

Response ID ANON-H5U8-WXVS-2

Submitted to **Hounslow's Transport Strategy (Local Implementation Plan 3)**

Submitted on **2018-12-31 17:49:30**

Introduction

1 What is your name?

Name:

Hounslow Green Party

2 What is your email address?

Email:

victoriageorge@blueyonder.co.uk

3 What is your post code? If you are answering on behalf of an organisation, please provide your business post code.

Post-code:

TW8 8PY

Local Implementation Plan 3

4 Do you agree with the objectives we have set for LIP3 in chapter 2 and under each of the nine outcomes? Please use the text box below to detail any changes you may like to see.

Partially

Agree with vision and objectives?:

In general, the LIP does not make enough reference to the climate change emergency. The October 2018 IPCC report 'Global Warming of 1.5°C' says that an unprecedented scaling-up of efforts to cut greenhouse gases is needed to prevent catastrophic climate change. The LIP does not reflect the urgent need for radical action. For example, the target of 71% journeys to be 'active travel' or public transport by 2041 is not strong enough. A better target would be that by 2030, 100% of all journeys are zero carbon, that is with all car/van journeys being electric and less than 20% of all journeys made, and for this 20% to decrease relative to those made by active travel or public transport by 2041. This target would require much stronger measures to disincentivise higher-emission vehicle ownership by residents, and for through traffic, with decisive action by the council starting immediately.

The LIP makes the assumption, both for acquisition of funding and for planning purposes, that expansion at Heathrow is definite (P.48). If the council's position remains "better not bigger" then the LIP should outline an alternative vision based on a zero expansion scenario, along with the council's plans and reasons for opposing expansion.

Little reference is made to how noise from traffic and aircraft affects the population of Hounslow. Particularly in the light of revised guidelines on noise from the WHO (environmental noise guidelines for the European region Oct 2018), more consideration of this aspect is needed, for example in relation to the positioning of new buildings near main roads, and the effect of noise on learning in schools.

5 LIP3 describes a number of transport challenges faced by the borough. From the list below, please pick your top 4 challenges.

ranking of challenges - Air quality:

1

ranking of challenges - Congestion on the roads:

2

ranking of challenges - Road safety:

ranking of challenges - Inconsistent quality of cycle / walking network:

3

ranking of challenges - Accessibility of highway network for mobility or sight impaired people:

ranking of challenges - Capacity on public transport / overcrowding:

4

ranking of challenges - Lack of cross borough public transport routes (orbital links):

ranking of challenges - Accessibility of public transport (including cost):

ranking of challenges - Lack of Electric Vehicle Charging infrastructure:

ranking of challenges - Volume of HGV's on the road:

Please use the comments box below if you have any further comments on the transport challenges, or have others to suggest? :

The London Environment Strategy has tougher air pollution limits, in line with WHO guidelines, than are used in Hounslow's current Air Quality Action Plan, which uses EU standards. If the LIP is to align with the London Environment Strategy, then it must express greater urgency to cut Pms (particulate matter) from buses, HGVs and private cars in addition to NO². The council must continue to press for the whole of Hounslow to be included in the ULEZ.

Outcome 1 should more explicitly support CS9, including supporting the proposed route along Chiswick High Road rather than diverting to the A4. Chiswick High Road is so congested and so poorly served by bus-only lanes that CS9 must be an improvement both in terms of air quality and public transport efficiency. Hounslow should be firm in its support for this route.

1F puts greater emphasis on education than on engineering schemes as the way to increase cycling. In fact, the risks for cyclists from other traffic are all too real, and so the emphasis should be on proper provision, ie. separating cyclists from other traffic as well as education and training.

The Hounslow Priority Cycle network is a positive initiative but does not go far enough. There should be a commitment to the MTS target that 70% of residents should live within 400m of a strategic, high-quality route. It appears that there are many areas, such as in Osterley and Feltham, where this will not be the case.

'Severance' as a disincentive to walking is mentioned many times, particularly in relation to the A4. However, the current speed limit of 40mph is not discussed, despite this being a major factor in terms of safety and air pollution for pedestrians and cyclists along this road. Many of the side roads intersecting with the A4 have inadequate crossings, which, in combination with the speed of traffic, make cycling along the off-road cycle path alongside the A4 hazardous, and walking, even from bus stops on school journeys, unsafe for children.

Extra 'severance' created by new developments is not considered in the LIP. Many are 'gated' or have a perimeter fence. The planning permission process should actively discourage this and instead demand the provision of ways through for walkers and cyclists as a default position.

The differentiation between the relatively cheap cost of running a car compared with rail travel continues to be a major problem particularly for commuters. The LIP notes that many commuters travel by car through the borough, and also notes the council's lack of control over this. However, putting pressure on government in relation to train fares as compared to petrol is within its control and should be included as a worthwhile part of the LIP.

6 Reducing car use is a key part of the new Mayor's transport strategy, and the council is required to reflect that within our own policy document and projects. What do you think are the main things the council could do to help you reduce your car use and support more trips being made by sustainable modes?

comments on how LBH might help consultee reduce car use:

Step up the provision of car clubs to make this a genuinely convenient alternative to car ownership across the borough.

Increase provision of secure cycle parking, at stations, linking in with bus routes and near local shops. Also provide secure cycle parking near people's homes, especially blocks of flats.

Do everything within the council's power to enhance the timescale and certainty of funding for the new train links Southall to Brentford and Willesden Junction to A4/Syon, and put pressure on providers to increase frequency of Sunday train services.

Travelling by bus would be a much more attractive option if bus routes were less congested by private cars (often single-occupancy) blocking the road. The introduction of more bus-only lanes would solve this problem, and if in the short term they increased congestion, this would in itself help discourage private car use. The target of 11.5 mph for buses by 2041 is totally inadequate, and Hounslow could get much closer to achieving 15mph if more radical measures were introduced to actively discourage private car use.

Clarify timescales and coverage of 20mph limits on Hounslow's roads, and push for 30mph maximum on larger and TFL roads.

Ensure adequate public transport provision to sports facilities and parks, particularly given the obesity problem in the borough. For example, there is no public transport access to Gunnersbury Park and its new major sports centre. The only bus service to the park is the E3, serving Ealing, Acton and Chiswick. Hounslow people have to walk, and many have to cross A4 as part of that walk. There are plenty of other examples like this across the borough. Driving to parks and sports centres can only be curbed through good transport and safe walking routes.

Local Implementation Plan 3

7 What is the one issue in your area that you would like us to prioritise in the strategy?

Any changes to the objectives set out?:

For Hounslow to set a target of net zero emissions from transport by 2030 in recognition of the global climate change emergency.

8 Would you recommend any changes to the LIP3 delivery plan (Chapter 4)? The delivery plan sets out the main transport schemes and initiatives we are proposing to progress between 2019 and 2022 funded by the Transport for London annual grant. Details of longer term projects and other funding sources are also included. A link to the three year TfL funded programme is available here:

Comments box:

That is is checked for compatibility with Hounslow's forthcoming climate change strategy and with housing plans.

In reference to Appendix J:

'targeted casualty reduction schemes to be identified following review of casualty data': This is disappointing as the only direct reference to road safety schemes.

Pedestrians tend to avoid dangerous roads with poor crossings and often drive along them instead. Not all hostile roads that need improved safety schemes are captured through casualty data. All dangerous roads where there are public facilities like schools and/or workplaces and homes need safe crossings and safer speed limits.

A feasibility study and one priority cycle route to be completed in the 3 years appears unambitious, and the low funding compared with cycling education and training is questionable.

Similarly, the weight given to new/enhanced bus lanes does not appear adequate to meet the need to seriously prioritise bus reliability. It is tangible measures like bus lanes and segregated cycle routes which are really going to change behaviour, and Waltham Forest's scheme (circa £30million) is an example of this.

9 Do you have any other comments about our draft transport strategy you would like us to consider?

Additional comments?:

We would be grateful for some feedback on our comments. We take (unpaid) time and trouble to respond to consultations and give our views in good faith and in the spirit of co-operation. It would be encouraging to know that they have been given consideration, even if the council is not always able to turn them into action. Thank you.

Equalities information

10 What is your sex /gender?

Not Answered

11 What is your age?

Not Answered

12 What is your ethnicity?

Not Answered

13 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

14 If your answer to the previous question was yes, please indicate the type of disability which applies to you. People may experience more than one type of disability, in which case tick all types that apply. If your disability does not fit any of these types, please specify 'other'.