

Wandsworth Council's Third LIP - Appendix 1

Summary of Consultation Feedback

1: Online Questionnaire

There were 26 responses to the online questionnaire as follows. More detailed comments received in the questionnaire are included in the following Table A1.

In what capacity are you responding to this consultation? (answered by 26 respondents)		
<i>NB Respondents were able to select more than one option, so percentages add up to more than 100.</i>		
Response	Number of respondents to this question	Percentage of respondents to this question
I live in the local area	20	76.9%
I work/study in the local area	5	19.2%
I am a visitor to the local area	1	3.8%
I am a member of a local group or organisation	6	23.1%
I am responding on behalf of a statutory consultee	0	0.0%
Other	1	3.8%

To what extent do you support or oppose the objectives of the LIP? (answered by 26 respondents)		
Response	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Fully support	5	19.2%
Tend to support	10	38.5%
Neither support nor oppose	4	15.4%
Tend to oppose	5	19.2%
Fully oppose	2	7.7%
Don't know	0	0.0%

To what extent do you support or oppose the delivery plan? (answered by 26 respondents)		
Response	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Fully support	5	19.2%
Tend to support	7	26.9%
Neither support nor oppose	5	19.2%
Tend to oppose	4	15.4%
Fully oppose	5	19.2%
Don't know	0	0.0%

In relation to this consultation, is there anything we have not considered that may have a negative impact on you or the local community? (answered by 20 respondents)

Response	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Yes	14	70.0%
No	6	30.0%

Are you: (answered by 24 respondents)

Response	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Male	16	66.7%
Female	6	25.0%
Prefer not to say	2	8.3%

What was your age last birthday? (answered by 23 respondents)

Response	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
19 and under	0	0.0%
20-24	0	0.0%
25-34	1	4.3%
35-44	3	13.0%
45-54	5	21.7%
55-64	6	26.1%
65-74	5	21.7%
75+	1	4.3%
Prefer not to say	2	8.7%

Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (answered by 23 respondents)

Response	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Yes	0	0.0%
No	20	87.0%
Prefer not to say	3	13.0%

How would you describe your ethnic group? (answered by 22 respondents)

Response	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
White	14	63.6%
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups	1	4.5%
Asian or Asian British	1	4.5%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	0	0.0%
Prefer not to say	5	22.7%
Any other ethnic group	1	4.5%

Please indicate your sexual orientation: (answered by 21 respondents)

Response	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Heterosexual / straight	13	61.9%
Gay man	1	4.8%
Gay woman / lesbian	0	0.0%
Bisexual	1	4.8%
Prefer not to say	4	19.0%
Prefer to self-describe	2	9.5%

Do you belong to a religion or faith group? (answered by 22 respondents)

Response	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
No	7	31.8%
Yes, Christian	6	27.3%
Yes, Buddhist	0	0.0%
Yes, Hindu	0	0.0%
Yes, Jewish	0	0.0%
Yes, Muslim	1	4.5%
Yes, Sikh,	1	4.5%
Prefer not to say	7	31.8%
Yes, other (please specify):	0	0.0%

2: Text Responses to Draft LIP

Table A1 below includes responses to the consultation draft LIP and an indication of where these have led to changes in the Final LIP.

- Consultees 1-9 provided comments directly on the Council website in response to a press release¹
- Consultees 10-14 provided comments by email
- Consultees 15-40 provided comments as part of their response to the online questionnaire.

Some comments have been anonymised due to data protection.

¹

http://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/news/article/14837/consultation_on_council_initiatives_to_support_mayor_s_transport_priorities

Table A1: Text Responses to Consultation and Proposed Changes to Draft LIP

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
1	1a	Philip Bradley	It would be very helpful if the 84 page document which this article links to had a Table Of Contents. The Table of Contents page does say "To be added for consultation". Oops.	Contents table was included in consultation document. Link was to a committee paper rather than the actual document.	None
2	2a	Len James	It's about time Wandsworth council started spending money on structures they are responsible for like painting Wandsworth bridge and renew the decorative lighting on the bridge plus renew the pavements. Instead of spending money on Bellevue road off Trinity road that has had more money spent on it than Wandsworth bridge has ever seen	Noted. In general terms bridge maintenance and footway repairs are already referred to in the draft LIP, e.g. Wandsworth Bridge corrosion protection (3.4.7) and footway repairs (3.4.8).	None
3	3a	Michael Leigh	The objectives and initiatives are very laudable but unless rigorous action is taken by the Mayor and the London Boroughs to reduce car/vehicle travel into London, and within London, their impact will remain limited and air quality will remain poor.	Noted.	Additional text on car dependency and its impacts added in the "Challenges and Opportunities" section
4	4a	LizzieAnne	One thing the UK can't accept is that we are over populated. Wandsworth keeps building more housing - and folk need to travel around - to works & so on - so obviously there is going to be more privately owned vehicles. Ordering on line - all the supermarkets have their delivery vans - retail have their own delivery system - all creating a massive increase in transport. Taxis, Addison Lee. Uber - an increase in all. Roads in Wandsworth are the same as when I went to school in the 50s/60s - with absolutely no road improvement. As for cutting the Number 19 bus service - our mayor really is a nobby.	As detailed in the LIP, Wandsworth has seen a downward trend in vehicle ownership and vehicle kilometres in recent years, alongside growth in population, so the assertion that more homes will inevitably result in more vehicles is not borne out by the evidence. Taxis, private hire and buses are all regulated by or managed by the Mayor/TfL. The draft LIP already includes reference to freight/deliveries, and to working with TfL on bus route planning (e.g. Objective MTS 5b), but there is scope to add text relating to taxis and private hire.	Add text on the role of taxis and private hire to the new section on car dependency in the "Challenges and Opportunities" section
5	5a	A (1)	1. Please can any new footbridges over the Thames be weather protected? It's grim crossing these bridges in the winter at night with wind and rain whipping up the river. Plenty of examples on the internet e.g. in Canada. Why do we have to suffer? 2. Could those 'Big Buses' pick up passengers, say at Clapham Junction only, on their way into central London. Use sat Nav tracking.	Comment is a design issue for new bridges rather than a matter for the LIP. Passenger bus services are regulated by TfL. Tourist buses are not passenger services, so this would not be permitted.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
6	6a	Paul C Miller	I have some concerns ref the proposed toxicity charge routes for outside central London, the route cuts off the access route to the Wandsworth council tip on Smugglers way, as it is on the inside zone of the proposed area boundary.... which means that every time a Wandsworth borough residents wants to use the tip it will be charged for entering the zone.... I would like a response to my email.	Comments noted; these refer to the planned ULEZ rather than the LIP itself. The Council is aware of issues such as this and will work with TfL to address them before the ULEZ is introduced. No response email was possible as the consultee did not provide contact details.	None
7	7a	Mark Grant	This us all good but you still fail to deal with the appalling flyboarding, the flagrant dismissal of the law, the dreadful huge commercial signs that hang threatening over our heads that have been there for so long they are rotting. Our Borough is blighted by these arrogant Estate agents. Banning them from a couple of roads is a travesty as to what should be done by these agents BAN THEN NOW We ALL loath them	This is a planning matter and not an issue for the LIP.	None
8	8a	Lynne Treanor	any visit to the Wandsworth council tip on Smugglers Way will attract the extra congestion charge - I predict a massive increase in fly tipping across the borough.	See comment on ref 6a.	None
9	9a	A (2)	Please paint Wandsworth Bridge green (like the refurbished Battersea railway bridge).	See comment on ref 2a.	None
10	10a	Battersea Society	We have set out our response in narrative form linked, first, to key issues set out from the Business Plan 2018, second in relation to the Active Wandsworth Strategy and lastly in relation to specific proposals. Where no issue is included this means we are supportive or have no comment to make. Our comments are preceded by a relevant extract from the Council's draft document. Overall we are supportive of the focus of these key issues and assume they are not set out in order of priority.	Noted	None
10	10b	Battersea Society	We are appending our response to the 2010 draft LIP because first, the section criticising the state of Clapham Junction station is still relevant and second because there are issues identified there which remain unresolved. One such instance is the congestion at the junction between Battersea Bridge Road and Battersea Church Road which remains a problem, only likely to increase as new buildings are occupied and not, as far as we can see, mentioned in this draft. Our response to the Mayor's Draft Transport Strategy is accessible via the Battersea Society's website and was sent to WBC at the time it was submitted. (Response to draft 2nd LIP included)	Noted. Draft LIP includes working with train companies to improve services and stations, e.g. Objectives MTS 5a and MTS 6a. Battersea Church Road is mentioned in the draft LIP in relation to bus delay, and schemes and options can be considered in future iterations of the Delivery Plan and/or TfL bus priority funding in support of Objective MTS7.	None.

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
10	10c	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work up design options for a Nine Elms Pimlico pedestrian and cycle crossing <p>We have already called for updated analysis of the need for this bridge in parallel to current design work. It is disappointing that WBC appears to be working in opposition to Westminster Council and its residents. Work on this scheme should not be to the detriment of the Cremorne Road/Golden Jubilee bridge which is our priority.</p>	Comment relates to a summary of the Council's Corporate Business Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies. Inclusion of these bridges in this part of the LIP is not on an either/or basis. Both are aspirations of the Council.	None
10	10d	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help progress implementation of the Northern Line Extension to Battersea. <p>Delay to opening needs to be reflected in increased bus services between Vauxhall and Battersea Park Station/Queenstown Road over next two years as development in Nine Elms come on line</p>	Comment relates to a summary of the Council's Corporate Business Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies. However it is understood the NLE is now likely to open in 2021. TfL is responsible for bus route planning and the Council aims to work with TfL on bus capacity issues as per Objective MTS 5b.	Text can be added to 2.2.12 relating to the NLE opening date and implications for public transport in the interim
10	10e	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the actions set out in the Air Quality Action Plan (see below) • Raise awareness of the impact of vehicle idling and use vehicle idling powers where appropriate (12.5). <p>Action is needed to control and limit pollution arising from static vehicles with running engines including 'resting' minicab/Uber drivers, school sports coaches in Battersea Park, outside the Latchmere Leisure Centre and other centres and mail order/on-line delivery vehicles. Delivery vehicles clog residential areas at all hours causing both air and noise pollution. The behaviour of these anti-social drivers reduces environmental quality for pedestrians and cyclists and acts as a further disincentive to walking or cycling along certain routes.</p>	Comment relates to a summary of the Council's Corporate Business Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies. Vehicle idling powers include potential for action against the types of behaviours listed.	None
10	10f	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with Network Rail and other partners to expand capacity at local stations, and seek improved access to stations. <p>Clapham Junction remains a disgrace and the appendix contains the comments we made at the time of the 2010 LIP. We would wish to see a detailed and timed proposal for improvements to the station. Likewise stair/lift access at Battersea Park station needs to be urgently addressed as current stairs are unsafe.</p>	Draft LIP includes working with train companies to improve services and stations, e.g. Objectives MTS 5a and MTS 6a	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
10	10g	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with key stakeholders to bring forward major infrastructure projects at Clapham Junction station including Crossrail 2, South London Heathrow Link and additional capacity on Gatwick line. <p>Realistic assessments are needed as to time scales for these mega projects and sensible ‘meantime’ planning undertaken so that the long term planning is not used as a justification for doing nothing to limit deterioration of existing travel and transport conditions. We are concerned that safeguarding the Bramlands area may lead to lack of action for many years to come, to the detriment of the overall Winstanley development.</p>	Comment relates to a summary of the Council's Corporate Business Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies. Draft LIP includes working with train companies to improve services and stations, e.g. Objectives MTS 5a and MTS 6a	None
10	10h	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with TfL to ensure that areas with significant regeneration are adequately served by the London Bus network <p>We strongly endorse this. See comment above on delay of the NLE and the Battersea Society's responses to the proposal to withdraw the 19 bus.</p>	Noted	See changes under ref 10d.
10	10i	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with partners to promote the Diamond Jubilee cycle and footbridge. <p>This is a priority given the quantity of new building proposed/approved for the York Road/Lombard Road area. We look forward to reading the forthcoming report on the progress of work on this bridge.</p>	Noted.	None
10	10j	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with TfL to bring forward proposals for the borough's town centres <p>Some years ago the Battersea Society put forward proposals to improve bus/rail interchange at Clapham Junction. At the time we were courteously received and told that proposals for a feasibility study would be put forward. We do not know to what extent the lack of any action was due to Wandsworth Council, TfL or some combination of the two. Again, some timescales are needed.</p>	Comment relates to a summary of the Council's Corporate Business Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies.	None
10	10k	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appoint a “healthy streets” champion that works to help reduce street clutter and create new pocket parks, as part of a total safety approach. <p>We endorse this suggestion but the champion needs to have clout to influence decisions on routes around and through large new developments both to influence decisions at the planning stage and then to avoid developers drastically changing layouts at later phases of the development through reserved matters applications.</p>	Comment relates to a summary of the Council's Corporate Business Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies. The LIP does include adoption of the Healthy Streets approach in full.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
10	10l	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue the introduction of electric vehicle charging points across the borough to facilitate and encourage the take up of electric vehicles. <p>We support this but electric charging points should be in parking laybys or on the road at the kerbside rather than on pavements. The use of lampposts as charging points has merit.</p>	<p>Comment relates to a summary of the Council's Corporate Business Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies. See also comment on 11i.</p>	See changes under ref 11i.
10	10m	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Install speed warning devices where residents request enhanced enforcement measures and invest in equipment to support community speed-watch <p>Introducing 20 MPH limits is a positive measure but will only have effect if active monitoring and well publicised prosecutions are brought for speeding. Speed humps and nick points do not deter van drivers or motor cyclists from driving at higher speeds and may cause added pollution and noise as vehicles slow and then accelerate. Some road users overtake those slowing at each hump/nick point (e.g. in Prince of Wales Drive, Nightingale Lane). Enforcement action should be taken where by-roads subject to speed control are used for rat-runs in order to deter such rat-running</p>	<p>Comment relates to a summary of the Council's Corporate Business Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies.</p> <p>Objective MTS 2b includes working with the Police to support the 20mph limit; this includes enforcement options.</p>	None
10	10n	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry out additional road and pavements repairs and renewal programme following the extreme winter weather. <p>We support this but are concerned at the lack of traditional work in conservation areas as distinct from short term fixes which act to the detriment of the area and then leads to the need for repair sooner than if traditional materials had been used. The Latchmere Estate is a notable example of this with increased use of tarmac and pavers.</p>	<p>Comment relates to a summary of the Council's Corporate Business Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
10	10o	Battersea Society	<p>The Active Wandsworth Strategy 2017-2022</p> <p>This includes a number of transport-related objectives, mainly around active travel (walking and cycling) which is a key theme of the Healthy Streets concept that runs through the MTS and this LIP.</p> <p>Walking and cycling should not be linked so casually. While we support safer cycling this should never be through undifferentiated shared cycling and walking pathways.</p> <p>There are frequent cases of cyclists on the footway, even when there are cycle sections on the roadway. Along the river path there is no attempt either to enforce the cycling restriction or to accept that shared use is inevitable and mark separate sections for cycling and walking.</p>	<p>Comment relates to a summary of the Active Wandsworth Strategy. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies.</p> <p>Walking and cycling are not linked casually, the words "walking and cycling" have merely been used to describe the term "Active Travel". Objectives and schemes in the LIP make a distinction between the different modes.</p>	None
10	10p	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P2.1: Normalise cycling as an everyday choice, increasing the cycling modal share and advocating greater prioritisation of physically active modes of travel (walking, cycling and using public transport). <p>We agree but see comment above and under F2.6 below)</p>	Noted	None
10	10q	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F2.6 Influence the shaping of the built and natural environment in regeneration schemes and major developments so that being active becomes the default choice. <p>This is a worthy objective but in spite of Battersea Society's repeated pleas pavements around new developments are all too often narrow and close to major highways and provide little incentive to walk rather than drive locally. Examples include Queenstown Road/Battersea Park Road south junction, the Linden Homes development in York Road, Culvert Road, parts of Nine Elms and many others.</p>	<p>Comment relates to a summary of the Active Wandsworth Strategy. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies.</p> <p>Transport requirements for new developments are addressed via the Local Plan and are referred to in LIP Objective MTS 8.</p>	None
10	10r	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F3.1 Influence the built environment and streetscape infrastructure to encourage active travel for pedestrians and cyclists, making roads safer and welcoming, less busy and accessible for those that haven't previously considered active travel options. <p>It is essential that separate space is provided/indicated for cyclists and pedestrians. More should be done to enforce good conduct by cyclists. While there may not be many critical accidents to pedestrians, the frightening effect of cyclists on pedestrians must be a deterrent to walking.</p>	see comment on 10o	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
10	10s	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F3.2 Influence the way places in the borough are connected for pedestrians and cyclists, encouraging more river walkways to be opened up. <p>See comments above.</p>	see comment on 10o	None
10	10t	Battersea Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F3.3 Promote the River Thames and the River Wandle as places for physical activity opportunities in the borough. <p>Agree but point re cyclists versus pedestrians is highly relevant here as high speed cyclists along Thames Path detract from safety and enjoyment of pedestrians and younger children.</p>	see comment on 10o	None
10	10u	Battersea Society	<p>Improve and increase driver awareness of cyclists in the borough.</p> <p>Improve and increase cyclist's awareness of pedestrians in the borough</p>	see comment on 10o	None
10	10v	Battersea Society	<p>2.2.26. As we have so often said, a high PTAL is no indicator of there being capacity on the public transport to which residents have access. Currently each development is assessed individually rather than any public attempt being made to assess the cumulative impact on public transport. We can see no indication that capacity now or in the future is used to judge the viability of schemes within any area, specifically York Road/Lombard Road.</p>	Comment relates to a summary of the Council's Local Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies. While PTALs have their weaknesses, they are used in the current London Plan and draft replacement London Plan.	None.
10	10w	Battersea Society	<p>2.3.10. Across the borough, rail and tube services will need to offer more capacity and better reliability. For many people, bus services will be the most affordable and most convenient travel option, but to attract more passengers improvements to the network will be required.</p> <p>We endorse this. There is a significant lack of bus provision from Vauxhall west of Battersea Park Station with only the 344 running this route. Bus provision from York Road through to Battersea Bridge and beyond is totally inadequate for existing users let alone the many new residents.</p>	Noted. Objective MTS 5b refers to working with TfL to ensure bus capacity is at the level required.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
10	10x	Battersea Society	<p>2.3.13. One of the main challenges in delivering the mode share target will be managing competing demands on the street. For example, providing more safe space for cycling could, without careful design, conflict with the desire to create a better environment for walking. Giving pedestrians more time at crossings could delay buses, making them less attractive. There are also potential conflicts with other modes, including freight and deliveries which often require access across footpaths or loading at kerbsides that might otherwise offer bus or cycle priority.</p> <p>We are delighted to see this acknowledgement of the competing needs of walkers and cyclists.</p>	Noted.	None
10	10y	Battersea Society	<p>2.4.24. Space available for car parking has an obvious influence on how many vehicles can be parked – and owned – by residents. Around two thirds of the borough is covered by 15 CPZs, which are kept under review. Requests for new or extended zones, or changes to operational hours, are subject to local consultation. Experience suggests that areas without a CPZ such as Culvert Road/Dagnall Street are used by commuters. It was notable that until, with the help of councillors and the MP, the Latchmere Estate became a cpz all parking space was filled early in the morning with the roads featuring on parking websites.</p>	Noted. Objectives under MTS Outcome 3 include the role of parking policy and CPZs.	None
10	10z	Battersea Society	<p>2.4.39. In the long term, concentrating new developments in areas with high Public Transport Access Levels (PTALs) will assist, but overall the main responsibilities for delivering public transport service improvements to encourage greater ridership rests with TfL and the train companies</p> <p>See above. Current PTAL measures are no longer fit for purpose and it is disappointing to see no acknowledgement of this.</p>	While PTALs have their weaknesses, they are used in the current London Plan and draft replacement London Plan.	None
10	10za	Battersea Society	<p>MTS7 Improve bus speeds through traffic management (e.g. bus priority, parking/loading controls) at key locations (corridors/junctions) where buses are delayed the most.</p> <p>It is quite ludicrous that there is public parking on major roads such as Battersea Park Road. Parking restrictions should be maintained TfL must reassess their willingness to allow parking on their red routes which, by definition, should set buses and through traffic as the priority. Another regrettable instance is the removal of parking restrictions on the major route of Lavender Hill/St. John's Hill on a Sunday, a heavy shopping day.</p>	Objective MTS7 in the draft LIP includes scope for using parking controls to improve bus speeds. Battersea Park Road is on the TLRN and as such it is not within the Council's control to change parking on this road.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
10	10zb	Battersea Society	<p>2.4.55. The Council will support higher density developments in areas of high public transport accessibility. The Local Plan includes maximum car parking standards and minimum cycle parking standards. These standards will be reviewed in line with the new London Plan when finalised, and will be applied to all new proposed developments in the borough. Planning applications for new developments above set thresholds are required to include a comprehensive Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, along with information on deliveries and servicing. New developments will also include provision for electric vehicle charging where appropriate, to ensure that journeys that need to be made in vehicles can be done so in the least polluting way.</p> <p>This is completely meaningless unless there is the road space and transport capacity – see above.</p>	Local plan policies and the LIP - including targets for traffic reduction and mode shift - aim to ensure development is sustainable and generated trips can be accommodated.	None
10	10zc	Battersea Society	The society appended comments on the second LIP consultation.	Noted.	None
11	11a	Wandsworth Living Streets	<p>Objectives General - Tend to support</p> <p>While the objectives are broadly commendable in themselves, we note that they are rather vague (and not SMART), they lack ambition, and in some cases are a repetition of objectives given in LIP 2 (for example, MS1 and MS2 on 'facilitate' active travel modes). Whilst open spaces can assist with creating active travel networks, we wonder whether the reference to these in MS2 reflects a reluctance on the part of Wandsworth Council to reallocate carriageway space on roads to cycling. The 'mode share' objectives are particularly crucial since they are fundamental to the MTS, but it is not clear from the LIP how we would know that we have met them.</p>	More specificity can be added to some objectives, as well as the inclusion of interim milestones.	Review objectives to make them more specific and add interim milestones to targets.

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
11	11b	Wandsworth Living Streets	<p>On MTS Outcome 1, 'Active', MTS1a, we think that 'considering' Healthy Streets indicators is weak. The use of Healthy Streets indicators should be an integral part of all current and planned schemes. It is our impression that MTS1b needs more fundamental review, given the stagnating mode share of cycling in the borough (see for example Table 2, WBC paper 18-405 and Section 6, WBC paper 17-183). We recommend that MTS1c be strengthened – it is not enough to 'limit' volumes and speeds of motor traffic in residential areas; these need to be reduced.</p> <p>We suggest the addition of a further Objective, to review relevant 'streets related' policies to ensure that they fully support mode shift to active travel modes and Healthy Streets. Wandsworth Council policies currently favour car (and motorbike) use, including car parking, as the default, suppressing mode shift to walking and cycling and the creation of residential streets which provide a range of amenities for local people.</p>	<p>Disagree re MTS1a. The full objective states that Healthy Streets Approach will be adopted. More detail will be added to MTS1b regarding the cycling strategy. Disagree re wording of MTS1c, though more specificity will be added to the text of this objective.</p> <p>No additional objectives are considered necessary here to further accentuate the LIP's aim for mode shift - see for example objectives MS1-MS10 and the mode share targets.</p>	Add more detail/specificity to MTS1b and MTS1c.
11	11c	Wandsworth Living Streets	<p>On MTS Outcome 2, 'Safe', we think that more is needed to ensure that streets are made safe and – crucially - feel safe for people using active travel modes. Although the LIP acknowledges a continuing failure to reduce road danger (reflected in the growing proportion of people not in cars who are being killed and seriously injured on roads in Wandsworth), there is no reference to the most recent pedestrian casualty data for Wandsworth, which shows an alarming 22% increase from 2016 to 2017. Pedestrians are the only road user group in Wandsworth to show such a dramatic increase in casualties; we suggest that this should trigger a fundamental review of causes (and causes of causes), with a view to more effectively reducing road danger at source, for the benefit of residents and visitors to the borough. In particular, we think the LIP should highlight the role of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (for more information please see https://londonlivingstreets.com/low-traffic-liveable-neighbourhoods/) in helping to reduce road danger on residential streets, which form the majority of roads in Wandsworth road network. MTS2a although welcome, given the disproportionate danger that HGVs present to other road users, does not cover the much greater overall danger presented by people driving. We suggest that MTS2a and 2b would benefit from a wider range of measures to ensure delivery e.g. use of Intelligent Speed Adaptation in the Council's procurement via council and council-contracted vehicles, a requirement for ISA to be incorporated in car club vehicles, asking TfL to prioritise the roll out of bus ISA on bus routes operating in the borough.</p>	<p>Disagree that the Council has failed in this regard; there have been significant reductions in KSI casualties as indicated in Figure 13 of the draft LIP. 2017 casualty data was not available at the time the draft LIP was written; however it is incorrect to assert that there was a large increase in KSIs in 2017, as there were changes to the methodology for collecting and recording road casualty data. Comparative backcast data will be included in the final LIP. MTS2a does include all vehicles ("...reduction of danger from vehicles...") so no additional clarification needed. Speed related objectives covered by MTS 2b and MTS 1c.</p>	See change under ref 14m

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
11	11d	Wandsworth Living Streets	Wrt MTS Outcome 3, 'Efficient', we think that the objectives should more strongly reflect the fact that private cars are an inefficient use of highway space. Whilst the council's planning policy cited in 2.4.22 (relating to requiring new developments to be car-free) is welcome, this will only cover a small minority of the borough's area. Much more focus is needed on 'retrofitting' - to make better use of public space, by reducing use of cars (parked and moving) and by reallocating road space to cycleways, cycle parking and parklets. Measures such as road user charging and the introduction of a workplace parking levy – not mentioned in the LIP - could both reduce car use and generate funding for use in supporting and encouraging more space-efficient and sustainable modes. We therefore recommend that Wandsworth Council carries out feasibility studies into RUC and WPL.	Noted. LIP includes traffic reduction and it is implicit throughout the LIP (e.g. objectives MS 1 and MS 2) that space-efficient modes will be supported. Objective MS 9 refers to the use of technology and innovation to reduce private motorised traffic. While there are no current plans for local road user charging or a workplace parking levy, they could be considered in the future under this objective.	None
11	11e	Wandsworth Living Streets	Wrt MTS Outcome 4, 'Clean and Green', MTS4c could entail the creation of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods to physically prevent rat-running through boundary street networks. The arrival of ULEZ represents a major opportunity to reclaim local streets for people, a measure which has proved popular in the past e.g. in local streets west of Putney Exchange. Whilst electric vehicles have zero tailpipe emissions, they have all the other drawbacks of motor vehicles, without the health benefits of increased physical activity via active travel. We are concerned about the effects of MTS4d (expansion of EV charging points) on active travel modes, particularly pedestrians. It is clearly perverse for Wandsworth Council to continue to reallocate space from pedestrians to users of electric cars in the borough. We would like this objective to be qualified to require provision of charging points either off road or on footway build-outs, as has been done in other London boroughs. We recommend further that the Council investigate the feasibility of installing public electric bicycle charging points on carriageway and in off-road locations.	Comments noted.	None
11	11f	Wandsworth Living Streets	Wrt MTS Outcome 6, 'Accessible', we agree that this is an important set of objectives in enabling sustainable travel modes by everyone in the borough. We suggest that it is not only public transport operators who could assist in improving provision of public transport information to users (MTS6c); given the free availability of real-time information such as Bus Countdown, other organisations e.g. health centres, hospitals, cafes and other public places could be invited to host a screen giving such information. This is the norm elsewhere and can be seen even in other UK cities such as Coventry. We agree that there is scope for improving interchange between public transport modes; Earlsfield station is one example of a station where interchange from buses (travelling southbound) seems unnecessarily difficult for people walking, requiring often lengthy waits at side road crossings.	Noted, MTS 6c can be revised to reflect the potential role of third parties in disseminating public transport information. Specific interchange improvements to be brought forward in schemes in the Delivery Plan and future Annual Spending Submissions	Revise text of MTS 6c to reflect the potential role of third parties in disseminating public transport information.

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
11	11g	Wandsworth Living Streets	We agree that, given the considerable development planned and underway in the borough, there is considerable scope for 'locking in' healthy travel modes as part of new developments (MTS8 – Sustainable Growth, MTS9 - Unlocking), we think that these objectives should be modified to ensure that associated streetworks, which may take years to complete, do not in the interim worsen conditions for people walking and cycling. There are numerous examples across the borough where walking and cycling infrastructure, including routes, has been and continues to be, disrupted, with little apparent consideration of the discouraging effects that such measures have on active travel, and particularly on mobility impaired people. This point cross-references to Objectives listed under MTS6, 'Accessible'.	Additional text can be added to Objective MTS 8 relating to the need to provide for active travel during construction and not just at the completed development.	Revise text of Objective MTS 8 relating to the need to provide for active travel during construction and not just at the completed development.
11	11h	Wandsworth Living Streets	Tend to support / Neither support nor oppose We highlight some comments on specific delivery elements below.	Noted	None
11	11i	Wandsworth Living Streets	We are concerned that the current programme to remove footway space and reallocate it to motorists is currently and will, if continued, worsen conditions for people walking. As well as its practical effect, this measure sends a clear message that driving is prioritised over walking, a clear conflict with the Healthy Streets approach underpinning the Mayor's Transport Strategy.	Disagree that the Council's commitment to providing for a switch from petrol and diesel vehicles to electric is detrimental to people walking. Better air quality will benefit everybody and make the borough's streets and public spaces more pleasant places to be. Both the Equalities Impact Assessment and SEA have highlighted specific issues in relation to the design and placement of charging infrastructure, which will be considered at the implementation stage.	Add text relating to the EQIA and SEA and the need for appropriate design and placement of charging infrastructure.
11	11j	Wandsworth Living Streets	We welcome provision to upgrade public transport provision in this area. We emphasise the need to prioritise active travel modes over private motor traffic in Nine Elms Lane area, in order to ensure that multimodal journeys can be undertaken 'seamlessly' and thus compete effectively with driving.	Noted. Nine Elms Lane is part of the Transport for London Road Network.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
11	11k	Wandsworth Living Streets	We welcome complementary works to improve interchanges at East Putney and Southfields. We note however that the Southfields scheme has been designed to worsen provision for commuter cycle parking, and that cycling access to the station has an unresolved 'critical fail'.	The scheme has been designed to improve the experience for both pedestrians and cyclists visiting Southfields town centre. The aim is to encourage more people to cycle by integrating cycling facilities into the existing road layout and increasing the amount of cycle parking in the area. There will be new cycle parking stands within the vicinity of the station.	None
11	11l	Wandsworth Living Streets	Whilst the scheme proposals will result in some improvements on Wandsworth High Street for active travel modes, which are welcome, these have been watered down from the original proposals and will for example still permit north-south motor traffic movements across Wandsworth High Street, a source of danger and pollution to people walking and cycling in the town centre. We are concerned that the proposals pre-date the MTS and do not take full advantage of this opportunity to improve access for people using active travel modes e.g. in showing modelled increases in journey times for walking and cycling, and apparent abandonment of the Wandle Trail in central Wandsworth. These weaknesses currently remain unresolved, which – given the centrality of Wandsworth town centre in the borough - is likely to compromise the borough's ability to meet headline mode share and road danger reduction targets in the MTS	This is a TfL-led scheme, the gyratory forming part of the TLRN. An update to the LIP is required given that the scheme no longer appears in TfL's most recent Business Plan.	Update text of 3.3.15-3.3.17 to reflect current status of scheme.
11	11m	Wandsworth Living Streets	We welcome Wandsworth Council's willingness to consider complementary measures to this scheme. We have made the point that the scheme requires significant reductions in permeability for motor traffic on side-roads of the A24 through Tooting in order to work safely for people walking and cycling, and LIP or other appropriate funding could be used to progress this, creating Low Traffic Neighbourhoods as part of the process.	Noted.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
11	11n	Wandsworth Living Streets	<p>Under para 3.4.5. we note that “The Council collects around £25.7m in parking revenue every year. The majority of this revenue (£14m) goes towards the cost of concessionary travel paid for by the Council, including the Freedom Pass. Parking revenue is also used to cover the costs of the parking service, including enforcement, along with road and footway maintenance, street lighting and Wandsworth Community Transport...”.</p> <p>We think that there is scope for reviewing parking charges and restrictions, to better reflect the harms and loss of amenity caused by motor vehicles e.g. introduction of differential charges for diesel vehicles (to help reduce air pollution), or for larger cars (to discourage greed in appropriation of public space). This review should incorporate timings of parking restrictions at weekends, it being notable that on Sundays, the ability to walk, cycle or travel by bus through town centres such as Wandsworth and Tooting is noticeably compromised by the presence of on-street car parking. A surplus thereby generated could fund practical measures such as the offer of an annual bulky household refuse collection to car-free households in the borough, to better support and encourage the [nearly half] of Wandsworth’s households who do not own a car or van.</p>	<p>Parking charges cannot be set with the aim of generating a surplus. The council will continue to use parking policy and charges to support transport objectives. A current proposal is for an increase in parking charges.</p>	<p>See change under ref 14e relating to additional text on parking charge review</p>
11	11o	Wandsworth Living Streets	<p>We note that these are listed as Cremorne Diamond Jubilee and Nine Elms – Pimlico Bridge. We agree that these are important infrastructure projects to address severance caused by the River Thames. These projects underline the importance of improving active travel route networks in their respective localities, in order to maximise their benefits. Given the acknowledged delay likely in delivering such infrastructure, we suggest that it might be more productive to earmark associated funding (where feasible) to shorter term, disseminated measures, which would benefit borough residents as a whole e.g. narrowing and raising the entrances to all side streets to require turning movements to be taken more slowly; developing a programme to invite local residents to submit bids for on-street parklets, so that there is a parklet on every street.</p> <p>We recommend that the Council adds the Wandle Trail to this list, a much neglected part of Wandsworth’s green and active travel infrastructure with major discontinuities which limit its usefulness especially to families with young children.</p>	<p>Noted. Some of the measures proposed form part of the schemes in the programme of investment (Table 7) and more are expected to emerge from the "Transport information gathering" proposal to be undertaken in 2019/20.</p>	<p>Add Wandle Trail to list in Table 4</p>

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
11	11p	Wandsworth Living Streets	We note (see Table 5) that there is only one reference to Liveable Neighbourhoods (a Mayoral flagship programme), in relation to the bid for Putney Town Centre. We recommend that a high quality Liveable Neighbourhood proposal be submitted for each of the next three funding years, prioritising the areas with the greatest need, such as least green space.	Realistically TfL is not going to fund one new Liveable Neighbourhood scheme each year in the borough. However new bids will be considered in future years, based on guidance at that time. The text could be revised to clarify this point.	Revise text to clarify that Putney Town Centre is the Liveable Neighbourhood bid submitted for 19/20 funding and that other LN bids may be submitted in future years.
11	11q	Wandsworth Living Streets	<p>Table 6: LIP Risk Assessment for three-year programme 2019/20-2021/22 and Table 8: LIP Risk Assessment for annual programme – 2019/20 both highlight High or Medium-High of risk of Lack of local support for delivery of schemes, e.g. after consultation. We agree strongly with the stated need for early engagement with the public, in order to mitigate this risk. However, we think that the terms of consultation need to be fundamentally changed if this is to be successful. There are growing numbers of examples in London of such a fundamental shift in the terms of public consultations, for example the early use of the Healthy Streets approach by Hounslow Council in its committee paper on a trial street partial closure in Isleworth, an approach which has gained that Council public recognition, see https://www.hounslow.gov.uk/news/article/285/closing_church_street_recognised_for_prioritising_safety_and_quality_of_life_for_residents</p> <p>We note that Waltham Forest Mini-Holland – which similarly (but on a larger scale), faced and had to address a backlash from residents content with the status quo, has received over 50 awards, hosts frequent study visits from all over the world, and has already demonstrably reduced air pollution and increased physical activity of its residents. The rewards for borough residents, councillors and officers of such leadership are there to be seen.</p>	Noted. "Transport Information Gathering" in the Annual Programme (Table 7) is one means of early engagement.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
11	11r	Wandsworth Living Streets	<p>We note the lack of interim targets for: mode share, proximity to Londonwide strategic cycle network, traffic volumes measured by vehicle-kilometres, car ownership, CO2 emissions, NOx emissions, particulate emissions, daily trips by public transport, time disadvantage of step-free access to public transport, and bus journey reliability.</p> <p>We recommend the addition of Interim Targets in order that progress may be effectively monitored.</p>	Noted. Interim trajectories will be added.	Add interim trajectories to the 2041 targets in Table 9.
11	11s	Wandsworth Living Streets	In Table 9, under Outcome 2: 'London's streets will be safe and secure', we note that the 2022 borough KSI target is 'Down to 46 or less' and the equivalent target for 2030 is 'Down to 30 or less'. Given that Figure 13 shows that in 2016 the number of KSIs in Wandsworth went off trajectory (at 98 KSIs, according to TfL in 2017) and that the number of KSIs in Wandsworth in 2017 increased dramatically to 147, it does not seem credible that the borough will meet these interim targets without a much more rigorous approach to reducing road danger and volumes of motor traffic. Measures that could help with this would include support for road user charging, Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (to remove rat-running from residential streets) as mentioned earlier, and protected cycling provision on all distributor/main roads.	There was a change to data collection and recording which has made comparison of data with previous years inappropriate. However TfL have produced backcast data which enables year on year comparison and this will be included in the LIP. It is agreed that the targets are very challenging. The LIP includes a range of measures aimed at reducing traffic and road casualties.	See changes under ref 14m below.
11	11t	Wandsworth Living Streets	Paragraph 2.4.21 refers to a drop of 33% licensed vehicles in the borough of Wandsworth from 2001 to 2017. This should surely have provided a strong incentive for a commensurate move to reallocate road space from private motorised modes to active travel modes as well as to place making. The introduction of the Healthy Streets approach to underpin the MTS and borough LIPs provides further support for reviewing use of highway space across the borough. We suggest therefore a review of the Council's parking policy to better understand and address the barriers (literal, in the case of pavement parking) to active travel that its policies and practices currently present. Given the gradual increase in size of private cars, the status quo means that space is gradually being reallocated to drivers, contrary to the Mayor's Transport Strategy and Wandsworth's stated objectives. A useful step would be to commit to a percentage of removal of on-street car parking on an annual basis. Concomitant with this, all frontagers would be offered amenities using the freed up space e.g. parklets, as mentioned earlier, bike hangars including parking for cargo bikes, trikes and adapted cycles, and so on.	Comments ignore the likely role played council policy in the reduction in licensed vehicles (e.g. CPZs, car clubs), and the LIP's targets for further traffic reduction. Given a finite amount of CPZ parking space, if cars are getting bigger this suggests that there will be fewer cars able to park in the same space, rather than there being more space reallocated to private cars drivers. Parking policy is already used to support transport objectives and will continue to be.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
11	11u	Wandsworth Living Streets	<p>We summarise the benefits of Parklets as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing rest points every 50m is critical for older, pregnant and disabled people to be able to walk outdoors and visit shops and amenities. This provides valuable opportunities for exercise which is otherwise impossible if no seating is provided along streets. Many footways are too narrow to walk on let alone wide enough for regular seating. • Having a community focal point on a street will bring communities together, facilitating community interaction. This will reduce social alienation, isolation and mental ill-health for many in the community. • Allowing residents to apply for and create their own Parklet will harness people's creativity and resources and allow them to invest in the public realm. This will enable a scalable programme. • Non-car owners currently have no stake in their street. It is car owners who are out there on the street washing their cars. Providing space for Parklets will allow all residents to go out onto the street to clean, maintain and use it. • Well-designed Parklets on quiet streets can provide a secure place for smaller children to play together and read outdoors. • Parklets with exercising opportunities can provide active people with gym and other exercise equipment. • Parklets provide an excellent opportunity for greening and visually livening up the street, instantly adding colour, plants and enjoyment to the street. • Allowing people to apply for a space to park their own bicycles, or for community cycle parking will add variety and choice of parking vehicles other than cars at the kerbside. • Parklets could also be used for many commercial and community uses. Some of these could be sponsored by companies. 	Points noted.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
11	11v	Wandsworth Living Streets	<p>We think there should be greater emphasis on quality of provision for active travel. For example, while the commitment to improved accessibility for pedestrians referred to in Table 7 (Proposed LIP Spending Submission for Wandsworth 2019/20-2021/22) is welcome, Wandsworth could work with TfL to review signalised crossings (wait time, time to cross, and other characteristics such as width) and scope for installing further diagonal crossings; the Council could review demand for zebra crossings and develop a programme to install these as low cost interventions to support walking. In this vein, it is a concern that the LIP does not include a re-statement to use London Cycling Design Standards in all highway schemes. Use of standards such as LCDS and the Healthy Streets toolkit would ensure that planning failures such as the proposed Quietway 4 route design at Earlsfield station and the poor quality provision on Magdalen Road could have been prevented at an early stage.</p> <p>The micro-environment is uniquely important to people walking, with degraded streets especially noticeable to people on foot. We recommend that the Council develop an initiative to recover the costs of damage caused to street furniture by motorists, use funds reclaimed from drivers or the MIB to support active travelling. This could be carried out using mobile CCTV, a tech tool which could also be deployed more widely to tackle flytipping hotspots.</p>	Comments noted. The quality and provision of crossings is implicit in the LIP (e.g. Objective MS 1). Furthermore, MTS 1a adopts the Healthy Streets Approach and MTS 1b refers to implementing the Cycling Strategy which itself includes use of LCDS.	None
11	11w	Wandsworth Living Streets	We note the stated role of Healthy Streets champion cited in 2.2.20, from 2018 Business Plan: ‘Appoint a “healthy streets” champion that works to help reduce street clutter and create new pocket parks, as part of a total safety approach.’ This remit does not reflect the Healthy Streets approach, the thrust of which is about much more than clutter and pocket parks (welcome as these elements are). Such a narrow remit in our view does not reflect a serious commitment to the Mayor’s Transport Strategy.	Comment relates to a summary of the Council’s Corporate Business Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies. The LIP does include adoption of the Healthy Streets approach in full.	None
11	11x	Wandsworth Living Streets	Although community severance is recognised to some extent (the Thames as a barrier to active travel in particular – although it is of course also a major attractor for people using active travel modes, especially when seeking out low-pollution routes), we think that the final LIP should acknowledge the role of severance in suppressing active travel more strongly. Its existence is for instance reflected in the cited low active travel levels in Roehampton, a part of the borough carved up by large, busy roads. Community severance by Penwith Road and Garratt Lane also underlines the importance of addressing Earlsfield Missing Link, mentioned above as a major borough weakness in the Wandle Trail and obvious inhibitor to families walking and cycling.	Additional text can be added to note the impact of severance	Add additional text relating to severance and active travel.

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
11	11y	Wandsworth Living Streets	<p>Finally, we have noticed that the LIP contains only very limited reference to children. The provision of Bikeability cycle training to children, while welcome, is clearly not enough in itself to enable children to cycle, as indicated by Wandsworth's stagnant mode share of cycling to school over the past decade. This clearly points to the need for meaningful infrastructure changes, including the introduction of a School Streets programme, as part of a broader programme of timed and temporary street 'closures'. School streets would have multiple benefits for children's health, in terms of reducing their exposure to air pollution and road danger, and enabling active travel. We suggest that a 'best in class' quality School Streets programme is developed, building on experience gained from other London boroughs in the adoption of this initiative.</p>	<p>Cycling to school is not of itself an indicator of how many children cycle overall. School streets are part of the toolkit available under school travel plan support and safer routes to school, as included in the LIP Delivery Plan</p>	None
11	11z	Wandsworth Living Streets	<p>With respect to the accompanying Equality Impact Assessment, we are surprised at the apparent lack of recognition of cycling as a mobility aid displayed in Wandsworth's draft LIP (see page 23) . This benefit could be extended to many more Wandsworth residents, including disabled people (who among all population groups find it most difficult to be sufficiently physically active to benefit their health) if the infrastructure was made more welcoming to people using all types of cycles. For a recent example of cycling as a mobility aid by a resident of Battersea, please see https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/av/uk-england-london-46619856/who-is-battersea-s-chopper-biker</p> <p>It should also be recognised (see page 26) that EV charging points on footways, while a particular problem for disabled people, especially those visually impaired, disadvantage all pedestrians unless the footway provides a high pedestrian comfort level i.e. is very wide; and trailing cables may present a trip hazard to anyone walking along or across a pavement. The loss of ability to walk sociably side by side is a material loss of amenity to all pedestrians.</p>	<p>These issues can be reflected in the final EQIA .</p>	<p>Revise final EQIA and include text in delivery plan relating to the design of cycling infrastructure and the positioning of EV charging infrastructure</p>
12	12a	Met Police (Road Safety Engineering Liaison)	<p>With the borough-wide implementation of 20mph speed limits, will you be carrying out speed surveys at locations where residents have identified speed related issues, and if so, what will be your response should recorded speeds be above DfT's recommended 24mph threshold as per guidance from TAL 9/99.</p>	<p>A sample of speed surveys have been carried out and are being assessed. Where mean speeds are over 24mph further measures will be considered. Review of 20mph limits will include analysis of before and after casualty data. The selection of the roads surveys have been partly at random and partly from roads that have been highlighted by residents in the past as being of concern.</p>	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
12	12b	Met Police (Road Safety Engineering Liaison)	How does Wandsworth plan to review the effectiveness of the 20mph limit – will this be in the form of speed surveys? With the focus on non-traffic calmed areas, if the review reveals areas of non-compliance, how will you respond?	See comment on 12a	Add short text to 2.4.14 and MTS 2b to give more detail on how 20mph will be reviewed, drawing on Paper No 19-32 to February 2019's Strategic Planning and Transportation Overview and Scrutiny Committee
13	13a	Wandsworth Community Transport	Although we fully support the objectives, there are a couple of overriding principals which we think should govern the final decisions regarding what actually happens.	Noted	None
13	13b	Wandsworth Community Transport	1 We don't think any main road speeds should be reduced to 20 mph, though we support the limit on side roads. It is incredibly rare that you can actually drive at much above 10 mph on our roads. Our vehicles normally average 8 mph in Wandsworth. On the rare occasions when the roads are clear (like in the middle of the night), you should be able to make reasonable headway. Speeding up and slowing down between speed cameras just increases pollution and noise and increases fuel consumption.	Lower speeds can play an important role in reducing both the number and severity of collisions, and contribute to Vision Zero. The case for 20mph on additional roads will be assessed on individual merits. Some additional roads have been proposed since the draft LIP was published.	See change proposed under ref 12b
13	13c	Wandsworth Community Transport	2 We don't think you should close alternative cross borough routes which would concentrate traffic into the already gridlocked main junctions. We don't think the term "rat run" should be used. Wherever you drive, there is always an alternative route (which is a much better term to use). And thank goodness! Traffic has to flow, and if you force everything down the A24, A3, Garratt Lane, Trinity Road or the South Circular, you will cause permanent gridlock, much more pollution, and much more danger to pedestrians and cyclists trying to use or shop on those major thoroughfares. Any of the expected benefits you get from your other proposals will be more that lost by the negative impact of permanent gridlock.	LIP aims for modal shift and reduction in traffic. The Healthy Streets approach will require less through traffic using residential streets.	None
13	13d	Wandsworth Community Transport	3 In general, any measures that reduce the traffic flow through the main arteries of the borough should be avoided for the reasons above. We are on the edge of permanent gridlock already. We can't afford to make things worse.	LIP aims for modal shift and reduction in traffic.	None
13	13e	Wandsworth Community Transport	4 Traffic calming measures should not include speed humps. These are absolute hell for anyone in a wheelchair or with a spinal injury traveling in the back of a long wheelbase minibus. There are other ways of achieving traffic calming.	Traffic calming, where considered necessary, will be appropriate for local circumstances and addressed in the design stage of schemes.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
13	13f	Wandsworth Community Transport	5 We know continuous walkways are all the rage, but we suggest you look very carefully at the Stapleton Road example in Tooting, which has been heralded as a model for future improvements. Yesterday I saw the third accident there that I have witnessed in the last few months. A car was beached on the protective corner bell. The last time, a car was actually half over turned! In the previous 40 years before the improvement, I have never seen an incident there. Hopefully no one was injured, but I fear it is just a matter of time. We already have continuous pavements along the main road where cars theoretically have priority, which work very well. If it ain't broke, don't fix it!	The design of individual schemes in the programme of pedestrian accessibility improvements (Table 7) will be according to local circumstances. Improving pedestrian accessibility and encouraging walking is a key part of the LIP. Comments on Stapleton Road can be passed to the relevant Council section.	None to the LIP. Pass comments on Stapleton Road scheme to engineering.
14	14a	Transport for London	Requirement 5 – The council have indicated that an SEA and EQIA have been undertaken; however it is not stated how these assessments have influenced the preparation of the LIP, this should be detailed in the LIP.	Can add text to clarify	Add text to clarify how SEA and EQIA have influenced the LIP
14	14b	Transport for London	The draft LIP outlines nine objectives to achieve mode shift, demonstrating the borough's intention to promote walking, cycling and use of public transport, which have been informed by the preceding challenges and opportunities. This is welcomed. Whilst the LIP advocates active travel and public transport, there is little detail provided on the problems associated with car dependency i.e. congestion acting to delay buses and deter active travel on perceived road safety concerns, road space which could otherwise be allocated to active modes. We note objectives MS3 and MS9 which aim to shift and reduce private car trips. However, it is felt the LIP does not explicitly emphasise or commit strongly enough to the need to reduce car use and ownership in favour of more sustainable modes. The LIP would benefit from the issues with car dependency being outlined in the challenges and opportunities section. The borough needs to make a stronger commitment to supporting traffic reduction. This is important in supporting reduced car dependency and encouraging modal shift to active travel. It would be beneficial to outline in this section the latest mode share breakdown across all modes of travel.	This section deals with mode shift specifically and increasing share on foot, bike and public transport. The main emphasis on traffic reduction comes under Outcome 3. As highlighted in that section, Wandsworth has seen the biggest drop in vehicles and a significant reduction in vehicle kilometres. It is considered that Outcome 3 is the appropriate place for discussing traffic reduction so no change is proposed to the objectives here. However text can be added the challenges and opportunities section under a heading of "Car Dependency". The latest mode share data for all modes will also be added.	Add "Car Dependency" section to challenges and opportunities section. Add breakdown of current mode shares.

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
14	14c	Transport for London	<p>3.1.1. Good reference is made to TfL's Strategic Cycling Analysis with a significant number of switchable trips identified (Figure 5); being the third highest among inner London boroughs, and more than half of those switchable trips currently being made by private vehicles.</p> <p>3.1.2. Reference to the continued implementation of the Wandsworth Cycling Strategy to 2020 is also recognised. It is noted that a map of the borough's Strategic Cycle Routes in 2018 will be included in the final submission of the LIP3.</p> <p>3.1.3. The intention to improve the service level on existing routes is welcomed, as informed by analysis which identified routes to and through town centres as having the most potential to attract more cycling (Figure 6).</p> <p>3.1.4. The borough is asked to include a map outlining the extent of the borough's proposed 2022 cycle network in the Final LIP submission. This would more clearly indicate the precise nature of strategic and local cycle routes the borough intends to deliver by the end of the Three-Year LIP period. For example, any local routes to complement the Cycle Superhighways and Quietways could be identified, as well as current cycle routes which could be upgraded to form part of the strategic network.</p> <p>3.1.5. The borough's longer term aspirations for the development of a cycle network for 2041 would also be extremely beneficial.</p> <p>3.1.6. The borough is also asked to indicate what elements of the Wandsworth Cycling Strategy to 2020 have been achieved / implemented to date.</p> <p>3.1.7. Good spatial analysis of variations in residents achieving 2x10 minutes active travel per day has been undertaken, and areas have been identified for targeted measures. We welcome the reference to community schemes designed in partnership with Public Health, which demonstrates commitment to delivering walking improvements in line with the Healthy Streets Approach.</p> <p>3.1.8. Whilst the objectives (MTS1a- MTS1e) identified demonstrate intent to increase active travel, the borough is asked to strengthen their objectives by providing more and specific detail for its ambitions.</p> <p>3.1.9. More detail could be provided in this section on the nature of the education and training measures the borough will implement.</p> <p>3.1.10. More detail could be provided on enhanced cycle parking provision and the borough's strategy for this.</p> <p>3.1.11. There is reference in the LIP to monitoring the Mayor's cycle hire scheme and dockless hire in the borough from Wandsworth's Corporate Business Plan. The LIP itself does not reference a commitment to increase cycle hire or work with dockless companies in the borough despite access to a bicycle stated as the most basic barrier (6.16) in the borough's Cycling Strategy to 2020.</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation)</p> <p>3.1.1 noted</p> <p>3.1.2 it appears comment is on an earlier draft; the final draft was sent to TfL and this includes the map of strategic routes 2018</p> <p>3.1.3 noted</p> <p>3.1.4. an indicative map for 2022 showing new routes can be included</p> <p>3.1.5. additional text can be added</p> <p>3.1.6. rather than repeat elements of other publications, a link will be provided to the cycling strategy progress report</p> <p>3.1.7. noted</p> <p>3.1.8. additional detail to be added to objectives</p> <p>3.1.9. additional detail can be added to the Delivery Plan section</p> <p>3.1.10. additional detail can be added to the Delivery Plan section</p> <p>3.1.11. the Cycling Strategy is referenced and this includes cycle hire. Some text can be added to clarify the Council's support for cycle hire schemes</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation)</p> <p>3.1.4 Add an indicative map showing new cycle routes to 2022 added after Figure 12</p> <p>3.1.5 Text added regarding long-term cycle network aspirations after 2.4.7</p> <p>3.1.6 Link provided to the cycling strategy progress report and appendix</p> <p>3.1.8 Additional detail to be added to objectives</p> <p>3.1.9 and 3.1.10 Additional detail on education and training, and cycle parking, added to the Delivery Plan section</p> <p>3.1.11 Text added to clarify the Council's support for cycle hire schemes</p>

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
14	14d	Transport for London	<p>3.2.1. We welcome specific mention of working towards Vision Zero and encouraging reference to the road danger reduction approach. Borough objectives are set in the draft LIP which address the Safe Systems elements of 'safe speeds', 'safe behaviour', and 'safe street design'. These objectives are welcomed.</p> <p>3.2.2. Although recognition is given of the 'safe vehicles' element of a Safe Systems approach, the borough is asked to give consideration to how the use of safer vehicles could be supported by the borough, for example through promoting a work-related road risk policy to address borough fleets.</p> <p>3.2.3. More detail could be provided in this section on the specific nature of the training programmes the borough will implement.</p> <p>3.2.4. Figure 15 illustrates the changes in KSIs over the period 2005-2016. Powered two wheelers represent the greatest number of KSIs yet proposals addressing this mode specifically have not been referenced.</p> <p>3.2.5. Good spatial analysis of KSIs in the borough has been undertaken. However, of those locations identified as hotspots (e.g. Putney Hill/Putney High Street, Queenstown Road and in town centres) it would be beneficial to outline the specific issues that need to be addressed in these areas.</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation)</p> <p>3.2.1 noted</p> <p>3.2.2 additional text to be included relating to borough fleet</p> <p>3.2.3 more detail on training to be included</p> <p>3.2.4 noted, final LIP will include more detail to address PTW casualties</p> <p>3.2.5 noted, more detail to be included in schemes in delivery plan</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation)</p> <p>3.2.2 additional text to be included relating to borough fleet</p> <p>3.2.3 more detail on training to be included</p> <p>3.2.4 include more detail to address PTW casualties</p> <p>3.2.5 more detail to be included in schemes in delivery plan</p>

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
14	14e	Transport for London	<p>3.3.1. The borough does appear to support the MTS aim to reduce vehicle traffic through encouraging mode shift though the borough is asked to make a stronger commitment to reducing vehicle traffic volumes through prioritising space-efficient modes of travel. This could be articulated more strongly in this section.</p> <p>3.3.2. The borough makes a strong commitment to supporting car-free and car-lite development in the borough through the planning process. This is important in maintaining the reductions seen in car ownership levels.</p> <p>3.3.3. We are pleased to read of the effectiveness of the aforementioned policies with a significant reduction in car ownership levels across the borough against the backdrop of a growing population and most other London boroughs experiencing increasing car ownership levels.</p> <p>3.3.4. We are pleased to read of the borough’s support for car clubs and intention to extend coverage of car clubs in the borough. However, the borough should have regard to Proposal 19 of the MTS which states provision of car clubs should only be supported when paired with a reduction in private parking availability. Without a restriction on parking, car clubs serve to provide access to a vehicle for a trip that could have otherwise been made by a more sustainable mode.</p> <p>3.3.5. The borough objective set in relation to the “expansion of CPZs in the borough” is welcomed, although caveated to “where they are proposed and supported by residents”.</p> <p>3.3.6. The borough’s intention to enhance their knowledge of local freight and servicing activity and reduce freight traffic in Wandsworth is welcomed.</p> <p>3.3.7. More detail could be provided on the specific interventions the borough will consider to reduce rat running, as per objective MTS3b.</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation)</p> <p>3.3.1 prioritising other modes is already included in other sections, but text can be added to clarify</p> <p>3.3.2 noted</p> <p>3.3.3 noted</p> <p>3.3.4 noted, but the MTS approach is not supported by evidence which shows that car clubs have a net benefit in terms of traffic reduction and air quality improvements. The MTS consultation report contends that “The amount of space required for 67 people in private cars is the same as that needed for 67 people travelling in car club cars...” but 67 car club members are more likely to be walking, cycling or using public transport for most of their journeys; 67 private car owners are less likely to be doing so. Taking all journeys into account, providing car clubs means a more efficient use of space. Notwithstanding this, new car club bays are only provided on street in place of other car parking so the desire is met in any case. Text will be added to clarify.</p> <p>3.3.5 wording will be reviewed to clarify</p> <p>3.3.6 noted</p> <p>3.3.7 further clarification can be added to this objective</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation)</p> <p>3.3.1 prioritising other modes is already included in other sections, but text can be added to clarify</p> <p>3.3.4 amend car club text to emphasise success and clarify compliance with MTS</p> <p>3.3.5 wording will be reviewed to clarify</p> <p>3.3.7 further clarification added to this objective</p>

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
14	14f	Transport for London	<p>3.4.1. A number of objectives have been outlined in the draft LIP for the purpose of achieving this Outcome in Wandsworth. Objectives identified include complementing measures to the ULEZ expansion, expanded provision of EV charging infrastructure for residential use and rapid chargers for commercial fleets, and greening the council fleet. These objectives are welcomed.</p> <p>3.4.2. However, no specific plans are identified to improve air quality in the five worst locations identified in the borough of Putney, Tooting, Wandsworth, Clapham Junction and York Road; which are also Air Quality Focus areas. Whilst the borough has committed to monitor and review air quality in the borough, the LIP needs to demonstrate how the borough will address air quality issues in the worst locations in the borough.</p> <p>3.4.3. Objectives to explore green infrastructure and deliver a net positive impact on biodiversity are welcomed. However, the LIP does not reference the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems.</p> <p>3.4.4. There is also no reference in this section to how the borough will improve air quality in locations with large numbers of vulnerable people or to implementation of recommendations from the Mayor's School Air Quality Audit programme. This would draw on objectives outlined elsewhere in the draft LIP including developing Healthy Routes to schools.</p> <p>3.4.5. We are pleased to read of the boroughs ambition to lead in the use of new technology and innovation to improve air quality. Further detail could be provided on what interventions the borough is considering.</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation)</p> <p>3.4.1 noted</p> <p>3.4.2 more detail will be included by further cross reference to the Air Quality Action Plan - not intending to duplicate an existing plan</p> <p>3.4.3 this objective is intended to include SUDS in a generic sense but it can be revised to make this more explicit</p> <p>3.4.4 further cross reference will be made to the AQAP and additional text added</p> <p>3.4.5 additional information will be included where possible though future developments especially in the technology sector can be hard to predict</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation)</p> <p>3.4.2 more detail included by further cross reference to the Air Quality Action Plan</p> <p>3.4.3 revise objectives to include Sustainable Urban Drainage Schemes (SUDS)</p> <p>3.4.4 further cross reference will be made to the AQAP and additional text added</p> <p>3.4.5 additional information included re technology and innovation</p>
14	14g	Transport for London	3.5.1. All requirements met.	Noted	None
14	14h	Transport for London	<p>3.6.1. The borough's ambition for all new and relocated bus stops to be accessible is welcomed. It is noted the borough has upgraded 95% of its bus stops to be accessible to date.</p> <p>3.6.2. The borough objective to support improvement to step-free accessibility at stations is welcomed. It is noted that a list of stations to be upgraded to step free access is indicated to be listed in the LIP. The borough is asked to include this in the final submission. The borough is asked to indicate which stations are priorities for improvement when this is incorporated.</p> <p>3.6.3. We welcome the borough's proposals to review and improve interchange locations, including bus-bus where key routes intersect. It is noted these key locations have been identified in Figure 9.</p> <p>3.6.4. More locally-specific detail could be provided on the proposed healthy and accessible routes to stations.</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation)</p> <p>3.6.1 noted</p> <p>3.6.2 list to be added</p> <p>3.6.3 noted</p> <p>3.6.4 developed and expanded on in delivery plan and annual spending submissions</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation)</p> <p>3.6.2 list to be added</p> <p>3.6.4 developed and expanded on in delivery plan and annual spending submissions</p>

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
14	14i	Transport for London	<p>3.7.1. The borough is asked to strengthen the objectives for this outcome by separating the current objective into more specific proposals. For example, a single objective for delivering the borough's bus priority programme could be identified, alongside a review of parking/ loading controls that have been named in the current standalone objective.</p> <p>3.7.2. Average bus speed mapping has been undertaken and junctions with low bus speeds have been identified (Figure 26). It would be beneficial to outline the specific challenges at these locations and how improvements to bus journey times could be achieved in accordance with Proposal 58 of the MTS.</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation) 3.7.1 noted; objective will be split 3.7.2 noted; some text will be added</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation) 3.7.1 objective will be split 3.7.2 some text will be added</p>
14	14j	Transport for London	<p>3.8.1. The borough has acknowledged the importance of Local Plan policies on development densities and restraints on parking in new development. The borough's commitment to revise Local Plan parking standards to align with the draft London Plan is welcomed.</p> <p>3.8.2. The transformative role of Crossrail 2 and the Northern Line Extension is acknowledged in the LIP. However, this outcome could be strengthened by outlining the scope for smaller scale local interventions and the importance of funding mechanisms to unlock development.</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation) 3.8.1 Noted. NB the borough has not committed to aligning parking standards with the new London Plan, which is not yet adopted. Text will be amended to clarify. We will have regard to the London Plan standards when they are published but we will need to go through our own Local Plan consultation and examination, i.e. we cannot pre-empt this process 3.8.2 additional text can be added</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation) 3.8.1 Amend text to clarify parking standards 3.8.2 Additional text added</p>
14	14k	Transport for London	<p>4.1.1. A 2021 mode share target aligned to the MTS borough data pack trajectory needs to be set. This is important in terms of reinforcing the borough's commitment to assisting delivery of the MTS mode share aim over the shorter term.</p>	<p>Noted, an interim trajectory will be set.</p>	<p>See change under ref 11r</p>
14	14l	Transport for London	<p>4.2.1. A 2041 target of 70% has been set for Outcome 1b. This deviates from the borough data pack trajectory and no explanation for this has been provided. As such, the borough target for Outcome 1b needs to be reviewed and, on the basis of the evidence provided in the draft LIP, set in accordance with the MTS borough data pack trajectory.</p> <p>4.2.2. A 2021 amended target that deviates from the TfL trajectory has been set for Outcome 1b. We would like to work with the borough to understand concerns raised around experience of delivery of Quietways to date.</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation) 4.2.1 noted, this was a drafting error and the correct target of 83% is referred to in the narrative on page 30. Text will be revised to include the correct 2041 target 4.2.2 Noted, the 38% target has now been included but supporting text added to clarify the challenges to delivering this</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation) 4.2.1 noted, this was a drafting error and the correct target of 83% is referred to in the narrative on page 30. Text will be revised to include the correct 2041 target 4.2.2 additional text added to clarify short term target and challenges to achieving this</p>

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
14	14m	Transport for London	<p>4.3.1. In accordance with the borough's stated commitment to the Mayor's Vision Zero aim the borough is asked to set a 2041 target of 0 KSIs in the borough's Outcome indicator targets table.</p> <p>4.3.2. Following the moves to new collision reporting systems – the Case Overview and Preparation Application (COPA) for the Metropolitan Police Service and Collision Reporting And Sharing (CRASH) for the City of London Police – we have now completed initial back estimates for the number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI) for each borough between 2005 and 2017 (contained in the 2017 'Casualties in Greater London' factsheet, available on the TfL website alongside supporting data tables at https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/safety-and-security/road-safety).</p> <p>4.3.3. We will issue a revised set of borough trajectories for Outcome 2 and Vision Zero and need boroughs to update their targets to reflect these new trajectories in their final LIP for 2022 and 2030 (2041 is unchanged at 0). The level of ambition remains unchanged, despite these revised figures. The borough is also asked to include the following text in the final LIP under Outcome 2 explaining the reasoning for the change in trajectories and targets: 'The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) introduced a new collision reporting system in November 2016 - the Case Overview and Preparation Application (COPA). The City of London Police also moved to the Collision Reporting And SHaring (CRASH) system in October 2015. This has had a number of impacts on the data that is available to Transport for London (TfL), and the London Boroughs in the ACCSTATS database for collision investigation. Under the new systems officers use an 'injury-based assessment' in line with DfT STATS 20 guidance and online self reporting is available. Both of these changes are expected to provide a better assessment of injury occurrence and severity but have made data collected from November 2016 onwards difficult to compare with earlier data. TfL commissioned the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) to undertake a back-casting exercise to enable pre November 2016 data to be compared with post November 2016 data. These initial back cast estimates include the number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI) for each borough between 2005 and 2017 and this data has been used to update borough targets to align with those contained in the Mayor's Transport Strategy, namely a 65 percent reduction in KSIs by 2022 against the 2005-09 baseline, a 70 percent reduction in KSIs by 2030 against the 2010-14 baseline and zero KSIs by 2041. The targets contained in this final version of our LIP have been set against Outcome 2 for Vision Zero to reflect the reporting changes. The level of ambition remains unchanged, despite these revised figures.'</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation) 4.3.1 Noted; this was a drafting error in Table 9, though zero KSIs by 2041 is referenced elsewhere in the draft LIP 4.3.2 noted 4.3.3 noted; revised text and new trajectories to be used in final LIP</p>	<p>(using TfL's notation) 4.3.1 Include 0 KSI target for 2041 in Table 9 4.3.3 Revised text and new trajectories to be included, along with backcast data to indicate trend.</p>

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
14	14n	Transport for London	4.4.1. The borough is asked to set a 2021 target in accordance with the MTS borough data pack trajectory.	Noted, an interim trajectory will be set.	See change under ref 11r
14	14o	Transport for London	4.5.1. 2021 targets should be set for each of the indicators for this Outcome. This would reinforce the borough's commitment to assisting delivering of this Outcome over the shorter term.	Noted, an interim trajectory will be set.	See change under ref 11r
14	14p	Transport for London	4.6.1. A 2021 target should be set for this Outcome. This would reinforce the borough's commitment to assisting delivering of this Outcome over the shorter term.	Noted, an interim trajectory will be set.	See change under ref 11r
14	14q	Transport for London	4.7.1. A 2021 target should be set for this Outcome. This would reinforce the borough's commitment to assisting delivering of this Outcome over the shorter term.	Noted, an interim trajectory will be set.	See change under ref 11r
14	14r	Transport for London	5.1 The schemes identified would deliver significant benefits with regards to several outcomes, particularly reducing severance. The borough is recommended to identify a more diverse range of ambitions to deliver against the longer term to 2041.	Noted, additional more diverse interventions can be added	Add more diverse long-term schemes
14	14s	Transport for London	6.1 More detail needs to be provided on the nature of the measures that are to be implemented under each LIP programme in the Three-Year Indicative Programme of Investment. This would not necessarily go into the same level of detail as the Annual Programme but would provide an indication of the type of measures (including scheme-specific detail, locations and timeframes) that will be delivered across the three years and provide more detail on the borough's intentions than currently outlined in the supporting commentary. 6.2 The borough is asked to review Table 5 for Local Transport Funding. It appears this has been double counted in the budget.	(using TfL's notation) 6.1 noted, we would propose to focus on those schemes not also in the annual programme so as to avoid repetition 6.2 yes, this is a drafting error and the second appearance will be removed	(using TfL's notation) 6.1 include further detail on schemes in the three-year programme 6.2 remove second reference to LTF in Table 5
14	14t	Transport for London	Comments on the Annual Programme (Proforma A) will be provided separately via the borough's Network Sponsorship contact. (Borough Council note: no further comments provided by the close of consultation 11th January 2019; response received 4th Feb 2019)	Comments received and further detail added to Programme of Investment section.	Add more information about schemes to the programme of investment
15	15a	Individual	The diamond jubilee bridge needs to be built so we can walk to imperial wharf station or if you can't afford that rebuild Battersea station so I can catch the train to imperial wharf	Noted. LIP includes Diamond Jubilee Bridge as an aspiration in Table 4 and new station at North Battersea can be added.	North Battersea Station added to Table 4.
15	15b	Individual	Don't like the nine elms bridge because I lived there before moving to Battersea and it's not needed. Also Westminster hasn't agreed to it. Build the diamond jubilee bridge or use that money to rebuild Battersea station	Noted. Both bridges are included in Table 4 as they are considered to serve different catchments and the Council supports both of them. A preferred location for the Nine Elms bridge has now been chosen	Add text to Table 4 confirming preferred location of Nine Elms Bridge.
15	15c	Individual	The diamond jubilee bridge needs to have a definite date for delivery	Noted. A definite date will depend on securing funds.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
15	15d	Individual	The diamond jubilee bridge needs a definite date	Noted. A definite date will depend on securing funds.	None
15	15e	Individual	Rebuild Battersea overground railway station. Cheap	Noted. See ref 15a	See changes under ref 15a
15	15f	Individual	Extension of northern line to Clapham	Not clear what is meant but may imply a desire for the Northern Line to be extended to Clapham Junction. The desire is to link Clapham Junction to the wider network via Crossrail 2	None
16	16a	Member of two organisations	It does not address the air pollution and noise in my area	Noted, but uncertain what specific area is being referred to. LIP aims to reduce emissions from transport (Objectives under MTS Outcome 4)	None
16	16b	Member of two organisations	I oppose the elimination of the #19 bus route from Battersea Bridge This bus can take one to Sloane Square, to Piccadilly, to the theatre district, to the British Museum, to Sadler's Wells, to Islington and Highbury.... All without having to wait for several other connections, in the rain, cold, dark, etc.	Decisions about the 19 and any other bus route changes in the borough are made by TfL. Objective MTS 5b includes the Council working with TfL to ensure that any changes are appropriate based on demand.	None
16	16c	Member of two organisations	It's a lot of words. What will actually happen....	Noted. LIP includes a Delivery Plan.	None
17	17a	Individual	Objectives - aspects liked: Reduce rat-running on residential streets, thereby improving conditions for walking and cycling. Basically all through motorised traffic should be eliminated from residential streets.	Noted.	None
17	17b	Individual	Delivery Plan - aspects liked: Mode shift. People should be actively encouraged to stop using cars on a daily basis.	Noted.	None
17	17c	Individual	If the council is serious about modal shift, all residential streets should be closed to through motorised traffic. This will then make an environment that is truly conducive to walking and cycling.	Noted.	None
18	18a	Individual	Objectives - aspects liked: Improved pedestrian areas, less cars on the road - environmental and health benefits.	Noted	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
18	18b	Individual	Objectives - aspects disliked: I would like to hear more about Crossrail 2, I do not support this if it means that Tooting market will be made a work site. Any shutting down of the markets - would be awful! So many businesses rely on this and provides Tooting with a great social setting.	A final route decision for Crossrail 2 has not yet been made. This scheme is promoted by TfL and Network Rail.	None.
18	18c	Individual	I think there needs to be a BIG review of the sites proposed for Tooting Broadway re. Crossrail 2. I would be fully supporting Balham for this. Crossrail 2 site in Tooting Broadway would have adverse effects.	See comment on ref 18b	None
19	19a	Individual	Objectives - aspects liked: the direction of improving air quality and pedestrian safety and environment	Noted	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
19	19b	Individual	<p>Objectives - aspects disliked: it's all good intentions but the council ignores those policy to suit its own ambitions and win votes on a subjective basis and not on objective and policy based.</p> <p>therefore whilst all the intentions are good I note that there is no commitment to stop all developments with car parking - there is no justification for a high PTAL borough like Wandsworth to support any on-site car parking - better to introduce new PT routes and lobby for the underground from nine elms to Wandsworth town centre - lack of vision by the council allowed all the development on the ram brewery where had there been any competent vision of officers and members it would have been ideal site for a new underground station and developments to be built around and above the station.</p> <p>The above should still be pursued on to the potential to develop adjacent site of B&Q or Homepage or north side of armoury way.</p> <p>To appease developers some parking is being allowed and again that needs to stop - zero parking developments should be the only ones allowed exception for disable parking only - Wandsworth could lead and encourage other neighbouring boroughs to follow suit in only allowing car free developments in the borough.</p> <p>the above measure would improve the environment significantly and expeditiously than all the other measures being proposed in the objectives</p> <p>yes through traffic along the south circular is still a major concern but that in itself will reduce with the mayors target of introducing the emission zone to the south/north circular road.</p>	Noted; comments mainly relate to planning issues best dealt with through the update of the Local Plan.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
19	19c	Individual	<p>Final comments</p> <p>as stated earlier - it's all good intentions but the council ignores those policy to suit its own ambitions and win votes on a subjective basis and not on objective and policy based.</p> <p>therefore whilst all the intentions are good I note that there is no commitment to stop all developments with car parking - there is no justification for a high PTAL borough like Wandsworth to support any on-site car parking - better to introduce new PT routes and lobby for the underground from nine elms to Wandsworth town centre - lack of vision by the council allowed all the development on the ram brewery where had there been any competent vision of officers and members it would have been ideal site for a new underground station and developments to be built around and above the station.</p> <p>The above should still be pursued on to the potential to develop adjacent site of B&Q or Homebase or north side of armoury way.</p> <p>To appease developers some parking is being allowed and again that needs to stop - zero parking developments should be the only ones allowed exception for disable parking only - Wandsworth could lead and encourage other neighbouring boroughs to follow suit in only allowing car free developments in the borough.</p> <p>the above measure would improve the environment significantly and expeditiously than all the other measures being proposed in the objectives</p> <p>yes through traffic along the south circular is still a major concern but that in itself will reduce with the mayors target of introducing the emission zone to the south/north circular road.</p>	<p>Objective MTS 8 covers these issues. It should be noted that PTALs vary across Wandsworth and many parts of the borough are in lower PTAL areas (Figure 7 of draft LIP).</p>	<p>None.</p>

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
19	19d	Individual	<p>as stated above it should be policy to stop all new developments in the borough with on-site car parking - linking the permit parking to the parking standards - bearing in mind that parking standard should be zero - however for any new permit applications limiting permits to one per dwelling and not on a rising scale which is discriminatory to lower income household and favourable for the higher income holders - the streets are already heavily stressed - this would also encourage greater use of car clubs, walking, cycling and definitely public transport.</p> <p>No reviewing of existing town centres for pedestrianising the roads and areas - old york road should be considered for such a measure as shown by the shopping events there - other areas ideal for pedestrianising should be investigated.</p>	Noted. See comments on ref 19c. Objective MTS 3e in the draft LIP refers to use of parking policies to manage supply and demand for parking. Objective MS1 is to provide attractive conditions for walking, particularly in town centres. It should be noted that Old York Road is a bus route and will be affected by TfL's proposals for Wandsworth gyratory.	None
20	20a	Individual	The entire policy is anti car. I cannot live my life without a car. There is no recognition of the millions of people that rely on a car to get about their daily lives. I use the tube, the bus, I run to and from work but on occasions I need to drive. Roads have been narrowed, there are more obstacles, turns have been blocked off etc all of which has slowed traffic to the lowest speeds we have ever known. This in turn has led to greater pollution. And we have a proliferation of empty buses and it has been proved that this has led to an unprecedented level of pollution in Putney High St. The current policy is well intentioned but abjectly poorly executed. The policy has also resulted in a huge volume of road users that are completely ignorant of the Highway Code - specifically cyclists but now also an increasing number of people on manual or electric scooters. I have been struck by cyclists whilst running as they do not observe red lights. I have been spat at and sworn at on numerous occasions. I have a friend who cycles who refuses to use the cycle super highway along the embankment because the other cyclists are so aggressive. This is what you have created and there is not one jot of recognition that there is a problem.	Comments noted. Disagree that the draft LIP is anti-car; the intention is to be pro-people, and meet the requirements of the MTS. Achieving mode shift from private car to other more space-efficient modes means better conditions for those who need to drive. Poor road user behaviour, both towards cyclists and by some cyclists, is acknowledged as an issue to be addressed in the Council's Cycling Strategy (Action A1).	None
21	21a	Individual	Objectives - aspects liked: I like the overall objectives for healthy, safe streets supporting active travel. But, the Wandsworth proposals to achieve this seem insufficient	Noted. Further detail is provided on the Programme of Investment	see change under ref 14t
21	21b	Individual	Delivery Plan - aspects liked: It is good that Wandsworth is making positive statements about increasing walking and cycling. Commitment to reduce danger at source is welcome. Reducing pedestrian waiting times at crossing.	Noted.	None
21	21c	Individual	Delivery Plan - aspects disliked the Statements about promoting cycling looked a bit vague, so I was unclear what would actually be done. Disappointing that the healthy streets champion focus on street clutter rather than active travel. this is disappointing given the high potential outlined in this document.	Noted. NB reference to healthy streets champion is from a summary of the Council's Corporate Business Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies. The LIP does include	See changes under ref 21a

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
				adoption of the Healthy Streets approach in full.	
21	21d	Individual	Final comments Was good to see emphasis on healthy streets initiatives, and promoting active travel. I couldn't tell from this plan what the interventions were to achieve this, as unclear to me what cycling promotion meant, and whether it was real action or just encouragement to cycle which has had little impact to date. . There are many examples of successful London initiatives implemented in for example City of London. If the LIP is taking an evidence based approach and implementing real, physical improvements that would be great. If like the last several years is a series of cancelled initiatives and low quality proposals then unlikely to achieve the stated ambitions.	Noted	See changes under ref 21a
22	22a	Individual	Objectives - aspects liked Wandsworth gyratory works to free up Wandsworth centre and redirect cars. Improvements to Garratt lane bus and traffic calming.	Noted	None
22	22b	Individual	Objectives - aspects disliked Cyclists represent a big danger for us regarding our children. Cyclists do not respect traffic signals and have on a number of occasions endangered the lives of our children.	Poor road user behaviour, both towards cyclists and by some cyclists, is acknowledged as an issue to be addressed in the Council's Cycling Strategy (Action A1).	None
22	22c	Individual	Delivery plan - aspects liked: Reducing traffic and therefore emissions	Noted	None
22	22d	Individual	Delivery plan - aspects disliked: I don't see how Earlsfield station can absorb the additional influx of new train users resulting from a number of local planner residential developments. It still takes sometimes 3 or 4 trains to come and go at the station before space on a train becomes available. I don't think the trains can accommodate peak times.	Para 2.3.10 notes that more rail capacity will be needed, and para 2.4.39 notes the role of the train companies in delivering this. Objective MTS 5a refers.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
22	22e	Individual	Additional comments: Living in Earlsfield we are aware of a number of largescale developments that will impact greatly on public transport and we believe parking in our area - with increases in service vehicles. Whilst we recognise the need to provide more homes across the borough the scale of developments on new sites should respect existing densities - which is not the case in a great deal of instances. Traffic consultant reports are provided with large scale developments but they don't truly , in a lot of circumstances, truly appraise existing situations when attempting to arrive at impact statements. Family homes in the borough are a fundamental cog in the success of the borough with families arguably caring more for their surroundings and communities than residents within 1 and 2 bedroom apartments. The plan must ensure that the ability for family homes to retain on street parking within good proximity to their homes - which in Earlsfield is becoming at risk. Whilst new developments are showing vastly reduced car parking numbers, and stating that residents will not be allowed to have parking permits, all to be controlled with a section 106 agreement post planning - we have to question how, once in occupation, the voice of 350 residents does not allow such a matter to be overturned. I am concerned that these legal bases for planning g approvals could be overturned once residents are in situ - and parking for historical owners is made unbearable. The family home in Wandsworth must be better represented in the report - as it feels it is geared to a younger audience whom do not arguably have the same passion to see our local communities in the borough thrive to control crime flytipping and the support of our shops.	The Local Plan includes measures to promote sustainable transport at new development and draft LIP objective MTS 8 refers. Residential developments of 10 units or more are ineligible for resident parking permits and this is ensured through legal agreements.	None
23	23a	Individual	Objectives - aspects disliked: not diverse enough	Disagree. There are a broad range of objectives and schemes to meet these objectives in the delivery plan. If the comment relates to equalities, it should be noted that an Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken.	None
23	23b	Individual	Too vague with after effects of plan	"After effects" are anticipated to be progress towards the targets in section 3.8.	None
23	23c	Individual	Delivery Plan - aspects disliked: too many to go into	Unable to comment as no specifics given.	None
23	23d	Individual	Stop wasting people's money on these stupid consultations and put more police on streets.	Policing is not a matter for the LIP. The Council considers it appropriate to consult on the LIP in order to gauge a range of views on the future of transport in the borough.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
24	24a	Member of two organisations	Objectives - aspects liked: Better public transport but not good enough.	Comments not specific enough to respond to.	None
24	24b	Member of two organisations	Objectives - aspects disliked: Nine Elms Pimlico Bridge is a waste of money and goes nowhere to nowhere	Disagree. A preferred location for the bridge has now been chosen.	See change under ref 15b.
24	24c	Member of two organisations	Delivery plan - aspects disliked: Scrap the Nine Elms to Pimlico Bridge Prioritise Diamond Jubilee Bridge to connect North Battersea to Imperial Wharf station Connect Northern Line to Clapham Junction with stop at the Latchmere Prioritise Crossrail 2 and Clapham Junction - LHR link More capacity on buses particularly the 170 and routes along Battersea Park Road and Nine Elms Lane Retain the 19	Both bridges are included in Table 4 as they are considered to serve different catchments and the Council supports both of them. Major public transport proposals and the need to provide bus capacity are included in the draft LIP.	None.
24	24d	Member of two organisations	More emphasis on affordable housing required. Lack of affordable housing will mean key workers (e.g. police, fire, teachers) cannot reside in the borough	Not a LIP issue.	None
25	25a	Individual	did not add any comments	None	None
26	26a	Individual	The proposals make it particularly difficult for workers in the area	Not clear how or why.	None
26	26b	Individual	Businesses will suffer	Not clear how or why.	None
27	27a	Individual	Objectives - aspects liked: Mode shift: I believe there is a lot to do to improve public transport on the main axes. Journeys from Clapham junction to Clapham common/Wandsworth with buses are not reliable and time consuming. Clean and green: this should include replacing all bus fleet by cleaner vehicles	Noted. As stated in the LIP, the Council will work with TfL, who are responsible for buses in London, to improve bus journeys. Regarding emissions from buses, this is again a TfL issue but some text can be added under Outcome 4 to clarify.	Revise text e.g. under MTS 4a to bring out more information about the role of buses in air quality and TfL's plans for bus improvements in this regard.
27	27b	Individual	Objectives - aspects disliked: clean and green: am walking to Clapham junction station every day and breathing polluted air	Noted. LIP and AQAP aim to address this problem.	None
27	27c	Individual	Delivery Plan - aspects liked: Clapham junction air quality monitoring and action. This area is full if pedestrian but still very busy trafficwise	Noted.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
27	27d	Individual	Delivery Plan - aspects disliked: Cycling objective is not supported by the construction of proper cycle lane, separate from car traffic and from pedestrian.	The design of individual schemes in the plan may result in sections of segregation or segregated routes. This is a matter for scheme development in line with the LCDS (as referred to in the Cycling Strategy - Objective MTS 1b)	Broaden text of MTS 1b to clarify use of LCDS.
27	27e	Individual	I don't see any overly ambitious objectives such as building a tram link between the high streets. It is quite disappointing	It is not considered that a new tram scheme would be feasible at this time.	None.
27	27f	Individual	How is the public transport network going to adjust to the new northern line extension? Will there be new bus routes or cycle/ car parking facilitated?	Bus changes are covered in Objective MTS 5b. Parking at the new Battersea station is covered through the planning process for the station and the wider VNEB area.	None
28	28a	Individual	Increase train frequencies at Queenstown Road station and Battersea Park station. Increase cycle lanes on lavender hill, Queenstown and Latchmere road. Install car charging points in Dunston Road and make it a solar success priority area. Renovate Clapham junction, link it to St Pancras ASAP. Also Heathrow.	Train services are the responsibility of train operators but this is covered by Objective MTS 5a. Cycle lanes may arise from scheme proposed in Queenstown Road. Latchmere Road is on the TLRN so is the responsibility of TfL. The council is rolling out electric vehicle charging infrastructure boroughwide. Better train links from Clapham Junction are also covered by MTS 5a. Crossrail 2 which is supported by the council would connect Clapham Junction with Euston/St Pancras.	None
29	29a	Individual	Priority should be given to providing more safe cycling routes i,e. parks, pavements etc. [action 13] Pothole repairs should be prioritised over kerb build outs and other cosmetic installations which create more danger for cyclists	Noted.	None
29	29b	Individual	Delivery plan - aspects liked: Hydrogen buses	Noted, though this is not include in the LIP and buses are the responsibility of TfL.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
29	29c	Individual	Delivery plan - aspects disliked: there is no mention of the very real menace of potholes which are left for months without being fixed and cause £££ of damage to cars and serious injury or death to cyclists	Pothole repairs form part of the council's annual programmes (see 3.4.5) but TfL is not currently providing any LIP funding for maintenance of principal roads and footways.	None
29	29d	Individual	Extra taxes should be imposed on oversize SUVs and diesels and not on small cars	The Mayor's ULEZ includes fiscal incentives to reduce diesel use.	None
29	29e	Individual	Failure to properly maintain the road surfaces	Pothole repairs form part of the council's annual programmes (see 3.4.5) but TfL is not currently providing any LIP funding for maintenance of principal roads and footways.	None
30	30a	Individual	Objectives - aspects liked: A clean and safe borough in all respects	Noted	None
31	31a	Individual	Objectives - aspects liked: Improving the Wandsworth one way system	Noted.	None
31	31b	Individual	Objectives - aspects disliked: Wandsworth town station access needs improvement, so many developments approved without thinking about local amenities and how they cope, the exit gates at the station are badly congested due to the volume of commenters and only have four barriers for entry and exit...this is a big priority	Noted. Objectives MTS 5a and MTS 6a relate to improving rail-based public transport and access to stations.	None
31	31c	Individual	Please really think about what makes sense for all not just having a fuzzy deluded view	LIP is intended to have a balanced view.	None
31	31d	Individual	Negative impact: The huge amount of developments being approved for the Wandsworth town area without real thought on how the town will cope with the current transport options	The LIP's aims for mode shift and Local Plan policies supporting sustainable travel to and from developments should have a positive impact.	None
32	32a	Individual	Objectives - aspects liked: Better use of walking, cycling and public transport. Sorting out the Wandsworth One-Way system - has a study been made of removing the kerb outside All Saints Church (Corner Wandsworth Plain) which reduces the A3 and A205 to one or two lanes immediately after traffic lights, so speeds are slow?	Noted. This scheme is the responsibility of TfL.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
32	32b	Individual	Objectives - aspects disliked: 20mph speed limits, which cause motorists to use lower gears, increasing fuel consumption and pollution. No-one seems to have studied the City of Bath's 20mph scheme, where the number of accidents has NOT fallen, and the scheme needs removing.	The overall impact of 20mph limits is considered positive. Lower speeds will be needed to help meet Vision Zero.	None
33	33a	Individual	did not add any comments	None	None
34	34a	Individual	Objectives - aspects liked: Cleaner air , less noise , enhanced safety , less traffic congestion , more pleasant public realm	Noted	None
34	34b	Individual	Objectives: aspects disliked: The policies and objectives have OMITTED powered two / three wheeler mopeds, scooters and motorcycles especially in the 50cc - 600cc range , they have more of a future than cars, and are better users of road space (more parking bays required) .	Noted. More can be added to discuss the role of PTWs, though this will largely be in relation to road danger reduction as the borough's mode share target set by TfL is to aim for an increase in walking, cycling and public transport, not an increase in PTW use..	See change under ref 14d
34	34c	Individual	Delivery Plan - aspects liked: deliver for section 4	Unclear to what this refers.	None
34	34d	Individual	Delivery Plan - aspects disliked: omitting to deliver for use of scooters and motorcycles	Noted. See ref 34b	See change under ref 14d
34	34e	Individual	Final comments: Failing to include and plan for greater use of motorcycles and scooters , they too will develop into electric power versions - e.g. my own scooter a Honda PCX 125cc achieves more than 128 mpg , is Euro 4 compliant and has engine cut out when stopped ,for example at traffic lights . It would be first on the scene in a medical emergency etc...	Noted. See ref 34b	See change under ref 14d
35	35a	Individual	Objectives - aspects disliked: 20 MPH speed limits- additional comment from www.petroprices.com: https://www.petroprices.com/news/collisions-due-slow-drivers-soar-recent-years/ Slower drivers increase risk of accidents.	That is not the conclusion drawn in the linked article. In fact, it states that the DfT figures for 2017 show there were 175 injuries attributable to excessively low speed, but nearly 20,000 injuries for speeding. Lower speeds reduce risk of collisions and reduce the severity of injuries.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
36	36a	Individual	Delivery plan - aspects liked: How many extra days to wait for delivery AND HOW MANY PEOPLES WILL LOSE THEIR JOBS!!!	Unclear to what this refers.	None
36	36b	Individual	Delivery Plan - aspects disliked: They need to update their van!!!	Not clear what is meant	None
37	37a	Individual	Objectives - aspects liked: Healthy Streets and developing traffic-free routes because I think more effort should be made to encourage walking which can be very unpleasant along busy roads	Noted	None
37	37b	Individual	Objectives - aspects disliked: I don't think the air quality targets are ambitious enough particularly in terms of implementation	The Council considers the trajectories adopted (Figures 22-24) to be challenging rather than unambitious.	None
37	37c	Individual	Delivery Plan - aspects liked: The links to the Mayor's Transport priorities	Noted	None
37	37d	Individual	I would like the plan to include options for opening the parts of the Wandle Path by the river in Earlsfield and Wandsworth Town where walkers have to use local streets.	Traffic free routes will be developed and promoted where possible as per Objective MTS 1e	None
37	37e	Individual	I would like consideration to be given to a bus route between Earlsfield and Southfields. At the moment the journey involves travelling to Wimbledon or Wandsworth and changing buses or trains and it is too far for many people to consider walking so they drive.	Noted, but TfL is responsible for bus network planning. The council's influence is covered in Objective MTS 5b.	None
38	38a	Organisation	Objectives - aspects liked: It is great that LB Wandsworth has so fully embraced the objectives of the MTS to support the benefits and delivery of active forms of transport.	Noted	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
38	38b	Organisation	<p>[ORGANISATION] would like to congratulate Wandsworth on its moves to a lower speed environment over the past few years. We note the enormous progress in the borough since the last round of LIP. We realise that there is a conversation within the borough and in the LIP3 submission about going further with lower speed limits and would like to emphasise the importance of this. In the three most recent years for which data is available (2015 to 2017), 27% of all casualties of any severity in Wandsworth have occurred on borough managed A and B roads; 26% of all of those killed and seriously injured have occurred on borough managed A or B roads. Of the killed and seriously injured casualties on borough managed roads, 60% have occurred on borough managed roads that are classified as A or B. It is of course imperative that TfL reduces casualties on the TLRN but it is important that Wandsworth also now moves to include the borough managed distributor roads in its programme of 20mph roads. We understand very well that merely changing the speed limit does not mean that maximum speeds fall to that maximum BUT, in conjunction with activities that TfL is proposing in its Vision Zero Action Plan it will set the context for considerable moves in the next few years towards improved compliance. Included in this are its three-tier approach to enforcement in conjunction with the Metropolitan Police, designing for lower speed limits when changes are made to the street environment - if the speed limit is 20mph lower speed limits can be designed in (e.g. tighter radii on corners). The most interesting move towards compliance is, however, new technology. All new TfL buses are being fitted with mandatory Intelligent Speed Adaptation (ISA) and all London buses will become speed limit compliant with the introduction of ibus2 in 2022. This means that if the borough sets a lower speed limit on its main roads, the bus fleet will comply with it. As there are elements of new technology which are starting to offer significant benefits in increasing compliance with lower speed limits, we would suggest that Wandsworth incorporates the following into its policies for Safe Vehicles in relation to vehicles operating in the borough in the future (i.e. Wandsworth sets a date (e.g. 2022) that, for all new vehicles from that time on in the following categories, mandatory ISA is a requirement):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adopting ISA in its own fleet procurement practices as part of its renewal programme; - Ensuring ISA is a standard requirement for any service procured by the Council with a fleet requirement; - Promoting the installation of ISA in taxis and private hire vehicles and encouraging TfL to make ISA a requirement for new taxis and private hire licensing; - Encouraging the uptake of ISA in other fleets which operate in the borough, such as hauliers, construction firms and coach operators – potentially this could be an aspect of granting planning applications; - Working with the insurance industry and vehicle manufacturers to promote and encourage the use of ISA in private vehicles; - Include ISA on any car club vehicles that aim to operate from a base within the borough. 	Noted. Speed related objectives covered by MTS 2b and MTS 1c.	See change under ref 12b

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
39	39a	Individual	Good analysis, let down by the absence of any meaningful targets. The delivery plan lacks sufficient detail to support the objectives.	Noted. More detail on schemes to be included in final LIP	See changes under ref 21a

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
39	39b	Individual	<p>Objectives - aspects disliked:</p> <p>Focusing on active travel:</p> <p>> Para 2.2.13: cycle routes along the riverside – the council has never enacted cycle track orders to legitimise cycling between Wandsworth Bridge and Lombard Road, despite placing S106-type obligations in every planning application to build a wide pedestrian & cycle route. If the Jubilee/ Cremorne Bridge proposal is honest, the CTOs need to be enacted with supporting, light engineering measures.</p> <p>> Para 2.2.20 Implement Quietways “taking into consideration local impacts” – the farce of Quietway 4 Magdalen Road suggests this needs revisiting. The council watered down the proposals to placate local NIMBYs and local Conservative members – specifically the zebra crossings – and Met Police and TfL safety reviews have resulted in further engineering measures being installed in line with the original design. The weak proposals for the Wandsworth – Teddington Quietway (Q21) rightly received a lot of criticism during their consultation. A key feature of the TfL Quietway schemes is low traffic streets, but not one street proposed by WBC for Quietway treatment has any filtering to stem through traffic. TfL has, rightly, now imposed a higher-quality threshold for cycling-related investments, and WBC will need to raise its game significantly to achieve the new standards.</p> <p>> Para 2.2.20 dockless bike hire – WBC’s selected provider, Ofo Bikes, have withdrawn from London. Maybe time to review strategy, and adopt a more positive tone with potential providers?</p> <p>> Para 2.3.6/ 2.3.7 / 2.4.6 cycling possibilities – good analysis, but no resulting actions. Feels like WBC is subcontracting the modal shift challenge to TfL on TLRN roads, while offering nothing itself on WBC-controlled roads. For example, there’s no proposal for a 2022 cycle network across the borough that satisfies today’s quality standards. Nothing is proposed for poor quality cycling blackspots, such as the west of borough around Putney and Roehampton. The cycle demand does fit with TfL TLRN (overlapping with the blue paint CS7 and CS8 routes) but there’s no request from WBC to TfL to upgrade blue paint to proper, safe segregation as we see in Central London. Good analysis, let down by vague proposals.</p> <p>> Para 2.3.13 – competition for road space, prioritising active travel and public transport. Surely, the objective should be to reduce the number of short-distance local journeys by private vehicle? You only need to look at traffic levels in school holidays to see the difference. Why won’t WBC explicitly state an objective to achieve modal shift?`</p> <p>>Para 2.4.7 supporting cycling with “other measures” – this paragraph is almost content free – what’s the proposal? (1) Example of cycle parking: in LIP2, the council</p>	<p>Do not agree with the thrust of this analysis and several points are inaccurate. The LIP includes objectives to improve cycling. The Council was pro-active in engaging with dockless bike providers to secure a scheme, and it is unfortunate that the operator has now withdrawn. There is a continuing role for bike hire and this is included in the LIP. Consultee suggests the LIP does not include an objective for mode shift, yet Objectives MS1-MS10 are all aimed at mode shift and the LIP includes a target to increase mode share on foot, by bicycle and by public transport.</p>	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
			<p>requested £50,000 for ten on-street bike hangers (from Cyclehoop) in 2013. After several years, the council finally installed just two, and the trial which should have concluded in 2018 is still ongoing. By contrast, other London boroughs have made far greater progress with LIP funds – Waltham Forest has over 300, neighbouring Lambeth has 100+. (2) Example of increased permeability by permitting contraflow cycling in one-way streets. Here too, WBC requested £30k/year in LIP2 for “consultations” starting 2014, of which only one took place, and a trial in five streets starting late 2018. By contrast, the City of London has permitted contraflow cycling in nearly all one-way streets, including 12ft wide medieval alleys. WBC is quite happy requesting LIP funds year-after-year, allegedly for planning, analysis and consultation, but delivering little. I fear this pattern will continue.</p>		

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
39	39c	Individual	<p>Delivery Plan - aspects disliked:</p> <p>The delivery plan does not deliver the objectives. The plan is almost entirely a restatement of existing initiatives, plus in Table 7 two rows of "FUTURE PROGRAMME" as a substitute for thinking of anything new. It's a really poor submission, and falls short of the imagination, ambition and detail provided in other boroughs' LIP3 submissions. For a borough that – under Conservative administration – claims a high standard of governance, it's a shoddy effort.</p> <p>Only Table 7 is worth any review, as the rest of the "Delivery Plan" is light on meaningful detail. Looking at specific initiatives from the perspective of active travel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Priory Lane, the council's consultation ended in February 2018, after the original proposal to committee was in Autumn 2015. When will the consultation report be published? Is it likely to placate cycling advocates who pointed out the proposal's many flaws? And, given the glacial pace at which the scheme has proceeded to date, will WBC really spend £122k in 2019/20 to build a high-quality solution? > Culvert Place – variants of this proposal to improve conditions for walking and cycling have existed since the council's first cycling strategy in 2007. What will be achieved by spending £75k in the next two years that hasn't in the last 10? > Garratt Lane corridor – will the improvements address the poor provision for cycling at the north end of the road on National Cycle Route 4 between the Ram Brewery and St. G's park? > Cycle parking – is this a commitment to rolling out Cyclehoop on-street hangers? After five years of dithering? How many on-street hangers will the council commit to up to the end of the LIP3 cycle in 2022? > Cycling schemes – where's the detail? This is really poor when compared to the submissions from other London boroughs which are far more specific about how funds will be requested and spent up to 2022. There's no detail here to support the analysis provided in paras Para 2.3.6/ 2.3.7 / 2.4.6. > School travel plan support/ safe routes to schools – how much of this will be targeted at independent/ fee paying schools within the borough? The state schools in Wandsworth generally have good mode shares and made progress towards reducing private motorised travel. However, the private sector schools are really poor e.g. planning applications submitted in last 3 years for several independent schools show 50%+ kids travelling by private car. The impact this has on Wandsworth streets – congestion and pollution – is clear, as is the relief when the school holidays start. > FUTURE PROGRAMMES – this is really poor by WBC. Every London borough has had 12+ months to prepare for LIP3, and most have been able to substantiate their asks for the 2019-22 period. This is basically as "give us money" request, and I hope TfL reject it and ask WBC to do some proper planning. 	<p>Disagree with this analysis.</p> <p>However further detail on schemes in the annual and three-year programmes will be included in the Final LIP.</p>	<p>See changes under refs 14s and 14t</p>

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
39	39d	Individual	<p>Final comments:</p> <p>Equality Assessment: I am really disappointed by the tone adopted in Table 5 page 24, which suggests that WBC, its officers and Conservative administration assume that people with impaired mobility/ disabilities do not ride bicycles. (Cycling schemes – adversely affected = disabled people). That’s untrue!</p> <p>If cycling schemes are designed well, they benefit all users – abled and disabled, 8-80 years old, and reduce dependence on motorised vehicles. It is wrong to assume that only fit, young people ride bicycles.</p> <p>Regarding Quietway 4, it is worth noting that the council ignored the views of disability advocates and the council’s own equality officer regarding the rebuilt Cats Back Bridge on Wandsworth Common. The council enforces bylaws asking all cyclists to dismount – including disabled/ mobility impaired cyclists – with the alternative route being on-road. This is not feasible for all mobility impaired cyclists, especially those using heavier non-standard bikes. While the council will claim that common sense is applied, the Quietway design and common bylaws arguably discriminate and should be reviewed.</p> <p>What’s puzzling about Table 5 is that WBC’s transport officers presumably work closely/are the same as those who prepared the Equality Assessment to accompany Richmond’s LIP3 submission, where the tone was slightly more positive. Why the difference between adjacent boroughs supported by a combined transport team? Other than political outlook?</p> <p>The council has established relationships with advocates for disability cycling, such as Wheels for Wellbeing. The transport team needs to reengage with them and learn.</p>	See comments on 11z.	See changes under 11z
40	40a	Organisation	<p>‘Wandsworth has a higher percentage of 25–40 year olds in its population compared to Greater London, and lower percentages in other age groups (Figure 2). This age group is heavily reliant on good rail and London Underground links to jobs and other attractions in central London.’ Many of these young people choose not to own a car and furthermore, many do not even bother to get a driver’s license, indicating that they have no intention of driving at all. Therefore, [ORGANISATION] believes it would be more beneficial for the council to frame it’s LIP towards non-car-ownership rather than to local and through-borough (commuters) drivers.</p>	Noted. The draft LIP is not framed towards local or commuter drivers, as evidenced by the targets and delivery plan.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
40	40b	Organisation	<p>Regarding surveys, residents appear to be almost equally unhappy with traffic congestion and parking, suggesting that they do not easily make the connection between their own use of vehicles and the problems they experience.</p> <p>If they walked, cycled or used public transport they would not suffer these problems (other than the noise, air pollution and perhaps bus delays of traffic congestion). We believe a wide-ranging educational program on the benefits of non-car ownership - financial savings, environmental benefits, health benefits and so on would be a worthwhile first step in changing mindsets towards to the Healthy Neighbourhoods/Safe Streets thinking as expertly set out by the campaign group, Living Streets https://www.livingstreets.org.uk</p> <p>Actually reducing car ownership across the borough from current levels by 2041 would be more ambitious than the Mayor's hope that numbers would shrink relative to the population (but not actual shrinkage in numbers). We believe that in a relatively near future the only cars on our streets should be car club/share electric vehicles and eventually, when the technology is reliable, driverless taxi-vehicles which could quickly and conveniently ferry people on journeys that could not be made by foot, bicycle or public transport.</p>	Noted. The LIP includes targets for mode shift to walking, cycling and public transport. It also includes targets for an absolute reduction in traffic levels and the number of cars registered in the borough.	None
40	40c	Organisation	<p>Brighter Borough for All: Low council tax - may not necessarily be the best approach. Many residents surveyed in Thamesfield during the 2018 council elections campaign, told us that they would be prepared to pay more for better services. 'Cleaner, green and safer neighbourhoods' - to be welcomed 'Help to get on in life'very vague and wide-ranging - how?</p>	Comment relates to a summary of the Council's "Brighter Borough for All" approach. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies.	None
40	40d	Organisation	<p>The Corporate Business Plan 2018 has, in the main, laudable ambition but is missing the essential thread of the MTS which is to reduce road use by vehicles and make streetscapes places predominantly for active travel and where vehicles are present, for them strictly adhere to the 20mph limit with regular Copenhagen-style crossing, giving precedence to pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>In [ORGANISATIONS]'s view appointing a single 'healthy streets champion' to reduce street clutter and create pocket parks across the whole borough would be minimally effective in achieving the Mayor's concept of Healthy Streets.</p>	Comment relates to a summary of the Council's Corporate Business Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies. The LIP does include traffic reduction and adoption of the Healthy Streets approach in full.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
40	40e	Organisation	<p>Active Wandsworth Strategy:</p> <p>essentially ambitious aims with additions to</p> <p>F3.5 we would welcome a network of segregated cycle lanes but 'investigating and supporting funding options' makes this a distant vision. Could existing CIL monies not be used for this?</p> <p>F3.6 to add safe bicycle storage on every residential street at regular intervals/as requested by residents (as per the council's 2013 Cycling Strategy)</p>	<p>Comment relates to a summary of the Active Wandsworth Strategy (not "Active Travel Strategy"). It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies.</p>	None
40	40f	Organisation	<p>Air Quality Action Plan:</p> <p>All points very worthwhile but how are they going to be followed through? Ambitions, targets, progress, transparency is needed.</p> <p>Again, no specific mention here of actively pressing residents in direction of reducing car ownership and use.</p>	<p>Comment relates to a summary of the Air Quality Action Plan. It is not the place of the LIP to replace or supersede other council plans or policies.</p>	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
40	40g	Organisation	<p>2.3.2 Headline modal share increase to 82% of all trips made in WW by 2041 to be active travel (walked, cycled or public transport) is enthusiastically welcomed and supported.</p> <p>2.3.5 Cycling mode share increase of 50% on previous LIP is misleading because it is so very low to begin with at 2.7% (2006-9), increasing to 4.2% (2014-17).</p> <p>2.3.6 With only 37,200 of the 400,000 potential daily cycle trips in WW currently being made, the actions required to increase cycle mode share needs to be very ambitious to reach this target. An extensive network of safe cycling routes, quiet-ways, segregated cycle lanes, Copenhagen crossings on busy roads and two-way cycling on one-way streets should all be part of the strategy to achieve it.</p> <p>2.3.13 'One of the key challenges in delivering the mode share targets is managing the competing demands of the street' is exaggerated in our view. With the majority of cars removed from many town centre streetscapes, they become areas spacious enough for pedestrians, shoppers and people relaxing in community spaces full of greenery as well as for cyclists and sympathetic cycle parking. Buses moving regularly along roads at 20mph stopping at Copenhagen crossings and the occasional electric delivery van would be an integral part of this ideal vision. There are many examples around the world in progressive cities such as Copenhagen and Ljubljana. Wouldn't it be wonderful if Wandsworth could be as visionary as this? https://citiesintransition.eu/publicatie/11998</p> <p>2.3.16 To Achieve Objectives of Modal Shift. MS9 [ORGANISATION] enthusiastically supports ambition to 'reduce mode share of private motorised traffic, including through the use of technology and innovation' which we assume to mean EV car clubs and driverless vehicles</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>We do not consider this misleading. There is no attempt to disguise that the mode share started from a very low base.</p> <p>Noted. NB the total number of potentially cycleable trips is not a target; the target is for 82% of all trips to be on foot, by bike or by public transport by 2041. The LIP includes schemes which will feature some of these suggestions.</p> <p>Disagree. Even in the type of space described, there are still competing demands from people travelling by different modes, as well as providing space for deliveries and public transport.</p> <p>Noted. In some cases there will be innovations not yet thought of.</p>	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
40	40h	Organisation	<p>2.4.12 The challenge of reducing absolute numbers of KSI deaths could be more easily met by reducing the absolute numbers of vehicles on the roads.</p> <p>Figure 14 Chart of KSI Casualties in Wandsworth 2016</p> <p>Comment: the high (and increasing) 39% P2W casualties could drastically be reduced by legislation that restaurant delivery riders must use pedal bicycles or electric bicycles. This would make their journeys only slightly slower but much safer for the riders and pedestrians crossing streets they use. It would also reduce the noise and air pollution around our busy town centres and residential streets, as well as reduce carbon emissions. It would also mean that delivery riders are not continually breaking the law and presenting a danger to cyclists by using bicycles-only barriers, an offence which is rarely ticketed and which the council is currently unable to enforce due to funding cuts and therefore lack of traffic-enforcement officer power. It would be an interesting exercise to do regular speed check on residential streets on motorbike riders in particular to check if the 20mpg speed limit is being adhered to. In our view, motor-cycle delivery riders are an increasing local problem, for all the reasons listed above.</p>	<p>Noted. The LIP includes traffic reduction.</p> <p>It is not for the LIP to propose or create new legislation, but Objective MTS 4e could be revised to clarify inclusion of local deliveries within the term "freight transport"</p>	<p>Revise Objective MTS 4e to clarify inclusion of local deliveries within the term "freight transport"</p>

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
40	40i	Organisation	<p>2.4.18-22 We welcome reducing the dominance of motorised traffic on our streets, with reference to traffic on the main arterial roads as well as local streets and also car ownership (resulting in parked vehicles on residential streets).</p> <p>2.4.23 Car clubs - fully endorse and support, as long as they are EVs, using electricity generated from renewable/green energy sources for re-charging</p> <p>2.4.24 CPZs - would request council to introduce tiered charging dependent on number of vehicles in household, as in many other LAs across London and UK. Also, with dropping car ownership, it seems fair and reasonable that 'parking' spaces on every street should be kept free at regular intervals for safe, lockable Bicycle Hangers. Many cyclists are challenged to store their bikes in small front gardens, inside their houses, or up many flights of stairs in flats, all of which disincentivise people from cycling regularly.</p>	Points noted. The council already charges a higher rate for a second resident parking permits at an address.	None

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
40	40j	Organisation	<p>Air Pollution presents the greatest risk to our health than any other element of our street environment. All our lives are shortened to some degree from breathing our toxic air. The shortened lives translate to 9,000 annual premature deaths across London. We must be more ambitious in all targets and all areas to reduce air pollution to safe levels well before 2041. Our air quality breaks EU legal safe limits and despite three high court actions, the government is not taking urgent, decisive action to bring it down. Our politicians are failing to provide us with safe air to breathe - a basic human right.</p> <p>Regular Car Free Days - especially on September 22 World Car Free Day - are an easy win here and should be introduced across Wandsworth fun carnival-atmosphere days of empty streets, families out enjoying a new community space, popup cafes, front garden cultivating and chatting, musicians busking...the possibilities are endless with imagination! With a few car-free days people will begin to realise they might just be able to do without one especially when the benefits are so obvious.</p> <p>All the transport-related actions of the MTS and the WW LIP will contribute to reducing levels of NO2, particulates and other toxins so, so course [ORGANISATION] supports all of these actions wholeheartedly.</p> <p>[ORGANISATION] would like to see much more mobile, real time testing of air pollution levels on all busy roads to build up a picture of where Clean Air Zones - timed restrictions to road traffic to reduce AP - are most needed. The streets around our schools, hospitals and doctors' surgeries should be particularly monitored and protected.</p> <p>[ORGANISATION] also supports the Mayor's staged expansions of the ULEZ and endorse the position of eventually seeing it expanded out to the M25 as soon as reasonably possible. We understand the Council's concern of possible issues around the boundary of the South circular from 2021 but encourage a positive collegiate relationship with the Mayor to investigate and overcome any potential issues, for the health and wellbeing of everyone living in Wandsworth, either side of the boundary.</p> <p>2.4.34 Electric vehicles are, with no doubt, preferable to those powered by fossil fuel. But we believe that mass EV ownership will repeat many of the existing problems - particulate matter from tyre/road friction, similar numbers of car accidents and KSI casualties, traffic congestion from equally-large hunks of heavy metal trailing down our roads and parked outside our houses. And there is the huge factor of inbuilt carbon emissions from the mining of the metal and production of the vehicle and possibly shipping it from abroad. This carbon cost takes many years of green motoring to offset. So the roll-out of EV charging points across the borough, in our view, is a good initiative but the encouragement of car clubs/sharing and discouraging of car ownership should be more emphasised.</p>	Points noted. Further detail on schemes will be provide in the Final LIP.	See changes under refs 14s and 14t

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
			<p>2.4.36</p> <p>MTS4b AP monitoring especially of 5 focus areas - Putney, Wandsworth, Tooting, Clapham Junction & York Road - must be regular and transparent and be followed up with urgent preventative action if levels are dangerously unsafe. Council should work with other campaign groups such as Living Streets, Mums with Lungs, Little Ninja, The British Lung Foundation, The British Medical Association, the Putney Society etc as well as with the Kings College London Air Quality Network who measure air (lack of) quality across the borough.</p> <p>MTS4g The council should be overly ambitious in its plans for tree-planting. Trees are Nature's carbon sequesters and an easy, cheap and low tech solution to absorbing carbon and sifting particulate matter, as well providing habitats for biodiversity - microbes, insects, fungi, birds and small mammals - in the middle of our great city. They also make our parks more beautiful places to be as well as make us humans happier!</p>		

Consultee Ref	Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Discussion	Proposed Amendment to LIP
40	40k	Organisation	2.4.41 Managing bus frequencies depending on patterns of demand is [needed] in order to avoid unnecessary congestion, use of vehicles and fuel.	Noted; Objective MTS 5b covers this issue	None
40	40l	Organisation	Other Mayoral Strategies: 2.4.57 We are pleased that these have influenced the LIP, in particular the Culture Strategy, which aims to encourage a shift away from a nightlife dominated by alcohol consumption to one with a strong element of artistic and cultural activity and the encouraging and appreciation of public art projects.	Noted	None
40	40m	Organisation	3.8.1 Overarching Mode Share AIM and Outcome Indicators We welcome the LIP guarantee to monitor progress on all elements of the MTS as required by the Mayor and TfL, using assessment data to be supplied on-going by TfL and as detailed in Table 9. We request that this information is made accessible and transparent to all residents on the council website. 3.8.2 Delivery Indicators Again, we welcome the guarantee to provide annual reports to TfL and request that this information is made accessible and transparent to all residents on the council website.	Noted. The council will consider how best to publish this information on its website. Much of the data belongs to TfL so this will need to be agreed with them. See above - similar comments apply.	None
40	40n	Organisation	[ORGANISATION] also provided its comments on the MTS	These are comments on the MTS and therefore not for the Council to respond to.	None
40	40o	Organisation	Negative impacts of LIP: Cannot be absolutely sure, as covers long time scale to 2041	Noted	None