

## Consultation responses (except TfL & Barnet Cycling Campaign)

Respondent	Response / summary of response
Individual #1  Resident (East Finchley)	<p>Firstly I would like to welcome and support the growing importance and prominence that is given to the promotion of walking and footpaths within the document. I think this is a good step forward. The draft delivery plan contains a number of ideas which support walking in the borough including items 1, 11,12, and 14 which are all extremely valuable. The definition of a strategic walking and cycling network is innovative and helpful and can be used as the basis on which to increase walking as a transport mode when combined with the other ideas around footpath improvements, the development of footpath guides, walking apps, and promoting linkages and improvements in the footpath network to connect schools, places of work and assembly, town centres, tube stations and bus stops.</p>
	<p>One addition that I would like to see included in the final LIP submission to the Mayor is the inclusion and production of a “<b>Rights of Way Improvement Plan</b>” Such a document, which is a statutory requirement, would be a productive way to assist in the delivery of the items included in the Delivery Plan and would set the strategic direction for improving footpath and walking conditions in the Borough over the longer term. A number of boroughs such as Hillingdon, have already produced such documents. It is good to see the Borough taking walking as a transport mode seriously both for health, work and leisure/recreation purposes.</p>
London Borough of Enfield - officer response	<p>Please note that having reviewed Barnet's draft LIP (at officer level), we welcome the London Borough of Barnet's plans to improve air quality, reducing car dependency, and enabling more Londoners to walk and cycle. As a neighbouring authority in outer London, we accept this presents challenges as we share some similar concerns in implementing the Mayor's Transport Strategy in the London Borough of Enfield</p>
	<p>We support proposals for joint working to try to address shared challenges such as pollution concerns on roads that link the boroughs, specifically the North Circular Road, and look forward to building on the good relationships that we already have in place.</p>
20's Plenty for Us	<p>We would like to thank you for the opportunity to respond to your LIP3 draft Local Implementation Plan. These comments come from the group 20's Plenty for Us and focus broadly on the proposed strategies around Road Danger Reduction and more specifically the Vision Zero policies as set out in the Borough</p>

20's Plenty for Us (cont)	<p>Transport Objectives C. To seek to achieve the Vision Zero ambition of zero Killed or Seriously Injured Road Traffic Casualties by 2041. While there is an understanding that, as you outline in the Introduction, Barnet has specific issues around car dependence and the difficulties of increasing mode share for the “active modes” of transport, the focus of the strategy on just three elements of a Vision Zero programme of a) Education, b) some improvements in junctions and c) a very piecemeal approach to lower speed limits feels like a (wholly) inadequate response to the policy framework set out by TfL in its Vision Zero Action Plan (VZAP) and fails to embrace it in any meaningful way. The lack of analysis of casualties in the borough in the plan around Outcome 2 is extremely regrettable with no consideration being given to the measures that will be credible and effective in relation to the collisions that occur on A roads that pass through the town centres. At the very least a map of casualty locations (by borough roads, TLRN and HA) would have been helpful. It is also regrettable that the extent of the road danger to pedestrians is not acknowledged with Barnet having the fourth highest number of serious and fatal pedestrian casualties (61) in 2017.</p>
	<p>The Vision Zero Action Plan from TfL has a very clear focus on how road casualties can be reduced in relation to Safe speeds, Safe vehicles, Safe streets and Safe behaviours. Safe speeds in particular is a focus on the Vision Zero Action Plan but there is little mention of this in this document. We understand that Barnet has been sceptical about the role of lower speed limits to date but we would point out that the Vision Zero Action Plan identifies speed as playing a part in 37% of all serious and fatal casualties and there is almost nothing in the strategy that relates to addressing vehicle speed. We would argue that, in Barnet not every borough managed road is appropriate for a 20mph speed limit BUT a) many communities in the borough have demanded lower speeds over many years and b) many residential roads and street and streets where people and vehicle mix are appropriate for lower speeds limits. While the introduction of lower speeds limits in themselves will only make a small difference to average speeds, they do make a difference AND allow other things to occur to increase compliance with the lower speed limits. These include elements from all of the headings set out in the Vision Zero Action Plan as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safe Streets. In those areas where lower speed limits are introduced, streets can then be designed for lower vehicle speeds. With main roads this will be along the</li> </ol>

20's Plenty for Us (cont)	<p>lines of the Healthy Streets guidance and could include: the removal of centre white lines when resurfacing occurs, narrowing and raising the entrances to side streets to require drivers and riders to manoeuvre more slowly and other devices to increase compliance with (lower) speed limits. For residential roads this may involve the use of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods to reduce road danger at source (<a href="https://londonlivingstreets.com/low-traffic-neighbourhoods-two-new-guides/">https://londonlivingstreets.com/low-traffic-neighbourhoods-two-new-guides/</a>) and reduce the impact that fast moving through traffic has on residential areas.</p>
	<p>2. Safe vehicles. The plan has nothing to say about this. There is, however, a wide range of existing and emerging initiatives that the Council can implement to reduce the danger that vehicle pose. One of the most significant of the emerging technologies relates to the uptake of intelligent speed adaptation (ISA) which following successful trials by TfL in 2015 is being adopted on all new buses from this year onwards. Indeed by 2022 all London buses will be fitted with mandatory ISA (with the roll out of ibus2). As this technology offers such benefits to increasing compliance with (lower) speed limits we would suggest that Barnet incorporates some/all of the following into its policies for Safe Vehicles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopting ISA in its own fleet procurement practices as part of its renewal programme;</li> <li>• Ensuring ISA is a standard requirement for any service procured by the Council with a fleet requirement;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Encouraging the uptake of ISA in other fleets, such as hauliers, construction firms and coach operators;</li> <li>• Working with the insurance industry and vehicle manufacturers to promote and encourage the use of ISA in private vehicles;</li> <li>• Include ISA on any car club vehicles that aim to operate from a base within the borough.</li> </ul>
	<p>Safe Behaviours. The issue of enforcement of traffic laws does not appear in the strategy even though it is a significant element of the VZAP. Although police resources are stretched, the police have committed to a significant investment in improved enforcement as part</p>

20's Plenty for Us (cont)	<p>of the Vision Zero Action Plan and there are other opportunities afforded by proposals for an enhanced Safety Camera programme – again there are many borough managed roads in Barnet with high numbers of casualties which could be candidate locations for higher levels of enforcement. Also absent is any mention of Community Roadwatch which puts the monitoring of vehicle speeds into the hands of the community in terms of the nominations for locations with this work undertaken in conjunction with the Metropolitan Police.</p> <p>We understand that Barnet is in a difficult position in relation to a successful approach to Vision Zero for a number of factors. The plans outlined in this strategy are, however, simply not credible in relation to the task ahead in relation to the issues that pedestrians and the communities in the borough face in relation to traffic domination and road danger and casualties. We would urge you to address these issues face on and, at the very least, embrace some of the approaches set out in the VZAP in a more wholehearted way.</p>
Ramblers Association	<p>I am responding on behalf of the Ramblers to the consultation on the draft Local Improvement Plan. We welcome the emphasis that is placed on walking in the Draft Delivery Plan on pages 62 to 64, in paragraphs 1, 11, 12 and 14. The encouragement of walking both for leisure and commuting to work is central to our aims.</p>
	<p>I see from the supporting commentary for the annual programme on page 89, that item 1 “<b>Define borough-wide strategic walking &amp; cycling network and improvements needed</b>” is to be delivered or part delivered during 2019/20.</p> <p>This borough is lucky to have a large network of historical routes for pedestrians that supplement the road network, along with other urban alleys. Walking on a footway that is <b>not</b> beside a road is a pleasanter experience, reducing exposure to pollution caused by traffic fumes and the risk of accidents. This network of urban routes should therefore be central in defining a borough-wide walking network.</p> <p>It would be a great help if the Borough had all the urban footpaths recorded on the Definitive Map of Rights of Way (as has been required since the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981) so that the entire network of routes available to pedestrians is clearly recorded and protected. As a part of this work, the Borough could also take the opportunity to prepare a Rights of Way Improvement Plan (a statutory requirement under section 60 of the CROW Act 2000).</p>

Ramblers Association (cont)	<p>I therefore suggest that an additional item is added to the Delivery Plan to “Record footpaths not associated with roads as Rights of Way on the Definitive Map as part of a Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Barnet</p>
	<p>Ramblers volunteers would welcome the opportunity to help in identifying the walking routes and which of them may be suitable for shared use with cyclists</p>
Barnet Society	<p>We understand the London Borough of Barnet has to prepare a Local Implementation Plan (LIP) giving their proposals to implement the Mayor’s Transport Strategy. Barnet’s draft LIP sets out its long term goals and transport objectives for the next 20 years. Included in this draft LIP are several items in respect of walking and footpaths and it is this area the Barnet Society welcomes the opportunity to comment.</p>
	<p><b>The Barnet Society Supports the following parts of LIP3</b></p> <p>We are very concerned that footpaths could be under threat if they are not identified on the Definitive Map of Rights of Way by 1<sup>st</sup> January 2026 and therefore we strongly support those elements on the plan that enhance walking provision and establishing the footpaths. These are described in the Delivery Plan Table 5 (pages 61-73) which support walking including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define borough-wide strategic walking and cycling network and improvements needed, including aspirations for networks serving Copthall, West Hendon and Dollis Valley.</li> <li>• Develop walkable neighbourhood plans for areas of the borough exploring links between home and work, schools, transport nodes, leisure activities and identifying small interventions that will make walking a more attractive option in the future.</li> <li>• Targeted improvements to public footpaths and strategic walks such as London Loop, Capital Ring, Dollis Valley Walk and Pymmes Trail.</li> <li>• Develop/Refresh walking publications and make available via an app, electronically or on paper: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Historic Walking Guide</li> <li>2. Circular Walks and linking routes from stations to London Loop, Capital Ring, Dollis Valley Walk and Pymmes Trail and others.</li> <li>3. Prepare and publish footpath guides based on 20 minute walk times from each of the Borough rail and underground stations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested additions to the LIP3</b></p>

Barnet Society (cont)	<p>We also ask that you include in the Delivery Plan a "Rights of Way Improvement Plan" (ROWIP). This is a statutory requirement (Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 section 60 and should be funded through the LIP. It should be a commitment to update the Definitive Map of Rights of Way to include urban as well as rural footpaths. Urban footpaths have to be included on the Definitive Map following the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981.</p> <p>The Barnet Society thinks the production of a Rights of Way Improvement Plan would provide a useful tool and assist the Council to deliver the aims identified above in the Delivery Plan.</p> <p>When the existing footpaths are clearly identified it will show the historic network of existing paths that the Council already has and on which it will be possible to build a modern walking network containing links to new transport hubs, places of work, schools, places of assembly etc and thus help achieve the overall goal of 80% of trips being on foot, by cycle or public transport by 2041.</p>
Individual #2  Resident (High Barnet)	<p>The objectives are brave, but the proposed solutions are weak. There seem to be several principles that would be useful:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To encourage any shift in travel modality, the alternative has to be easy and safe.</li> <li>2. If people are to walk, cycle or use public transport any gap or change in perceived or real safety will render the whole project far less effective.</li> </ol> <p>So to recap: easy and safe - and easy and safe in <b>EVERY</b> part of the route.</p>
	<p>I take your point about the diffusion of the area meaning the car will remain in use more than in central London - so the objective has to be to get those who are close enough, and willing, to walk or cycle. This means that the roads will flow better for those who simply have to drive - and perhaps an integration with public transport might bring those numbers down too.</p>
	<p>So, for public transport, I agree with your analysis that we need more east west orbital routes. I don't know enough about procurement and planning to give any advice, but braver aspirations would be more powerful.</p> <p>For walking, always think of school children and the aged. My wife does walk our children to school and she has to cross the A1000 at Hadley Green where there is no zebra crossing. Then she has to cross from the green to the Church, again with no crossing. As our</p>

Individual #2  Resident (High Barnet) cont...	<p>children grow, there is no way we can let them cross on their own.</p> <p>So the principle is, if you're making the school routes more palatable for walkers, make sure you address the whole problem. Any gap will kill the project.</p>
	<p>For cycling, I often cycle into London and around the borough. The Dollis Valley cyclepath way is pleasant, and I'm pleased its there. But there are gaps in it all over the place, and if I want to go a different way the roads are murderous. And that's literal. I've been cycling for over 45 years, I follow the rules, always have lights on and yet have been knocked off, attacked, chased. This is unacceptable and has nothing to do with how I cycle, and everything to do with the public perception of road ownership and entitlement.</p> <p>It's also true that cycling along the Dollis Valley adds around 9 to 10 minutes to my journey. I work in N12 and cycle from EN5. Going down the A1000 is fast and direct, but unpleasant and dangerous. Dollis Valley is more pleasant and safer, but my trip takes me 24 minutes against 15 on the A1000.</p> <p>If you look at the cycling provision in the borough it is disgraceful. Patchy, incomplete, badly maintained. If you saw a road network like that you'd be horrified by its fragmentation. Walking routes are trickier to analyse as they follow the roads, but I think the same analysis would come from them, a transport system that is centred on the car.</p>
	<p>That's the paradigm shift that needs to be reached. We all need cars, and some need to use them more than others. But many people would happily walk and cycle more if it felt less like a third-rate choice, less like being left to skirt round the edge of a vehicle based road system.</p> <p>I hope you can make some changes to make a real difference to the provisions for walking and cycling in the borough, but they must have higher aspirations to make anything like the difference you're aiming for.</p>
Individual #3 (address unspecified)	<p>I think more could be done in the LIP for safer cycling.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) In particular more safe spacing is needed on the roads not footways.</li> </ol> <p>Cyclists are forced to ride near the curb where roads are often in worst repair, potholes and large cracks in the highway.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2) More Quieter Neighbourhoods please. Enfield has 36.</li> </ol>

Individual #3 (cont)	<p>3) Park routes are fine in LIP but lack ambition.</p> <p>4) Healthy Streets improvements for buses should also cater for cycling</p> <p>5) More Advanced Stop Lines (ASL) would be beneficial for cyclists and safer</p> <p>6) Restrict car speeds to 20mph for all residential areas</p>
Individual #4  Resident (High Barnet)	<p>As someone who's been a keen walker since an early age, I've been looking at the draft LIP, dated October 2018, from that particular perspective, and I'm very glad to see the Council giving so much attention to walking, and note that the words walk(s)/walking appear 38 times in it. However when the document is examined in detail it reveals what appears to me to be a significant lack of balance - in the LIP "walking" is seen mainly as a functional means of getting from A to B using streets - which is great as far as it goes and is, of course, to be encouraged. But that's only a part of the story, and the LIP is very weak when it comes to off-road footpaths and walking as a leisure activity. The evidence for this assertion lies not only in the sparsity and, frankly, the low quality of what the document does say, but also in what it doesn't say about walking, most particularly about rights of way, which don't rate even a passing mention, which I find very odd</p>
	<p>Whilst the words street(s)/on-street/off-street appear 89 times, the words path(s)/footpath(s) appear only 4 times, (and that's in a 110 page document! Need I really say any more ...?) The draft LIP doesn't even pay lip service (no pun intended) to walking off-road, along not only the footpaths and bridleways in the greener parts of the Borough, but also along the very many urban alleys and footpaths. Whilst it does mention the long distance routes such as the London Loop, it completely misses out this huge network of local footpaths which in total vastly exceed the lengths of all the long distance route through the Borough combined. The use of all these footpaths should feature much more prominently in the LIP, to complement the references to the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (Page 21) as well as the Council's ambition "to make ... walking more attractive for leisure, health and short trips" (Page 20), and their use is something to be encouraged as both a healthy and enjoyable exercise in its own right</p> <p>At Page 89, the draft reads: "The following proposals are expected to be delivered or part delivered</p>

Individual #4  Resident (High Barnet) cont...	<p>during 2019/20 ... Define borough-wide strategic walking ... network and improvements needed..."</p> <p>Taken in the context of the rest of the document, this "strategic walking network" would appear to have been conceived as something which sits alongside the rail, underground, and bus networks i.e. directed principally at the means of getting around the Borough. There is, of course, absolutely nothing wrong in that as far as it goes: the problem is that the proposed strategy doesn't seem to relate to, or to include, a strategic network of footpaths. [If I'm misreading this part of the draft, and the intention is, indeed, to include footpaths, this should be explicitly spelt out.]</p>
	<p>The Borough does already have a readily-available borough-wide walking network - it's the Definitive Map and Statement (DMS), which is the Council's statutory record of all the rights of way on foot (and on horseback, though this doesn't feature that much in Barnet), and this covers many of the local footpaths referred to above, but it has been completely ignored in the LIP. Why?</p> <p>The DMS should be the starting point for the development of the borough-wide strategic walking network as envisaged in the LIP, and furthermore any "strategic" network such as this will need to link in to those of neighbouring authorities, and there appears to be nothing whatsoever in the document to reflect that, either.</p>
	<p>Right now Barnet Council's DMS is a hugely undervalued resource, and the key to exploiting that resource is for Re to do what would appear to be included in its contract with the Council, and put a copy on the Internet, and this is something which should be funded though the LIP (if no funds are otherwise available). Having online access to this would play a significant rôle in encouraging more people to walk more, which is avowedly what the LIP envisages the Council doing.</p>
	<p>Furthermore, the DMS would be even better still if the Council were to pull its finger out and meet its statutory obligation under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to keep the DMS under continuous review. (There's plenty of evidence of the Council's failure to meet this statutory obligation, which has happened under all administrations since this provision came into effect in 1983.) Directly related to this point is the Council's failure to meet another of its statutory</p>

<p>Individual #4 Resident (High Barnet) cont ...</p>	<p>obligations, this one under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 to draw up a Rights of Way Improvement Plan, which should have first been prepared by November, 2005 at the very latest, and should by now already have had its first review (the Act requires the Plan to be reviewed no more than 10 years after its initial preparation, i.e. by November 2015 at the very latest). Given the Council's long term failure to meet even its statutory obligations, and the fact that rights of way don't receive even a single mention in the LIP, it's very difficult to take at all seriously the very little that the LIP does say about footpaths and walking as a healthy leisure activity, and the Council's commitment to this.</p>
	<p>At Page 64, the draft LIP reads "Develop / refresh walking publications and make available via an app, electronically and in paper format:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic walking guide</li> <li>• Circular walks and linking routes from stations to London Loop, Capital Ring, Dollis Valley Walk, Pymmes Trail etc</li> <li>• Prepare and publish footpath guides based on 20-minute walk times from each of the Boroughs Rail and underground stations"</li> </ul> <p>The idea of a historic walking guide is to be welcomed, though there are some issue with the other two bullet points.</p>
	<p>Firstly, if the Council wants to encourage more people to make more use of these circular routes and footpaths, as the LIP explicitly states that it does, it also needs to explain how to reach them by bus as well as by train and underground, the stations of which are far too widely separated to serve as the only means of getting there and back by public transport.</p>
	<p>Secondly, I would guess that the majority of residents of the Borough would need to walk more than 20 minutes in order to get to and from a rail or underground station in the first place (i.e. 10 minutes each way). To suggest that they will then choose to make a journey by rail or underground for the sole purpose of a walk of as little as 20 minutes at the other end strikes me as ludicrous in the extreme.</p>
	<p>You can't be serious! When it comes to rights of way, footpaths and walking for leisure, the Council is hugely under-ambitious as far as the LIP is concerned, and also as far as the funding</p>

Individual #4 Resident (High Barnet) cont ...	<p>which it could potentially bring in, and none of what the draft does say seems to have been thought through by anybody who has any idea of what they are talking about, or can even be bothered to get the names of the long-distance paths right - it should be the "Dollis Valley GreenWalk" and the "Pymmes Brook Trail". And one wonders whether the people who wrote this stuff have ever even been for a walk in the Borough ...?</p>
Individual #5 (address unspecified)	<p>Document arguing to have "Transport for London not fund the replacement of two bridges over Dollis Brook in Barnet's Local Implementation Plan (LIP)", and for Barnet to "not replace these bridges, but rather to spend some funds on maintenance".</p> <p>This expresses the concern that pedestrian only paths are being converted to shared pedestrian and cycle paths without consideration of pedestrians or the areas they pass through.</p>
London Borough of Brent	<p>Brent Council welcomes the objectives of the LIP3 and are pleased that the objectives align with the identified key transport issues for our borough, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Support for improved orbital transport links across the borough and between outer London centres to provide wider access to employment opportunities and to enable journeys currently made by car to be made by sustainable forms of transport; and</li> <li>ii. Improve public transport accessibility, support the expansion of bus and rail services and, support increased bus priority to deliver more reliable, faster and more accessible public transport services;</li> <li>iii. Improvements along the A5 being the boundary road to our two boroughs.</li> </ul> <p>This reflects the significance of an improved public transport offer to encourage more residents to travel more sustainably more often in the context of Outer London and aligns with Brent Council's identified priorities and objectives of further regeneration on both sides of the A5.</p> <p>The Council, therefore, whilst encouraged to see reference to improvements along the A5 borough boundary road. We would support the inclusion of the reference of increased partnership working along the A5. This strategic road needs to have joined up thinking to ensure both Barnet and Brent get the maximum benefits from initiatives and schemes proposed along it.</p>

London Borough of Brent (cont)...	<p>Brent Council would like to see reference to the A5 corridor study which we have been speaking with TfL and Barnet officers.</p> <p>Brent Council notes that whilst the Brent Cross Rail Freight Facility will reduce lorry movements across London, the acknowledgement by Barnet Council to the increase in localised lorry movements without 2 reference to measures to mitigate them is a concern and needs to be addressed. Mitigation measures need to be included in the delivery plan for the rail freight facility.</p> <p>Brent Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss these matters further, and would also welcome updates on the progression of the Barnet Council's Local Implementation Plan and accompanying delivery plan for both short to medium and long-term interventions.</p>
---	---