

10. Consultation

General

- 10.1 Barnet Council regularly undertakes Public Consultation exercises on specific issues of concern to the community or about how we manage and deliver our public services. We try to get as broad a range of views as possible. And the following paragraphs set out some of the ways this is achieved.
- 10.2 We consult with representatives from community organisations and the Barnet Civic Network. (The Civic Network brings together organisations that represent the full range of local communities to think through key issues for the future of the Borough.)
- 10.3 We also have our own Citizen's Panel to help us gauge the opinions and comments of residents. The panel is made up of 1,000 Barnet residents, selected to be representative of the adult population of the whole borough – based on ward, age, gender, ethnicity, socio economic status, employment status, housing tenure, faith and disability.
- 10.4 The panel helps to obtain an accurate picture of Barnet residents' views. Services use the panel to find out residents' views on various aspects of council services, their concerns about living in Barnet and their perception of the council and any other aspect that may affect residents.
- 10.5 The Community Plan, which sets the overarching agenda for the Borough is developed by Barnet's Local Strategic Partnership. As well as public sector organisations such as the Council, the Health Service and the Police, the LSP also provides a forum for the private, voluntary and community sectors to directly influence the strategic direction of the borough at the highest level. North London Chamber of Commerce, Brent Cross shopping centre, Barnet Voluntary Services Council and Barnet Multi-Cultural Community Centre (which represents groups from a range of cultures) are among the organisations represented.
- 10.6 Barnet Voluntary Services Council (BVSC) worked with the Council and Barnet Volunteer Bureau to develop the Voluntary and Community Sector Compact. This provides a framework for joint working between the sector and the Council and recognises the contribution the sector makes to development of local policy and delivery of services.
- 10.7 This Compact includes a Code of Practice on consultation and communication with the Voluntary and Community Sector to ensure the benefits of the consultation are maximised, and not neutralised by "consultation fatigue" caused by duplicate and inappropriate consultation. Consultation with Voluntary and Community groups regarding the detailed development of schemes follows the principles laid out in the Voluntary and Community Sector Compact. Groups are consulted about issues that are relevant to their members, where they can genuinely influence the decisions made.

- 10.8 For example, in North Finchley where a new high specification de-cluttered footway and improved pedestrian crossing facilities are being delivered the scheme has been prepared by consulting and involving the wider community by establishing a focus group which includes local disabled groups.
- 10.9 Barnet has recently carried out a Best Value Review of transport which has also informed the LIP. This included consultation with the Citizens Panel and an external challenge event involving representatives from a range of organisations including BVSC, the Federation of Residents Associations in London Borough of Barnet (FORAB), the Barnet Borough Senior Citizens' Forum and Barnet Community Transport.

Local Implementation Plan consultation

- 10.10 The Council has prepared its Local Implementation Plan (LIP) to comply with the requirements of Sections 145 & 146 of the GLA Act 1999. This requires us to prepare a plan setting out how we will implement the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) in the borough and submit it to the Mayor for his approval. The Mayor may only approve a borough's LIP if it is consistent with his strategy and adequate for the purpose of implementing the strategy.
- 10.11 Under Section 145 of the GLA Act boroughs are required to consult with:
- The relevant Commissioners(s), (Metropolitan Police Service and City Police);
 - Transport for London;
 - Such Organisations representative of disabled people as the council considers appropriate; and
 - Each other London borough whose area is likely to be affected by the plan.
- 10.12 The Metropolitan Police Commissioner is the relevant Commissioner for Barnet, and Disability Action in the Borough of Barnet (DAbB) are considered and appropriate organisation representative of disabled people.
- 10.13 In addition the LIP guidance issued by TfL recommended that consultation also be carried out with:
- The Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEP) and London Ambulance Service representatives;
 - The Highways Agency;
 - Network Rail and the SRA (involving TfL's London Rail business), where appropriate;
 - Local Mobility Forum, or equivalent and other equality target groups;
 - Representatives of business, local environment, transport and community groups; and
 - Neighbouring Local Authorities (for outer London boroughs).
- 10.14 The Strategic Rail Authority is being abolished so it was not considered appropriate to formally consult with them.

- 10.15 Business and the voluntary and community sectors have been heavily involved in setting the strategic priorities for the borough and have recently provided input to the Transport Best Value review. Therefore to limit 'over-consultation' in accordance with our code of practice for consulting with the voluntary and community sectors, it was not considered appropriate to include a wide range of local groups in the Full LIP consultation.
- 10.16 However the London Transport Users Committee (LTUC) and Barnet Community Transport specifically asked to be consulted and they were therefore included in the consultation as organisations representing or having knowledge of issues affecting public transport users, equality target groups and community groups.
- 10.17 Consequently formal consultation on the Consultation Draft LIP was carried out with:
- Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police
 - Transport for London
 - DAbB – Disability Action in the Borough of Barnet
 - London Borough of Enfield
 - London Borough of Haringey
 - London Borough of Camden
 - London Borough of Brent
 - London Borough of Harrow
 - London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)
 - London Ambulance Service
 - The Highways Agency
 - Network Rail
 - Hertfordshire County Council
 - Hertsmere Borough Council
 - London Transport Users Committee (LTUC)
 - Barnet Community Transport
- 10.18 The Statutory Consultation on the Consultation Draft LIP commenced on 29 July 2005 and finished on 30 September 2005. During this period the document was also made available for public information on the Council's website.
- 10.19 All schemes, plans and proposals contained within the LIP will be subject to appropriate levels of consultation and Member agreement during their detailed design and implementation.
- 10.20 Consultation responses have been received from the following, and are summarised in the next section:
- Police
 - Transport for London
 - London Borough of Camden
 - London Ambulance Service

- The Highways Agency
- Hertsmere Borough Council
- London Transport Users Committee

10.21 Although not statutory consultees, and therefore not detailed here, the Countryside Agency and the Green Party have also provided helpful comments.

LIP consultation responses

Respondent	Summary of response	Revisions made / Comments
Police	<p>Proposed action in table 6.4 to continue to monitor accident data and carry out site visits in conjunction with Police suggests the involvement of the Police beyond the current post-fatal-collision site visits undertaken. Suggests that unless an extension of current practice is proposed would be more accurate to reword this.</p> <p>Would welcome the chance to carry out site visits prior to deployment of the five mobile vehicle activated signs mentioned at 6.54 with the possibility of joint enforcement and education initiatives at these sites that could be co-ordinated through the local casualty reduction forums.</p> <p>At 6.65 ask that, in addition to referring motorcyclists to the BMF, also consider referring motorcyclists to the Bikesafe scheme and include this in the LIP. Whilst the Bikesafe scheme is not a training scheme it aims to improve rider skills and therefore reduce casualties through education.</p> <p>Support and agree with statement in 6.9, valuing the multi-agency partnership working and look forward to putting this into practice in the future.</p>	<p>Table 6.4 amended to reflect Police comment.</p> <p>Action included to consult with Police on VAS sites.</p> <p>Action included to refer motorcyclists to Bikesafe where appropriate</p> <p>Noted</p>
TfL	Extensive detailed comments on all areas of the LIP.	TfL's assessment of the LIP will lead to a recommendation to the Mayor regarding whether the LIP is approvable. Consequently significant additions and revisions have been made to address

Respondent	Summary of response	Revisions made / Comments
		the issues raised by TfL in order to provide an approvable LIP.
London Borough of Camden	<p>“Despite the boroughs’ common boundaries there have been few cross-boundary issues in the past, but would expect that the liaison and cooperation that has taken place in the past on schemes where there may be a cross-boundary impact will continue in the future. From the schemes listed in Table 5.1 none stand out as of any concern to LB Camden.</p> <p>Current potential projects include possible traffic proposals for the Ranulf Road area (the vast majority of which lie in Barnet), and I trust that you feel that the liaison arrangements around the major traffic diversions which are likely to arise from the reconstruction of Kilburn Road bridge are adequate.</p> <p>It has been suggested locally in the past that a coordinated project for the Cricklewood Town Centre would be of benefit. Whilst Camden is responsible for only the east side of the southern margins we would be happy to take part in any project here. We have said the same in our response to LB Brent.”</p>	Noted
London Ambulance Service	No ‘corporate’ comment to make. Draft plan passed to local management team to invite their comments especially with regard to ‘priority routes’ for emergency services and other local issues.	No further comment received from LAS. At a local level consultation and coordination with all the emergency services with regard to ‘priority routes’ is currently ongoing, as well as liaison over local issues.
The Highways Agency	The Highways Agency’s interest relates to the motorway and all purpose trunk road network that it	Study for the M1/A5/A41 corridor may have an impact on the M1. However this study would

Respondent	Summary of response	Revisions made / Comments
	<p>manages on the Secretary of State's behalf. In the case of Barnet this directly relates to the M1 motorway and indirectly to the M25 and A1.</p> <p>The Agency would be concerned about any policy or proposal that would adversely impact on the M1 in terms of additional traffic, but cannot see anything in the consultation version of the LIP that would do so.</p>	necessarily involve consultation with the Highways Agency in developing any proposals.
Hertsmere Borough Council	<p>Re: cycle map on page 18 of the main document. The map currently does not include an off-road cycle link from Barnet to Hertsmere via Edgwarebury Lane, one of the key links in the proposed network of Hertsmere's Watling Chase Greenways Project. Would like to see this route included.</p>	Cycle map revised to include this and other off-road links that had been omitted.
London Transport Users Committee	<p>“i) Schemes We would like to have read more of actual schemes, projects and programmes, at least in the early years, planned to be delivered flowing from Barnet's policies and proposals.”</p>	Further details now incorporated

Respondent	Summary of response	Revisions made / Comments
London Transport Users Committee (cont)	<p>“ii) Streets for people. We would like to see this as an overarching agenda - our streets are not just places to travel through and park cars, but the space where we, and our children, walk, play rest and do business. The Committee has adopted a transport hierarchy with pedestrians at the top then cyclists, public transport users, etc – private, non essential, vehicles at the bottom.</p> <p>The Committee very much supported the Jan Gehl/TfL/ Central London Partnerships approach, <i>Towards a fine city for people</i>, to incrementally improve our streets to favour pedestrians, cyclists, bus users and amenity, thereby creating a better balance between traffic and people.</p> <p>In terms of your LIP we believe this will mean wider footways, better pedestrian crossings (informal and formal located on desire lines), slower speeds, removing obstacles from footways (including guard railing) and selective streetscape improvements. Associated streetscape improvements should be part of all schemes.”</p>	<p>The following schemes and information has been included in Barnet’s LIP to address the streets-for-people policy area.</p> <p>Regeneration creating Street-for-people</p> <p>Colindale has been identified as part of phase two of the Mayor’s programme for 100 public spaces. The council will continue to work with the regeneration partners in the area to ensure that enhancements are made to the public realm and walking environment.</p> <p>Barnet’s transport vision for Cricklewood, Brent Cross, and West Hendon includes improvements to the pedestrian and cycling environment, new and improved public transport and better integration between modes. The pedestrian strategy for the area is based around the Brent River Walkway and new High Street, which will act as a pedestrian spine linking public transport with new urban squares and residential areas.</p> <p>Schemes that improve street for people</p> <p>Local Safety Schemes address many of the pedestrian accident ‘hot-spots’. These schemes seek to improve pedestrian crossing and overall transport user safety.</p> <p>Signal timings at junctions will be analysed and establish whether a pedestrian phase could be introduced. This will allow the borough to consider</p>

Respondent	Summary of response	Revisions made / Comments
		<p>the impact on traffic movements that a pedestrian phase may have, and what improvements could be made (either physical or timing based) to make pedestrian movements more convenient.</p> <p>In 2005/2006 £1m of prudential borrowing is being spent on footway maintenance mainly targeted at pavements in Town Centres with North Finchley Town Centre being identified as the first Town Centre for major repairs at an estimated cost of £500k. Council will use this opportunity to remove obstacles from footways and improve the overall streetscape.</p>

Respondent	Summary of response	Revisions made / Comments
London Transport Users Committee (cont)	<p>“iii) One-way systems and roads. These are very problematical in all sorts of ways to bus passengers, cyclists and walkers. For bus passengers they extend journey time, confuse passengers and often do not pass passenger objectives. They encourage higher vehicle speeds and so endanger and discourage cycling and walking. They create a poor walking environment and cause community severance. If there are such systems and roads in Barnet (I write generally without local knowledge) we would like to see a policy statement seeking to remove them and proposals to tackle them.”</p>	<p>One-way streets and one-way systems, whilst present in Barnet, are generally small scale and not a major feature of the streetscape.</p> <p>The comments provide by LTUC include some of the draw-backs of such systems. While these are valid in the general sense, given the multiplicity of demands on our streets, there will also be benefits of such systems (most obviously to traffic flows) in some instances.</p> <p>Recent work in North Finchley has re-introduced two-way traffic on a road that was formerly one-way, and regeneration proposals in West Hendon also involve work to permit the removal of a one-way system.</p> <p>However the Council takes the view that a specific policy to remove or ‘tackle’ one way streets would not be appropriate in Barnet’s situation and that decisions regarding the future introduction or removal should be made, taking into account all available information (both disadvantages such as LTUC mentions as well as potential benefits) based on the conditions that apply locally.</p>

Respondent	Summary of response	Revisions made / Comments
	<p>“iv) Managing demand The Committee welcomes Barnet’s Parking Plan policies insofar as they acknowledge the need to ‘lock in’ or enhance the benefits of controlled parking zones by price and permit allocation.</p> <p>We would like to see policies that recognise the issue of congestion/road user charging as a necessary part of the mix of solutions to tackle traffic growth and congestion in the medium to long term across the borough and wider area.”</p>	<p>The Local Implementation Plan is a document that addresses the short to medium term. Consideration has been given elsewhere (through the Council’s Best Value Review of transport) to the appropriateness of congestion charging and/or road user charging in the borough in the long term.</p> <p>There is widespread support for the concept that road pricing may be the only viable long term solution to transport problems both within London and nationwide. However a key issue is that it should be progressed in a way that will minimise adverse, differential effects that may be encountered through piecemeal implementation. This effectively requires a nationwide or at minimum a region-wide scheme.</p>
London Transport Users Committee (cont)	<p>“v) Footway Parking. The Committee opposes footway parking. The disabled and visually impaired have enough difficulties navigating the footways. Too add yet more obstacles onto the footway will make travel for this group of vulnerable users more difficult. Where demand for parking exceeds supply the Committee supports the rational management of parking by permit and price – controlled parking zones.”</p>	<p>London Borough of Barnet does not generally condone footway parking. However many areas of the borough are characterised by particularly wide footways, even though carriageways may not be wide. In some instances residents have parked on the footway for many years believing that margin strips in block or bituminous macadam had been provided for this purpose.</p> <p>As set out in the Parking and Enforcement Plan it is recognised that in some cases this parking could be safely accommodated, and that formalising it may be a more appropriate response than penalising residents. The decision whether it is appropriate to formalise footway parking in certain areas will</p>

Respondent	Summary of response	Revisions made / Comments
	<p>“vi) Bus priority. Barnet’s policies seem to confuse bus priority with improving the flow of all traffic. There appear no actual bus priority schemes proposed, even in the early years of the plan. This is disappointing as the Committee believes that without improving bus priority, buses will become less attractive thereby lessening the opportunity for modal switch away from the private car to buses. We believe there should be a greater emphasis on the reallocation of road space to bus priority. We would like to see policies and programmes to review loading and waiting controls on bus routes, giving priority to buses over stationary vehicles.</p> <p>The committee recently identified route 263 as a particularly problematic route. There was an issue with the access to Barnet and Chase hospital. We recommend that the local authority, TfL and the hospital study the access road. We also noted that illegal and inconsiderate parking at bus stops was adding to delays and would therefore welcome more enforcement.”</p>	<p>depend on a range of issues and local circumstances, including how busy the area and what other demands exist. However maintaining access for pedestrians and especially for disabled people, will be an essential requirement.</p> <p>Further information expanding on the reasons for Barnet’s approach now incorporated in Chapter 3.</p> <p>Bus priority schemes are included in both the draft and final LIP. Development of these schemes in conjunction with other LBN agencies results in a flexible programme. However proposals for route 263 among others are included for the programme.</p>

Respondent	Summary of response	Revisions made / Comments
	<p>“vii) Bus stop accessibility. The LIP is not as supportive as we would wish with respect to bus stop clearways. These are an absolute requirement if buses are to be able to sensibly approach and pull away from kerbs such that those with disabilities etc can board buses easily. Bus stop clearways should be of London Bus Initiative standard. The problems of bus lay-bys are well rehearsed. We would like to see policies and proposals to fill in bus stop lay-bys, if they exist in Barnet, as part of you bus stop accessibility programme.”</p>	<p>The Council has set out a programme to make, where practicable, all bus stops fully accessible. With limited funding available, the bus stop accessibility programme will be prioritised according to volume of passenger movements and other local factors – for example stops near hospitals or other facilities with higher than usual volumes of passengers who would benefit from accessibility measures. The exact measures used will be appropriate to the individual circumstances. The provision of bus stop clearways or removal of lay-bys may be necessary in some instances to ensure accessibility, but decisions about the exact measures used in will be taken based on their appropriateness to the individual circumstances.</p>
	<p>“viii) Rail station access. The Committee would like to see all Barnet’s stations, identified and assessed with a view to implementing improved access for the sustainable modes and by the disabled.”</p>	<p>The proposed audit of walking routes to WAGN stations has been expanded both in terms of geography and modes of travel that are covered. The audit will now cover all national rail stations outside the regeneration areas.</p>
	<p>“ix) Supporting town centres. We would like to see the LIP identify all of Barnet’s district and local centres and markets with a view to implementing improved access for the sustainable modes and by the disabled.”</p>	<p>Revisions have been made to the LIP to strengthen information provided on Barnet’s planned improvements to town centres. The LIP now contains a summary of information on planned and completed works within all of Barnet’s town centres. These works included footway resurfacing, carriageway resurfacing, directional signs, various local safety schemes, CCTV as well as work associated with the lighting PFI.</p>

Respondent	Summary of response	Revisions made / Comments
	<p>“x) Consultation. Consultation and engagement is essential, but so too is the implementation of good transport schemes based on policy and the wider public interest. The Committee would like to see a strategy to consult with all street users including those that pass through, not just frontagers, and to give due weight to the wider public interest and to those that do not respond to formal consultation. This is vital if a balanced and informed view is to be arrived at rather than a referendum of frontagers.”</p>	<p>Barnet’s approach to consultation as described earlier in this chapter is far wider than “a referendum of frontagers”. However with regard to the detailed impact of individual schemes the views of frontagers are likely to be an important part of the whole.</p>