appropriate to align this with the wider industry term of “ASAS” – i.e. Airport Surface Access Strategy	LIP2 now refers to ASAS instead of HASAS
British Airways Comments	Officer Response
LIP2 should note that Crossrail is in construction and is due to begin operations in 2018-19 and that Airtrack is not committed.	LIP2 does refer to Crossrail (see paragraphs 3.28 and 6.6)
[References to how Heathrow’s runways operate].The Government policy decision to abolish the Cranford Agreement will allow noise from aircraft to be more equally distributed between communities in the areas surrounding the airport and will make the airport more resilient. BAA is currently working to implement this.	LIP2 no longer refers to the mode of operation of runways. The Cranford Agreement, which limited the airport to this type of operation has now been ended by the Government and is no longer described.
The sources of emissions need to be identified in the Heathrow Area Priority Location in order to determine what measures are most appropriate. For instance there are sizeable movements of non-airport related traffic using roads in the area such as the M4 and A4	A study is currently establishing the borough’s transport carbon footprint to systematically reduce emissions in line with government and Mayoral policy. This will address the sources of emissions need to be identified in the Heathrow Area Priority Location
[comments on the references to the current situation regarding Heathrow ATM capacity and future passenger growth]. Currently they imply that Heathrow has not reached its capacity limit when it has and that there is room for ATM growth above historic levels when there is not. Though actual flight numbers have fallen since 2007/08 due to the economic downturn the number of slots allocated at Heathrow is very close to the 478,000 passenger ATM limit so it is to be expected Heathrow will return to its capacity limit very quickly over the next few years	Noted. Any further LIP2 reference to the capacity limit of 480,000 ATMs per annum may cause unnecessary confusion
The only real source of passenger growth over and above the levels reached in 2007/08 will be from airlines operating larger aircraft. This increase in passengers (removing the impact of	The Council has no mechanism to control the size of aircraft operated by airlines, therefore no control over number of passengers accessing the airport. The passenger

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
increased transfer passengers) will impact local roads, public transport and air quality. These surface access and air quality impacts need to be measured against the 2002 baseline, as detailed in LIP2, and it should be noted that operated ATM's have previously been at the 480,000 capacity limit and that there is no possibility of growth in ATM's over historic levels as allocated slots for passenger ATM's are very close to the 478,000 limit	numbers as detailed in documents such as Adding Capacity at Heathrow as referenced earlier show a gradual increase which is attributed to the use of larger aircraft.
[reference to] "Adding Capacity at Heathrow Consultation supporting technical documents" as the reference for anticipated growth in car journeys at the airport. It is unclear if the forecasts in the consultation, which was published in 2008, have been adjusted for the impacts of the economic downturn since then? Part of the growth in car journeys will be returning to historic car journey levels at Heathrow (2007/08 passenger peak) and will be off-set by increases in public transport mode share before new growth in car journeys and public transport trips occurs.	The Council are not in a position to forecast passenger movements or emission totals on behalf of the airport. This is why recognised documentation has been referenced. As the impact of the economic downturn is unlikely to be a permanent feature (BAA/BA states Heathrow will return to its capacity limit very quickly over the next few years) the borough have to ensure the issues are identified and measures in place to address the predicted growth levels.
Local Target 6 Heathrow Airport, Modal Share for Hillingdon: BA notes the ongoing support for work to improve public transport mode share at Heathrow for LBH residents. BA will continue to work as part of the Heathrow Area Transport Forum to pursue these goals with LBH and other stakeholders	Noted and welcomed
LIP2 does not specifically reference any action to support Heathrow Airport as a major transport hub in the borough. In light of recent discussions around the possibility of building a new hub airport for London this should be reflected in LIP2. Whilst there will be no substantive change to Heathrow's status in the lifetime of LIP2 there is likely to be a debate around the long-term future of the airport. BA is cognisant of LBH's position on expansion of Heathrow but that should not preclude supporting re-development or enhancements of the airport in its current 2-runway form	Hillingdon Council is keen to work constructively with BAA, BA and other partners to secure the long-term future of Heathrow airport and support re-development or enhancements of the airport in its current 2-runway form
LIP2 does not specifically reference a view on development of High Speed Two. The proposed route runs through the borough and there are also proposals for a station at Heathrow as well. As with Heathrow above, whilst there will be no substantive development during the lifetime of LIP2 the Phase 1 (London to Birmingham) and Phase 2 (Manchester, Leeds and Heathrow) consultation will take place in this timeframe. At a strategic level BA supports the principle of a high-speed rail network including a station at	The currently proposed route alignment was not known at the time that the initial draft of the LIP was prepared. Now that the details have been made available through the government's consultation, Hillingdon Council has expressed serious concerns regarding the proposed HS2 alignment and is formulating its response as part of the current consultation

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
Heathrow	
London Borough of Ealing - Comments	Officer Response
LB Ealing welcomes the new draft LIP from Hillingdon Council	Noted
We also welcome the focuses to reduce reliance on the private car for journeys to Heathrow Airport, cycling and Cycling Hubs (which will support our own objective to increase cycling) and also public footpath improvements in Yeading Valley (Charville Lane to Sharvel Lane). Walking and cycling improvements on the Grand Union Canal are particularly as they will complement similar works in LB Ealing	Noted
Including references for all your data would be useful to enable accurate comparisons	Such references will be developed within the West London Partnership working
We would value your comments on the LB Ealing Draft LIP by 11 th March 2011	Comments are made on an ongoing basis through West London Liaison. LB Hillingdon is particularly keen to work closely with LB Ealing on developments affecting the borough boundary area in general and especially the traffic generation issues associated with the Southall Gasworks Development, in particular with regard to the A312 Hayes Bypass.
Eastcote Residents Association - Comments	Officer Response
Co-operation of individuals is fundamental to the overall plan's success. It is therefore unfortunate that the consultation did not include proactive dissemination to the residents associations from the start of the consultation period.	Noted; however consultation has been wide spread and inclusive.
Local challenges & Opportunities: We concur with the overall assessment and in particular that the LIP2 address the challenge of poor north-south transport links in Hillingdon; congestion causing traffic delays, prioritising the 30 identified congestion hotspots; the need to improve access to and from local destinations; the high dependency on private vehicles and low proportion of trips made by cycling, walking and public transport; Hillingdon's carbon emissions from transportation are much higher than the London average. The number of people travelling into and out of Hillingdon is a major contributing factor; and all within the context that Hillingdon is projected to generate 9,000 new jobs and an average of 425 new homes per annum and the implications that this will have on demand for travel	Noted
School Travel Plans: The proportion of schools with an implemented School Travel Plans is encouraging as are the significant commitments from LBH and partners; doubt to the accuracy of the level of trips to and from school undertaken other than by car (61% non-car); Traffic calming measures restricted to 'outside' schools do not	Noted; 'Hands up' surveys have been conducted consistently since the introduction of school travel plans and is officially recognised as a reasonable method to assess modal change; School route audits form part of services offered on demand to schools as part of the travel plan services;

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
address whole journey risks and decisions regarding modal choice are invariably taken on what is the weakest link (highest risk);	
We very much endorse the LIP2 statement <i>'Sustainable travel at an early age will both inspire the children's guardians and teach children how to travel more wisely in the future with positive spin-off effects for future generations'</i> ; the link between levels of sustainable travel to/from school and benefits associated with environmental, health, congestion and economy suggests that this issue could be transformational to address collectively.	Noted and welcomed;
A borough wide initiative focused on challenging unsafe driving practices in order to improve the health and safety of our children would be difficult to resist.	The suggestion to introduce a borough-wide campaign to improve driver behaviour will be borne in mind;
LBH may wish to adopt as a key performance indicator a percentage of non-car dependent journeys with the ability to disaggregate by individual schools	The final core and local performance indicators have been discussed and agreed with TfL upon submission of the Draft LIP2
Biking Borough: the cycle journey time advantages over the car during peak commuter times are appreciable and are not accurately accounted for	Cycle journey times are indicative and have been taken from the TfL Journey Planner when drafting LIP2. Journey time was estimated based on anecdotal time measurements in case of gaps - TfL was made aware the minor gaps
There is significant potential to increase the cycle modal in line with the Mayor's Cycling Revolution. However the proposals outlined are likely to overcome the many perceived barriers including concerns regarding safety. Illegal and inconsiderate parking is a safety issue.	Noted
LIP2 could be more creative and innovative in respect of its approach to securing an increase in cycling – especially commuting	Since the draft LIP was prepared, the borough has made a successful bid for three-year extra funding to allow significant improvements to cycling practice and provision.
Objective to reduce the number of people killed and seriously injured and reduce the overall number of pedestrian and cycle casualties; The proactive work with regard to vulnerable road users (children, young adults, cyclists and powered two wheeler riders) is acknowledged as good practice.	Noted
This is only one side of the `average` collision conflict and there are inadequate proposals contained within this LIP2 to address the risks created by dangerous, careless and illegal drivers.	The LIP bid contains a significant element to ensure that Hillingdon's accident record remains favourable when compared with other London Boroughs
Success in reducing injury collisions is unlikely to reduce perceptions of road traffic danger. Damage only collisions (not measured or	The final core and local performance indicators have been discussed and agreed with TfL upon submission of the Draft LIP2

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
<p>analysed by the Council) and poor driving amounting to 'near misses' act as a significant deterrent to those considering walking and cycling as an alternative to the car. This undermines the sustainability agenda. Some recognition of this fact is apparent in the inclusion of 'slight' injuries in the objective with regard to pedestrians and cyclists but this does not go far enough. Include an outcome performance measures that monitors perception of risk</p>	
<p>Enforcement: there are a substantial number of 'must' and 'must not's' contained within road traffic laws such as requirement to have a driving license; be insured; obey traffic signs; not drive whilst impaired through drink or drugs; obey speed limits; correctly register the vehicle; and not drive a defective vehicle etc. The Highway Code, invariably long forgotten, also contains advice to all road users to manage risks and can be used to mount a prosecution for 'careless' driving or securing redress through civil action. It is widely acknowledged that having a credible enforcement capability is essential if an acceptable level of compliance is to be secured. Furthermore the effective management of road risk requires a co-ordinated approach across engineering, education and enforcement interventions. This draft LIP2 objective does not adequately acknowledge this and in particular does not include details of the enforcement interventions needed to reduce death, injury, damage and fear. It is acknowledged that the majority of the enforcement capability is not under the control the local authority but rather the Police and to a lesser degree VOSA. Hillingdon Council may wish to secure a Service Level Agreement with Metropolitan Police Service to deliver transparent road policing enforcement capability to assist in achieving the LBH LIP2 objectives.</p>	<p>1) Hillingdon Council works very closely and constructively with the Metropolitan Police Service. Numerous formal and informal partnership arrangements are in place. The suggestion to enter into a Service Level Agreement will be borne in mind.</p>
<p>Within the draft objective to 'Identify and implement new opportunities for corresponding reductions in crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour' mention is made of the local crime & disorder strategy arrangements (Crime & Disorder Act 1998). The local strategy could include the issues of road crime, fear of road crime and anti-social road behaviour</p>	<p>The London Borough of Hillingdon has formal partnership arrangements with, amongst others, the Metropolitan Police, London Fire Brigade and London Probation Service. This includes the Safer Hillingdon Partnership (the crime and disorder strategic group) which meets regularly. The Safer Hillingdon Partnership receives an annual report about road safety, and discusses issues of road crime and anti-social road behaviour, and thereby provides strategic direction. Council officers attend the Police's Tactical Tasking and Co-ordinating Group and local councillors</p>

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
	can influence the priority setting of local police teams through the Safer Neighbourhood Panels.
Work Related Road Safety: it is estimated that up to a third of all road traffic accidents involve somebody who is at work as the time. In London goods vehicles, vans upwards, accounted for 16% of the total road deaths in London in 2009 and in 2008 the figure was 20%.	Noted
In the 10 year period 2002-09 there were 189 deaths in London involving large goods vehicles (over 7.5 tonnes). Of these deaths 9 were related to large good vehicle driver/occupants whilst 180 were other road users, the significant majority of which were pedestrians and cyclists.	Noted
Employers have legal duties under road traffic legislation but also, importantly, under health and safety legislation to manage their work-related road risks. Under s3 of the Health & Safety at Work Act 1974 this includes persons not in his employment and activities undertaken on his behalf i.e. contractors and logistics supply chain.	Noted
One of the underpinning principles of this legislation is that those that create the risks are best placed to address them. Particularly relevant where there is disproportionality in death and injuries as exemplified above.	Noted
LB of Hillingdon operates a substantial fleet in its own right (i.e. rubbish collection) but also a 'grey fleet' (business use of private vehicles) operation. In relation to LBH 'grey fleet' mileage claims amounting to £978,401 by 1,377 staff driving 967,686 miles in 2008. LB of Hillingdon could be a significant employer in the borough; as road user directly; procurer of goods and services; and as a public sector organisation tasked with the sustainable development of the borough should demonstrate leadership by a) Demonstrating compliance with HSE/DfT 'Driving at Work' guidance and associated legislation ¹ with regard to its own fleet (including 'grey' fleet), b) Include within LBH procurement practises a requirement that contractors and sub-contractors demonstrate similar compliance with regard to at-work journeys in Hillingdon, c) Promoting the adoption of work related road safety amongst employers within LB Hillingdon	Noted
Effective management of work-related road risks is an investment not a cost. It is a structured approach to securing compliance with existing legal duties; increasing profit; reducing carbon	Noted

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
emissions; and demonstrating a commitment to corporate social responsibility. From LB Hillingdon's perspective it is about providing leadership and acting as a catalyst for change	
Hayes & Harlington Community Development Forum – Comments	Officer Response
Support is expressed for the identification of Hayes Town Centre/Railway Station as a Major Scheme Bid (NB including Coldharbour Lane is important as well as the upgrading of the heart of the Town Centre and railway station area; that part of Pump Lane extending to Matalan should also be included). Such a project would be hugely significant for the locality and for the improvement of accessibility and connectivity for the southern part of the Borough	The importance of Coldharbour Lane is noted
Support is expressed for the proposal to improve links to/from and along the Grand Union Canal (generally, not just the Hayes Town Centre area)	Noted
LIP/SEA recognise there are issues arising from the south of the borough being identified as a development opportunity area and the difficulties that this potentially raises for achievement of LIP's Objectives and compliance with other Council, Mayoral etc Strategies	Noted
The monitoring of Heathrow Modal Shift is welcomed. Practical measures to achieve the targets should be set out	The final core and local performance indicators have been discussed and agreed with TfL upon submission of the Draft LIP2
The Mayor of London has suggested that there be a joint strategy for public realm and transport improvements in the Bath Road area through an Opportunity Area Planning Framework. This area has/is experiencing development pressures and regardless of how such a project is defined in planning language, there should be an exploration of such a public realm/transport project addressing the challenges in this area and the Heathrow Villages	The Mayor of London is leading on the Heathrow Opportunity Area Planning Framework. Local residents and businesses are already being consulted in preparation of proposals for the Heathrow Villages as included in LIP2
This response is based upon issues/ views that have been raised / expressed at previous meetings of the Forum/Committee. Our next meeting, which will focus on the future of the Borough prompted by the Core Strategy consultations, is not till this coming Friday, 4th March, and so I am not in a position yet to give a fuller response other than to set out briefly what has previously been stated	No further response has been received
Hertfordshire County Council - Comments	Officer Response
We are aware that growth in car ownership (para 3.51 in original draft) could contribute to the congestion problems on Hertfordshire's roads, and therefore support all the initiatives that Hillingdon is undertaking to improve the take-up by residents of sustainable transport	Noted and welcomed

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
including walking and cycling. If there are any cross boundary cycling initiatives that need to be explored, we support further dialogue with your officers	
We also welcome the use of new technology (for example the use of real-time information (p.5, p.36 and p.98 in original draft) to improve bus services. Hertfordshire has also recently published its own Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) Strategy and we would welcome cross boundary working to ensure that complementary systems continue to be developed to deliver as efficient, joined up and effective local transport service as possible	Noted
We note that there will be free parking for electric vehicles (25 plus places p.80 in original draft); are there any linkages between Hillingdon's LIP and the East of England's and London's successful bids to OLEV for electric vehicle funding? The growth in electric vehicle use will doubtless have a beneficial effect on Hertfordshire's air quality when these vehicles are travelling through from Hillingdon to Hertfordshire	LIP2 now clarifies the fact that charging of electric vehicles will be free whilst the infrastructure is being introduced, which is in accordance with the London-wide accord that is in place. The charging regime as applicable for the respective car parks will apply as for all other vehicles. Hillingdon Council is subscribing to London's successful bid for funding of electric vehicle charging infrastructure
Finally we note Hillingdon's commitment to public transport, and if there are any issues where joint working would be of benefit to both authorities, we would welcome future liaison with you. We would also welcome Hillingdon's input to the forthcoming consultation on Hertfordshire's Bus Strategy which takes place from Mid March 2011	Noted
Hillingdon Motorist Forum - Comments	Officer Response
The Introduction states that the car will remain the preferred method of transport in the Borough but the rest of the document then puts forward ideas to try and discourage travel by private car	The plan takes full account of TfL's guidance, including its funding programme requirements. Car travel constitutes the largest proportion of trips and this is fully recognised
Objective 2. This should include a commitment to improve the road network so as to reduce traffic congestion	LIP2 is concerned with providing innovative and smart transport solutions in a manner which is sustainable, responsive to demand and especially cost effective
Pollution Levels: 1) The assertion that poor air quality is purely down to private road transport is incorrect. Trains, buses, planes all produce significant pollution. Due to improved design, different fuels, the pollution levels will continue to reduce. 2) It is accepted that traffic congestion does contribute to pollution, therefore if improvements are made to the road system and congestion reduced pollution levels would fall even further	Noted
Parking Management / Provision: The suggestion is made in App2 in original draft that	Hillingdon Council adopts a sensible and responsive approach to its demand for

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
parking charges should be set to discourage travel by private car. Does this mean that only the rich or well off can enjoy travel by private car?	parking. LIP contains bids for the introduction of schemes to ease parking within residential areas and destinations such as town centres. LIP is not the medium to address the wider social implications
Road safety: The assertion that higher speed links will lead to more serious accidents is not proven, in fact statistics show that speed is only responsible for a small percentage of road accidents. Improvements to the road network would lead to greater road safety, for instance motorways are much safer than narrow roads but motorway speeds are higher	Noted
Pressure on the Greenbelt: The document comments that greenbelt land maybe needed for the Public Transport Infrastructure. This is not in keeping with the principle of protecting the environment. Why is it acceptable to take greenbelt land for public transport facilities but not for new roads. The West London Tram system is not being built	The Council is not proposing to implement any transport schemes in the Green Belt
Appendix 3 in original draft. Speed humps are mentioned. Hillingdon uses Speed tables. The operating times of Bus Lanes should be considered carefully, outside peak hours they can result in inefficient use of road space	Noted
Should the tax payer be expected finance the large subsidies required by public transport?	LIP2 is concerned with providing public transport solutions rather than wider inland revenue issues
I was surprised that the Email would only accept 2000 characters and so my comments were not as detailed as I would have liked. Is it possible to submit more detailed comments, for instance through your department	No limits were set in expressing views on the Draft LIP2. The Motorist Forum is at liberty to submit comments at any time as has been common practice during recent years
Yiewsley & West Drayton Town Centre Action Group - Comments	Officer Response
In general the plan has been welcomed. However, the following points are for your consideration:	Noted
There is general disagreement on the low priority status given to High Street, Yiewsley and Station Road, West Drayton in regard to the Congestion Hotspots. This aspect will also have to be updated as to the effect the opening of the new superstore at the end of the corridor will have on traffic movements	A major scheme is being implemented in Yiewsley and West Drayton High Street to improve the shopping ambience. The effects of new superstore on traffic in the area will be monitored
Congestion Hotspots: The Y&WDTCAG are aware of the proposals for the town centre, its aim to improve the ambience and the limitations that the scheme will have in reducing current congestion. In addition to Tesco's there will be a further 800+ homes coming on stream and the possibility of a recycling plant. Members would not agree with the low priority status given to	Table L1 as in the original draft has been deleted. Yiewsley and West Drayton is very important to the Council which is reflected in LIP2

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
Y&WD in LIP2	
There is no inclusion of any remedy to the congestion experienced in Pield Heath Road / Colham Green Road when accessing Hillingdon Hospital. Buses in particular can suffer long delays	Potential for measures in Pield Heath Road is being explored in liaison with interested parties including the Uxbridge Area-wide Travel Plan Partners such as Hillingdon Hospital, TfL and bus operators
Congestion Pield Heath Road/Colham Green Road: With respect, this area has been under discussion for some years with no resolution in sight. Inclusion in LIP 2 may help to focus on the problems and provide a definitive timescale for resolution	The Uxbridge – Heathrow public transport corridor features quite prominently in the West London Plan which is supported by Hillingdon Council officers. I can confirm that solutions are being considered but scheme development / implementation is considerably more complex than expected
The closing of local leisure/sports facilities resulting in the concentration on two centres several miles away and not easily accessible by public transport would indicate an increase in car journeys	LIP2 is concerned with providing innovative and smart transport solutions in a manner which is sustainable, responsive to demand and especially cost effective
Current Council's Parking Management Scheme in West Drayton mitigates against any improvement to the U3 bus route via Swan Road	<p>Parking Management Schemes are reviewed within 12 months after becoming operational. At the same time it is the Council's usual practice to consult with residents in the surrounding roads to see if parking has transferred and if they would like to consider options to address this. The West Drayton/Yiewsley Parking Management Scheme is programmed to be reviewed in September 2011 as agreed by the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling.</p> <p>An informal meeting took place on 7th April 2011 with Ward Councillors to determine which roads should be consulted on a possible extension to the scheme. The Yiewsley and West Drayton Town Centre Action Group will be kept informed of any consultations that are due to take place as a matter of course</p>
With 2012 and the subsequent increase in visitors using the airport hotels suggest that these hotels be encouraged to sell Oyster/Travel cards to help offset the very expensive fares encountered on buses and underground. It is surprising how many visitors to London stay at these hotels, particularly those located in Cherry Lane	Noted
It has been noted that neither Hayes or West Drayton Railway Stations will have parking facilities included in their upgrades and the advent of Crossrail. This will put more pressure on parking in residential roads	Hayes and West Drayton Railway Stations have been identified as Crossrail interchanges, the issues of which will be addressed in due course
Crossrail: In 2009 the Y&WDTCAG submitted to the Council Crossrail's response on this issue. In brief, the provision of parking facilities are not	The matter has been taken up with Crossrail

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
<p>in Crossrail's remit. Subsequent meetings with Crossrail continue to confirm the status quo. Network Rail has continually refused to countenance such a provision. This was despite the fact that the Y&WDT CAG had identified a site which would have been suitable. Network rail has now leased this particular site to business</p>	
<p>In the Monitoring Section it has been noted that the Hayes Town Partnership will monitor improvements to the stretches of the Grand Union Canal that passes through Yiewsley. Would it be possible to include the Yiewsley and West Drayton</p>	<p>The whole length of the Grand Union Canal towpath is subject to an upgrade, especially the section between Oxford Road and the Ealing borough boundary. The voluntary sector including the Yiewsley & West Drayton Town Centre Action Group is encouraged to increase surveillance and improve the ambience of the canal environment</p>
The Chimes Shopping Centre, Uxbridge Comments	Officer Response
<p>We are actively involved in transport matters in the borough with our own Travel Plan, are members of the Uxbridge Travel Partnership and have participated in the special public transport events held last year</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed</p>
<p>As part of our group company's policy we have an active interest in promoting sustainable travel to all of our shopping centres. From a business point of view, we also wish to ensure that Uxbridge is a pleasant and accessible place to visit by any means and whether for work, shopping or leisure</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed</p>
<p>Section 2.5 in original draft refers to Uxbridge as being the most significant interchange in the Borough and a gateway to the Borough. Section 2.6 states that it does not compare favourably with other equivalent urban centres for journey times. Section 3.26 states that transport improvements are key to ensuring the future success of Uxbridge as a Metropolitan Centre. We support the work currently being done to improve the environment around both the underground and bus stations. However whilst accepting that some funds to rectify these problems will come from other sources an allocation of only £10K per year from the LIP (table 3.3) in original draft seems inadequate for the most significant interchange in the Borough</p>	<p>Major improvements are being introduced in Bakers Road with further measures to follow in Belmont Road upon completion of the works.</p> <p>Uxbridge will also see the introduction of new trains and signalling upgrade along the Metropolitan Line during the LIP2 lifetime. Uxbridge will further benefit from the Eligible London scheme currently being introduced</p>
<p>Section 3.21 in original draft refers to the need to encourage modal change towards sustainable travel. Improvements to the public realm, provision of real time information not only at the station but other locations around Uxbridge centre will assist in this aim. We believe further investment is urgently required around both the bus and underground stations to address these</p>	<p>Initiatives are in hand to promote and improve connections between Uxbridge and Heathrow Airport in line with the West London Plan and through working with our seven neighbouring authorities on information provision. It is hoped that new initiatives will be developed through the Uxbridge Travel Partnership</p>

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
issues	
We also support the desire for faster transport connections with central London	Noted
North-South journeys: Section 3.21 in original draft refers to north-south journeys being usually slow and often indirect. Is there intended to be any LIP investment to address these issues?	The LIP2 delivery plan specifically addresses the need for measures to improve north-south journeys
Legible London: Section 3.73 in original draft refers to the 'Legible London' scheme. We are pleased to see the investment being made in improving the walking environment and public realm and are happy to work with you in delivering this scheme in Uxbridge	Noted
Crossrail: Is there intended to be any LIP investment to ensure that parts of the Borough not directly served by Crossrail can still easily access this new service when it opens?	Crossrail is seen as an important opportunity for providing interchanges between north-south and east-west travel within the borough. Suggestions for improvement are always welcome and dialogue with potential funding providers ongoing.
Grand Union Canal: The Y&WDT CAG has been involved in this process for some time. However, in order to help facilitate the upgrade to the Grand Union Canal the Group needs to be part of the process. This would mean either being part of the monitoring process or to be kept informed through the Monitoring Group or the Council	The Council is currently in liaison with British Waterways with a view to implementing schemes identified during the RISP in 2010. Suggestions for a Monitoring Group would be most welcome as none is in place at present
British Waterways - Comments	Officer Response
We are pleased that the document recognises the Grand Union Canal network's potential for sustainable transport, including walking and cycling, and water based leisure and recreation. It does not appear to recognise and promote the use of this former industrial transport artery for waterborne freight, however, in line with the Mayor's draft Transport Strategy. A sound economic, environmental and social case exists for considering freight by water as a viable alternative to road transport. This offers benefits including reduced lorry miles, reduced congestion, reduced carbon emission and reduced number of HGV related accidents. Opportunities exist for domestic and commercial waste and recyclables to be transported from the site to a Waste Transfer Station by water, as demonstrated by LB of Hackney's Waste by Water pilot scheme	Waterborne freight will be mentioned explicitly in the LIP2 final document. Waste by Water appears to provide potential provided the waste plant and processing facilities are located by the canal. One of the two waste sites identified in the Draft West London Strategy, currently at consultation, is located both within the borough and along the canal
Para 3.29 of the draft LIP supports measures for sustainable travel both for people and freight, which should include waterborne freight. Issues of loading and unloading are also particular hindrances to making this more widely successful	Noted
Para 3.64 refers to Hillingdon's Clean Vehicle	The suggestion will be borne in mind

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
Programme and the Freight Operator's Recognition Scheme which could be used to encourage waterborne freight	
BW look forward to developing policies and strategies with the Council to ensure that every opportunity and encouragement is given to new and existing developments to consider freight by water	It is suggested to await the outcome of the West London Waste Strategy consultation before considering freight by water initiatives further in 2012
BW supports the Council's aim to support walking and cycling, and we are pleased to note the intention for projects along our network within the LIP, which our Enterprise team are working closely with Hillingdon on. The towpaths provide a useful, safe and enjoyable transport option, a valued leisure activity, and beautiful resource for walks and bike rides, as well as being a very practical link between destinations.	Noted
BW's aims are to: Promote the towpaths as a "green link" between visitor attractions, local communities and facilities, and as a pleasurable walking route in their own right; conduct towpath refurbishment and associated access and safety works, environmental enhancement, signage and interpretation in a sensitive and creative way with third party/partnership funding including S106 contributions; adopt an "Access for all" policy wherever possible. Seek to link the towpaths to other footpath/walking routes e.g. Colne Valley Park, Capital Ring, London Loop; promote guided and even animated walks offered by interest groups on our towpaths e.g. Inland Waterways Association, Original London Walks; Promote and support organisations who devise waymarked walks with leaflets which incorporate some of our towpaths	Noted
We seek to identify basic signage needs for walkers. Actively seek third party funding for towpath improvement works and maintenance particularly from local authorities and developers. Encourage local authorities to be proactive in raising awareness of the existence of waterways network from the road, for example through distinctive signage at crossing points, published literature, Healthy Walks schemes and web site listings. Identify sections in greater need of regeneration and refurbishment and those which will enhance and add value to their waterway setting (e.g. by visitor attractions, trip boat moorings etc.)	Noted
Para 1.14 Page 8 in original draft: We would	The council is working with British Waterways

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
<p>support a new designation for towpaths that promoted safe shared use by all users, without prioritising cycling over other users. BW have been in discussion with Slough Borough Council regarding a joint ambition to improve the Slough Arm for pedestrians, cyclists, and boaters (passenger and freight). We are keen that LB Hillingdon's transport strategy coordinates with that of Slough Borough Council, as well as other adjoining boroughs, so that a comprehensive approach to the use of the waterway network and its towpaths is achieved and its potential to support local communities is maximised</p>	<p>and the results of a site visit with the Friends of Slough Canal with a view to improve the towpath surface along the entire Slough Arm. BW already provided some very indicative costs and the proposal is being pursued within SBC.</p> <p>It is understood that BW hopes to undertake a dredging programme in 2012/13 on the Slough Arm (c.£350k+ to be confirmed) and this could act as substantial match funding for borough and Section 106 contributions.</p>
HA4 7RQ Resident - Comment	Officer Response
<p>Table 2.2 in original draft does not show Watford has a journey time of 18 minutes to London (Euston) by London Midland Para 2.6 Journey times from Uxbridge to London (by Metropolitan Line). These have increased by 6 mins since 1938. Why doesn't it recommend that the Mayor of London is lobbied to reinstate on the Uxbridge branch a proportion of the Fast and semi fast slots that are now given totally to Bucks and Herts commuters. No mention of the Croxley Rail link is mentioned which will transform travel in the north of the Borough, nor Chiltern Railways Evergreen improvements due this May!</p>	<p>Reinstating a proportion of the Fast and semi-fast slots to the Uxbridge branch involves complex rail operational issues outside the control of LB Hillingdon. The current arrangements provide major overall benefits in exchange for relatively minor benefits.</p> <p>The Croxley Rail link and Chiltern Railway Evergreen project will transform travel for the north of the Borough to/from the Hertfordshire area rather than within the borough</p>
English Heritage - Comments	Officer Response
<p>London Borough of Hillingdon needs to identify transport opportunities for the historic environment (e.g. sensitively designed public realm upgrades) as set out in the <i>Mayor's Transport Strategy</i>, proposal 83: "The Mayor, through TfL, and working with the London boroughs and other stakeholders, will use the principles of 'better streets' to seek to improve town centres, in particular: removing clutter and improving the layout and design of streets; enhancing and protecting the built <i>and historic environment</i>; increasing the permeability of streets; and creating clear and easily understandable routes and spaces to make it easier for cyclists, pedestrians and disabled people to get about."</p>	<p>LIP2 explicitly refers to 'better streets' especially when referring to improving town centres and conservation areas. As a matter of course we will pay special attention to those at risk namely:</p> <p>Copper Mill Lock, Harmondsworth Village, Hayes Village, Ickenham Village, Longford Village, Morford Way (Eastcote), Northwood (Frithwood), Ruislip Manor Way, The Greenway, Thorn/EMI, Botwell, Uxbridge Lock and West Drayton Green</p>
<p>We would recommend the Borough considers how enhancement projects of this nature could influence the LIP vision, objectives and options. The English Heritage <i>Heritage At Risk Register 2010</i> could be a good starting point in relation to individual heritage assets, and the Borough's own Conservation Area Appraisals/ Management Plans may point to areas in need of transport/ public realm improvements.</p>	<p>We are fully aware of the following Heritage At Risk Register entries within the London Borough of Hillingdon:</p> <p>Colham Green, Uxbridge: Moorcroft House, stable / coach house, wall to south and house to north east, Harlington Road Colham Green, Uxbridge: Hubbard's Farm Barn, West Drayton Road Cowley Peachey, Old Mill House, Old Mill</p>

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
	<p>Lane</p> <p>Cranford: Cellars of former Cranford House, Roseville Road</p> <p>Cranford: Cranford House Stables, Roseville Road</p> <p>Eastcote, Ruislip: The Old Coach House, High Road</p> <p>Harefield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Breakspear House, Breakspear Road North - Dovecote north west of Breakspear House - Garden Walls to Nursery, Church Hill - Park (Annexe to Hospital), Hill End Road - Stable Blocks (two annexes to Hospital) <p>Harmondsworth: Barn west of Weekly House, Bath Road</p> <p>Harmondsworth: Manor Farm Barn, High Street</p> <p>Hayes: Benlow Works, Silverdale Road</p> <p>Hillingdon-Uxbridge Cemetery, Chapels, Uxbridge Road</p> <p>Hillingdon-Uxbridge Cemetery, Gatehouse, Uxbridge Rd</p> <p>Ickenham: Manor Farm moat</p> <p>Ickenham: Moated site, west bank of River Pinn</p> <p>Northwood: Langley Farm Barn, Breakspear Road North</p> <p>Uxbridge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Cedars, 66 High Street - Lido entrance building, Park Road - Grandstand, Park Road - Lido, North & South Fountains, Park Road - Lido, Park Road - RAF Cinema, Grays Road - RAF Walls rear of Hillingdon House, Uxbridge Rd
<p>Other examples might be improvements to the setting, access, signage or interpretation of heritage assets; or reinstatement of old street patterns/ surfaces and repair/ restoration of historic street furniture. We consider that the 'Existing environmental problems' section of the LIP should cover environmental problems beyond transport issues that might be addressed positively by the LIP</p>	<p>It is our normal practice to improve setting, access, signage or interpretation of heritage assets as a matter of course. Recent examples include Windsor Street in Uxbridge and Green Lane in Northwood. In each case we worked closely with our conservation specialists.</p> <p>Reinstatement of old street patterns is an issue unlikely to occur during the LIP period</p>
<p>We would suggest that poorly designed and located transport infrastructure, can have a visual impact upon the historic interest of heritage assets, such as listed buildings, conservations areas, and registered parks and gardens, and their settings. Examples of this can include prolific highway signage or inappropriate material finishes</p>	<p>Works currently being finalised at the Eastcote interchange confirm that we work fully in line with your suggestion, working closely with conservation specialists</p>
<p>The LIP could through its emphasis upon town</p>	<p>The final core and local performance</p>

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
<p>centre improvements help ensure the environmental quality of Hillingdon's places is conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>Monitoring indicators could include data on the state of the historic environment by making use of the English Heritage <i>Heritage At Risk Register 2010</i>. A further monitoring indicator could also consider heritage assets (e.g.% conservation areas, archaeological priority areas, nationally/ locally listed buildings and registered parks and gardens harmed by change)</p>	<p>indicators have been discussed and agreed with TfL upon submission of the Draft LIP2</p>
Transport for Buckinghamshire - Comments	Officer Response
<p>Page 3 in original draft: There are a number of Buckinghamshire residents that travel to Hillingdon/Uxbridge for education, employment, recreational/leisure purposes therefore it's important that the LIP does not limit it's scope to only those living within the borough but considers those that travel in to the area from neighbouring authorities</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Pager 3 in original draft: Are the popular destinations restricted to the Hillingdon area only? TfB would be interested to know if there is a demand from people in Hillingdon to travel to popular destinations within Buckinghamshire and/or a demand from Buckinghamshire residents to travel to popular destinations in Hillingdon. Improve condition of principal roads and increase satisfaction levels with network condition.</p>	<p>"Popular destination" is a term which will be changed in the Final LIP document. The philosophy is to adopt a layered approach to significant destinations, encouraging people to walk, cycle and use public transport especially for short distances. TfL modelling results show demand from people living in Buckinghamshire and working in Hillingdon. TfL may have a limited amount of information concerning travel from Hillingdon towards Buckinghamshire from its London Travel Demand Survey. It will be a small sample unlikely to be representative to consider making policy decisions</p>
<p>TfB would be interested to know if there are any principal roads that cut across Hillingdon and Buckinghamshire which require maintenance. This could be an area where partnership working between the two local authorities could be strengthened</p>	<p>The A4020 Oxford Road was surfaced last financial year from the A4007 New Windsor Street to the borough boundary with Bucks CC using TfL LIP funding and is therefore in good condition. The section from the borough boundary down to the Denham Roundabout in Bucks may well be on Bucks CC programme for works.</p> <p>The A4007 New Windsor Street / St Johns Road may feature in a subsequent years LIP Bid for Hillingdon and is in need of treatment, however I believe the Bucks section A4007 Slough Road is well maintained and may not require extensive treatment.</p> <p>Although not a principal road, the B470 Iver Lane is on our reserve list for surfacing (LBH Capital, not LIP) for 2011/12 and the section across the borough Boundary into Bucks (north of Clisby's Bridge) is in need of urgent</p>

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
	treatment also. These are the only principal roads that cross the boundary with Bucks CC
Page 4 in original draft: TfB would like to highlight the significance of High Wycombe as a transport interchange. It has recently seen the construction of a new bus station that operates more local and urban services, an upgrade of it's railway station to improve travel options across the country and potentially could see a regional coachway in the near future subject to resource availability	Noted
Page 18 in original draft: Can the data that reflects commuting patterns in and out of Hillingdon show what proportion of Hillingdon residents travel into Buckinghamshire for work and vice versa? This could help us determine if there is a need to consider sustainable transport options for travel between Hillingdon and Buckinghamshire (aside from the A40 Carousel bus service)	TfL has been approached with a request to advise
Page 21 in original draft: TfB accepts that whilst the challenge to address poor north-south transport links is a priority, any opportunities to enhance east-west cross border travel between Buckinghamshire and Hillingdon that offers significant benefits to both residents Hillingdon and Buckinghamshire residents should also be considered, especially in line with the A4020 scheme highlighted on page 35	Noted
Page 35 in original draft - Public transport improvements TfB Response: 3.21 - TfB will welcome any opportunities to enhance the public transport system for cross boundary travel to encourage modal change towards sustainable travel	Noted and welcomed
Page 41 in original draft - Improving the public realm TfB Response: 3.40 & 3.41 - TfB would like to see the plans for the proposed town centre improvement schemes (Legible London & District Centres) that have been proposed for Uxbridge, West Drayton, Ruislip Manor & Northwood Hills to see if/how they could adopted for town centres within Buckinghamshire	Details will be provided are being provided as requested
Page 60 in original draft - Figure 3.4 Congestion Hotspots TfB Response: TfB would like to know if there is any scope to involve TfB in solving the congestion hotspots that could be linked to cross boundary travel between Buckinghamshire and Hillingdon	Our main concern is to ease north-south traffic in the borough in line with the LDF Draft Core Strategy. We would welcome any suggestions you may have to address issues of concern to Buckinghamshire

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
Hayes Town Partnership - Comments	Officer Response
The HTP welcomes the high priority given to Hayes in the draft plan and believes that this is fully justified because of the pressing need to improve the local transport infrastructure and to maximise the economic benefits to the south of the Borough that will flow from the completion of Crossrail	Noted
The objectives of the plan are supported and the following are particularly relevant to Hayes Town: 1) Deliver better quality of life and improve air quality; 2) Promote healthy travel behaviour; 3) Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour; 4) Ensure the transport system enables all residents to access health, education, employment, social and leisure facilities; 5) Reduce Hillingdon's contribution to climate change	Noted
Local challenges and opportunities – north-south links: The draft plan rightly highlights the importance of addressing the poor north to south transport links in Hillingdon. The current road network is totally inadequate to cope with the existing levels of traffic as witnessed by the frequent congestion on the Hayes By-pass and the few other north-south roads. Traffic levels and congestion are bound to increase as a result of economic activity and the development of sites such as the former Southall Gas Works	Noted
It is clear that there is no prospect of any major changes to the road network and nor would there be any social or environmental justification for the disruption that would be involved. Therefore a radical improvement in public transport is the only feasible answer but it needs to be recognised that this is not just to cater for residents living in the north of the Borough travelling to work in the south. People who live in the south also need to travel to the north for family, social and leisure reasons and their needs should also be acknowledged in the document	LIP2 will explicitly acknowledge that people who live in the south need to travel to the north for family, social and leisure reasons
As well as improving north-south public transport there is a very strong case for improving transport interchange facilities to encourage the use of both buses and trains. This is especially relevant in Hayes Town. It is comparatively well served by a broad range of bus routes but the stopping arrangements are fragmented and they need to be rationalised as part of the redevelopment of the area around Hayes and Harlington Station if the opportunities offered by Crossrail are to be fully realized	The major scheme application for Hayes will ensure that transport interchange facilities will be addressed
Cycling and walking (pages 24 and 49/50) in	A supplementary Biking Borough bid has

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
<p>original draft: The potential importance of cycling and walking are referred to in the report and it is encouraging to see that long awaited schemes such as the improvement of the Grand Union Canal towpath are now being implemented. The Biking Borough Study is also welcomed. However at the present time the cycle network in and around Hayes Town remains disjointed and incomplete. There is a pressing need for a comprehensive approach to cycle route planning and related measures before there is any chance of persuading drivers to change transport modes on the sort of scale required</p>	<p>been submitted to TfL to follow up actions as suggested in the Biking Borough Study and the successful outcome of this bid was announced in May 2011. The Council will host the first Hillingdon Skyride in July 2011 which will be routed through Hayes</p>
<p>Area Travel Plan: Several years ago the Council carried out a comprehensive survey of all businesses in Hayes about their transport needs. This was a welcome initiative and it identified a willingness on the part of employers to work with the Council in addressing the existing traffic congestion and parking problems and achieving a shift from the use of cars to other modes. Positive interest was shown in a dialogue to help develop an Area Travel Plan for Hayes but this has not been followed through. In the Partnership's view an area-based approach involving local employers and other agencies is essential and this should be a key part of the Plan</p>	<p>Area-wide travel plan partnerships form an integral part of LIP2 and we are very interested in your suggestions on how best to proceed with developing and implementing the Area Travel Plan, possibly by following the Uxbridge Travel Plan Area Partnership led by Brunel University</p>
<p>Support for shopping centres and public realm improvements: The support for the Borough's shopping centres and the emphasis on improvements in the public realm are strongly endorsed by the Partnership. Both these issues are of particular relevance to Hayes Town</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The shopping centre has been under pressure for more than 20 years. It used to be at the heart of a thriving industrial area with EMI alone employing over 15000 people. The loss of factories in the 1980s with their replacement by warehouses meant that the numbers of jobs were reduced together with the footfall for the shopping centre. The building of out of town supermarkets and stores deprived Hayes of its main food suppliers and as a result the quality of the shopping offer deteriorated. Hayes is left with a limited range of shops. However it is important to stress that the shopping offer in Hayes does in many ways reflect the area it serves with families often on relatively low wages or benefits</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>In some respects the street scene in Hayes shows the difficult times that the Town has gone through with old and worn out paving from the</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
station along the whole of Station Road and down Coldharbour Lane	
A particularly controversial element of the street scene is the parking in the closed off part of Station Road. This was introduced as a compromise when the Council responded to complaints about the pedestrianisation of the Town Centre and decided to allow traffic to drive into but not through the shopping area. There are often disputes and near physical assaults and the proper management of these spaces needs to be reviewed as part of any improvement plan	Parking management in the closed off part of Station Road will be considered as part of the wider agenda being developed for Hayes
Hayes needs something to mark it out as different from other Town Centres. This could be some form of sculpture using the musical heritage of Hayes or an arch or other distinctive feature at the Coldharbour Lane or Station Road entrances to the Town. Involvement of the public in the choice would be a symbol of the willingness to engage the community in the improvement of the Town. In summary Hayes Town needs the following improvements: Re-laying of pavements and re-surfacing of roads; Street furniture replacement; Additional CCTV and improved street lighting where necessary; Shop front grant scheme; Review of traffic management and parking arrangements; Enhancement of car parks up to Park Mark standards; Increase in alley-gating schemes to reduce litter and dumping; Improved cycle parking facilities; Provision of street sculpture perhaps using the musical heritage of Hayes	The Council is keen to engage the community through working with the Hayes Town Partnership
Crossrail: The draft plan rightly recognises the vital importance of Crossrail to the future of Hayes Town. The Partnership sees it not only as a real benefit to the local area in terms of improved transport but also as a potential spur to the regeneration of the Town and the redevelopment of the area immediately to the north of the Station. Currently Hayes is rather fragmented with the station being isolated from the Town Centre itself. However the re-building scheme coupled with the almost completed housing and hotel development alongside the Grand Union Canal will give the opportunity to join the different elements together. It is therefore essential that the design of the station and its environs is seen as part of an integrated plan rather than a stand alone building	The area to the north of Hayes Station is currently subject to an urban design study being commissioned through Crossrail. The Hayes Town Partnership will be consulted in due course
The Partnership believes that this would present an opportunity to radically improve the bus/rail interchange facilities to get the maximum benefit out of Crossrail and also as part of a travel plan	Bus/rail interchange facilities will form part of the urban design study mentioned above

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
<p>that aims to strongly support and encourage the use of public transport. The area in front of the lower station building gives us the chance to achieve that objective and also to create a vibrant public space that will benefit the whole Town</p>	
<p>It is likely that these ideas can only be achieved by demolishing the blocks of shops and offices that make up what is known as the triangle and run from the booking office on the Station Road bridge down to the access road to the station itself. Since the buildings are rather dated and unsightly their removal and replacement would be a positive improvement to the urban scene. We have been in discussion with Crossrail about these ideas and we welcome the fact that they have commissioned consultants to carry out an urban design study of the whole area around the Station and that this is also being supported by the Council. There are currently some unresolved concerns including whether the whole of the triangle site will be redeveloped or whether the lower end will be left standing like a proverbial saw thumb. The future of the Station building is also in doubt and we have made it clear to Crossrail that this is seen by local people as one of the few remaining structures of historic interest in the Town. For all these reasons there is an overwhelming need for a comprehensive strategy for the area which involves the Council, Crossrail, Network Rail, First Group and Transport for London. The Partnership will be pleased to be part of that dialogue</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Grand Union Canal: The draft plan acknowledges the importance of the Grand Union Canal as a walking and cycling route but there is insufficient reference to its roles in terms of freight or town centre regeneration. The various attempts to use London's canals for the carrying of freight have had limited success but that should not prevent continuing efforts to exploit their potential especially for heavy loads which need to be transported on a regular basis. Any chance to avoid more heavy lorries on the locally congested roads should therefore be pursued enthusiastically</p>	<p>Waterborne freight is mentioned explicitly in the LIP2 final document. Waste by Water appears to provide potential provided the waste plant and processing facilities are located by the canal. One of the two waste sites identified in the Draft West London Strategy, currently at consultation, is located both within the borough and along the canal</p>
<p>The draft West London Waste Plan offers a real opportunity to explore this possibility in further detail. The Plan identifies access to navigable waterways and canals as one of the key criteria in the assessment of sites. Three of the 15 possible sites which are under consideration are in the Hayes Town area and two of these are</p>	<p>It is suggested to await the outcome of the West London Waste Strategy before considering freight by water initiatives further in 2012</p>

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
close to the Canal. It is therefore considered that this issue should be highlighted in the Local Implementation Plan	
The Canal through Hayes Town is an under-used asset. Walking across Station Road bridge the canal can hardly be seen because of the high brick parapets and passing through on a boat you would hardly know there was a Hayes	A scheme is being prepared at Western View for implementation in 2011/12 to improve visibility between the canal and land sides in Hayes
Even those who are aware of the canal are reluctant to use the towpath because it is isolated and not overlooked. Until recently it was a favourite haunt of street drinkers and although many of these have now been helped by the Alcohol Engagement Project the towpath is still mostly deserted except for an occasional dog-walker or cyclist and its use as a night time loo	The whole length of the Grand Union Canal towpath is subject to an upgrade, especially the section between Oxford Road and the Ealing borough boundary. The voluntary sector including the Hayes Town Partnership is encouraged to increase surveillance and improve the ambience of the canal environment
Experience from other parts of the county show that things could be so much better. Led by Birmingham the last 20 or more years have seen town centres transformed by opening up the canals to create vibrant water fronts. Old and worn out buildings have been replaced with modern well designed schemes that include places for people to live or work. Local heritage has been retained and old canal structures restored so that they add to the amenity. Most of all people have found good reasons to use, see and experience the canal frontage so that feelings of safety and community have been enhanced. All this could happen in Hayes, given the right vision, good planning and the necessary resources	It is hoped that the initiatives outlined above will lead to the right vision and good planning
For all these reasons the Local Implementation Plan needs to recognise that the town centre regeneration potential of the Canal complements what is said about the use of the towpath for walking and cycling. In particular the opening up of the Station Road bridge over the canal could be a catalyst for transforming the centre of Hayes	Noted
North Uxbridge Residents' Association Comments	Officer Response
We have already raised with Bob Castelijns the possibility of 'streamlining' the A10 'Bus Route' - so that not every journey has to 'trundle round' Stockley Park	Potential is being explored to improve direct bus services between Uxbridge and Heathrow, including promotion of the existing direct services 724, A30 and A40
The Swakeleys roundabout in North Uxbridge is a congestion black spot. In the morning rush hours, traffic queues regularly stretch back for up to a mile along Swakeleys Road and Breakspear Road South. This has a crippling effect on the social and economic life of Uxbridge and the environment	LB Hillingdon and TfL are working together on a project to smooth traffic along the A40. It is currently being investigated to what extent the opportunity can be used to rationalise the operation in the Swakeleys Roundabout area, reduce journey times and maximise reliability on north-south trips

Consultee/ Comments on the Draft LIP	Officer Response
Hillingdon Alliance of Residents Associations Comments	Officer Response
HARA represents South Ruislip, Ruislip, Eastcote, Northwood, Northwood Hills, Harefield, Home Farm, Grange, Ickenham, Oak Farm, Tudor Way, Yiewsley, Garden City Estate, North Uxbridge and Vine Lane and applaud on the whole the Local Implementation Plan	Noted
Members are hopeful that an interchange can be built between the Metropolitan and Central Lines	TfL assessed business cases one for diverting the Central Line Diversion to Uxbridge and one for moving West Ruislip station approximately 500m south to provide interchange between the Central line (running on a north-south axis) and the Metropolitan and Piccadilly lines (running on a west-east axis) is proving. The Cost Benefit Ratio is not proving viable for any of the options
Would like to see the 331 bus-route to be made into a circular route taking Northwood Hills, West Ruislip and Hillingdon Stations	The suggestion has been passed on to TfL Network Planning for further consideration
Would like to see a north south bus route, connecting Mount Vernon with the south of the Borough and taking in Long Lane	The Council is in the process of negotiating north-south bus services with TfL, bus operators and potential fund providers. TfL's current stance is that any new bus service has to be resolved so that its overall cost reduces. New north-south bus services will almost certainly involve reduction to other bus services which requires consideration of numerous issues and interests
The provision of cycle tracks should be continued and enhanced. Cyclists would be encouraged to use them if the tracks were designed with fewer interruptions	A supplementary Biking Borough Bid has been submitted to TfL's to increase cycling levels, achieve a step change, embed cycling in local priorities and activities, and to develop effective partnership working and share best practice amongst Biking Boroughs and more widely
The impact on local traffic on the developments at RAF Uxbridge and Ickenham Park are causing concern, exacerbating congestion on roads which are already very busy. Also of concern are any potential plans for the Master Brewer site at Hillingdon Circus that may indeed lead to more local traffic congestion along an already busy stretch of Long Lane. Any form of traffic control or enhancement along Long Lane needs to be carefully planned, any consideration given to the opinions of local residents and motorists	Transport impact associated with developments such as RAF Uxbridge and Ickenham Park are subject to careful consideration in advance of planning consents being granted. It is generally accepted that sustainable transport solutions have to be developed in order to accommodate demand for transport whilst reducing congestion to an absolute minimum. LIP contains a range of proposals which could lead to a change of transport mode reducing congestion especially on roads which are already very busy