

# **Draft Mayor's Transport Strategy Statement of Intent**

**Statutory consultation with the London Assembly  
and the Greater London Authority Functional  
Bodies and informal consultation with  
stakeholders, other organisations and the public**

## **TfL'S REPORT TO THE MAYOR ON CONSULTATION**

September 2009

Version 6

## Table of Contents

|   | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION.....  | 3           |
| 2. TFL'S ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES FROM THE FUNCTIONAL BODIES ..... | 13          |
| 3. TFL'S ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES FROM STAKEHOLDERS.....           | 19          |
| 4. NEXT STEPS.....  | 48          |

**APPENDIX 1: LIST OF RESPONDENTS TO THE CONSULTATION**

**APPENDIX 2: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION FROM THE  
FUNCTIONAL BODIES AND STAKEHOLDERS**

**APPENDIX 3: STATEMENT OF INTENT CONSULTATION QUESTIONS**

**APPENDIX 4: PROPOSED STATEMENT TO THE ASSEMBLY CHAIR**

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 Overview and purpose of this Report**

- 1.1.1 The Mayor of London has decided to produce a new Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS), which is the principal policy tool through which the Mayor exercises his responsibilities for the planning, management and development of transport in London. The development of this strategy has been delegated to Transport for London (TfL), although the Mayor retains responsibility for the approval of the documents consulted upon. TfL has also been delegated responsibility for undertaking the necessary consultation exercises.
- 1.1.2 The Mayor is required to consult the London Assembly and the four Functional Bodies (the London Development Agency, the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority, the Metropolitan Police Authority and TfL) before undertaking wider consultation. The Mayor is also under a duty to consult with the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA). The first phase of consultation, with the Assembly and Functional Bodies lasted eight weeks, and it will be followed by a wider public and stakeholder consultation, lasting 13 weeks, to commence in autumn 2009.
- 1.1.3 For the first phase of the consultation, TfL, on behalf of the Mayor, produced a draft MTS Statement of Intent (the "Statement of Intent"), which set out the guiding principles and broad policy statements for the development of the new MTS. This was consulted on with the Assembly and Functional Bodies in summer 2009. In addition, a number of other bodies were informally consulted over this period as pre-engagement to the statutory public and stakeholder consultation, planned for autumn 2009.
- 1.1.4 TfL has considered the consultation responses received from the Assembly, the Functional Bodies and the stakeholders who responded to the consultation. This report is TfL's analysis of the responses from the Functional Bodies, Olympic Delivery Authority and stakeholders. It highlights the key issues raised in these responses and addresses briefly how these have been considered in the development of the draft MTS. The Assembly's response is dealt with in the statutory Mayor's Statement to the Assembly Chair (see Section 1.5 below). Copies of all the responses to the consultation have been made available to the Mayor.
- 1.1.5 In parallel, the Mayor has also consulted the Assembly and Functional Bodies on Statements of Intent for a draft Economic Development Strategy (EDS) and London Plan.

### **1.2 Formal consultation with the London Assembly and Functional Bodies**

- 1.2.1 On behalf of the Mayor, TfL conducted a consultation on the Statement of Intent from 18 May 2009 to 13 July 2009, with the London Assembly and with the four GLA Functional Bodies, namely: the London Development Agency (LDA), Transport for

London, the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) and the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA). In addition, the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) was consulted, in line with the Olympics legislation.

- 1.2.2 At the start of the eight week consultation, TfL distributed the Statement of Intent to the 25 members of the London Assembly, the Chairs and Chief Executives of the GLA Functional Bodies, and the Chairs and Chief Executives of the ODA and GLA Commissions. The covering letter from the Mayor of London described the consultation process and invited consultees to contact TfL for further information or to request a meeting. It also provided details of how to obtain a copy of the Scoping Report for the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) which is being carried out on the draft MTS.
- 1.2.3 Consultees were invited to frame their responses around six questions contained within the Statement of Intent. These are listed at Appendix 3 and form the structure of Chapter 3 of this report.
- 1.2.4 The Assembly Transport Committee questioned Daniel Moylan (Deputy Chairman of TfL), Kulveer Ranger (Director for Transport Policy, GLA) and Michèle Dix (Managing Director Planning, TfL) on the MTS Statement of Intent on 26 May 2009. TfL offered a briefing to the Committee prior to the publication of the Statement of Intent which was not taken up. There was a meeting of the full Assembly to question the Mayor on the development of the MTS and also the London Plan and EDS on 22 July.
- 1.2.5 Formal responses were received from the following:
  - London Assembly (whose response was delegated to its Transport Committee)
  - Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA)
  - London Development Agency (LDA)
  - Transport for London (TfL)
  - London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)
  - Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA)

### **1.3 Informal consultation with stakeholders and pre-engagement activity to inform the development of the draft MTS**

- 1.3.1 The consultation on the Statement of Intent was primarily intended for the Assembly and Functional Bodies, in accordance with the Mayor's duties under the GLA Act. However, in order to raise awareness of the development of the strategy, and provide an opportunity to pre-engage in advance of the later phase of the statutory consultation with public and stakeholders, TfL contacted by email a wider group of stakeholders at the start of the consultation. These included the two GLA Commissions (London Health Commission, London Sustainable Development Commission), the London boroughs, London TravelWatch, Visit London and London's economic and regeneration partnerships, disability and mobility

organisations, transport and environment organisations, community representative organisations and business representative organisations.

- 1.3.2 The email described the approach taken in the Statement of Intent. It outlined the dates and process for the Assembly and Functional Bodies consultation and highlighted that there would be a further public and stakeholder consultation later in the year. It also indicated that the Statement of Intent could be downloaded from the TfL website and gave details of how to obtain a copy of the Scoping Report for the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA).
- 1.3.3 The email also invited a number of these stakeholders to attend briefings on the issues raised in the Statement of Intent and the development of the draft MTS. While these meetings mostly took place during the period of consultation on the Statement of Intent, their principal focus was the development of the draft MTS, and in effect they were pre-engagement for the public and stakeholder consultation which will take in autumn 2009. These meetings were hosted by TfL but some included representation from GLA and LDA officers to enable attendees to consider the initial proposals for the London Plan, EDS and MTS in an integrated way, and to make best use of people’s time. As indicated above, the consultation on the Statement of Intent was primarily intended for the Assembly and Functional Bodies, although the Statement was publicly available and a range of other organisations, members of the public and businesses also responded.
- 1.3.4 In addition, TfL engaged the London boroughs on the development of the draft MTS through London Councils and the sub-regional partnerships. TfL provided briefings and presented at London Councils and sub-regional partnership meetings. Five workshops were also held for the boroughs on the second round of the Local Implementation Plans (LIPs), setting the policy context for the draft LIPs guidance and process.
- 1.3.5 In total, 97 responses to the consultation on the Statement of Intent were received. This included 71 responses from stakeholder organisations, which are listed in Appendix 1. The table below sets out the numbers of responses received, by type of organisation.

| <b>Respondent Type</b>                                 | <b>Number of responses</b> |
|--|----------------------------|
| Assembly, GLA Functional Bodies and ODA                | 6                          |
| London Boroughs  | 22                         |
| London political representatives (eg Assembly Members) | 3                          |
| Transport and environment representative               | 9                          |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Business representative organisations/<br>Economic and regeneration partnerships | 9         |
| Non Departmental Public Bodies   | 4         |
| GLA Commissions  | 2         |
| Aviation / motoring organisations  | 4         |
| Local health/ community representative   | 1         |
| Partnerships   | 2         |
| Disability and mobility organisations  | 2         |
| Other  | 7         |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>71</b> |

1.3.6 In addition, TfL received a number of responses by letter and email from members of the public, businesses and other organisations, as set out in the table below:

|                     | <b>Number of responses</b> |
|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Public              | 6                          |
| Businesses          | 16                         |
| Other organisations | 4                          |

1.3.7 The Statement of Intent was published on the GLA and TfL websites at the start of the consultation, and paper copies were sent out on request. By publishing on the web, rather than printing and distributing large numbers of hard copies, TfL was able to reduce costs and environmental impact. Additionally, this reflected that, for the first phase of consultation, the consultation was primarily intended for a relatively small group, namely the Assembly and Functional Bodies. The Statement of Intent could be downloaded as a pdf from: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/11610.aspx>

## **1.4 TfL's Report to the Mayor and the structure of this report**

1.4.1 In accordance with the GLA Act 2007, the Mayor must have regard to any comments submitted in response to this consultation by the Assembly or any of the Functional Bodies. This Report is TfL's analysis of the responses received from the Functional Bodies (together with the ODA) for consideration by the Mayor, and full copies of the

responses have also been made available to him. The response from the London Assembly will be considered in a separate Statement from the Mayor to the Chair of the Assembly (see Section 1.5 below), which is issued alongside this report

- 1.4.2 Chapter 2 of this Report considers the issues raised by the Functional Bodies and the ODA, and provides a TfL response to these, considering the comments from each body in turn. The comments made by the Functional Bodies and other stakeholders as set out in this Report have been used by TfL and the Mayor in the development of the draft MTS. There will be further consultation with stakeholders and the public on the draft MTS in autumn 2009, at which time the Assembly and Functional Bodies will also have the opportunity to make further comments.
- 1.4.3 This report also describes the responses received from other key stakeholders who sent in a response to the informal consultation.
- 1.4.4 Chapter 3 summarises the issues raised by stakeholders, and sets out a brief TfL response to the most commonly-raised issues, including how these have been considered in the development of the draft MTS. The Mayor is under no statutory obligation to have regard to the responses submitted to the informal consultation. However, given the Statement of Intent was publicly available and a range of stakeholders, other organisations and members of the public responded to the consultation, these responses have also been considered. Copies of all these responses have been made available to the Mayor.
- 1.4.5 The structure of Chapter 3 reflects the six questions set out in the Statement of Intent (see Appendix 3), but also identifies those issues beyond the scope of the questions which were most often raised by respondents. Question 6 is organised by the six themes as set out in the Statement of Intent. These were:
- Supporting population and employment growth
  - Providing a better quality of life for all Londoners
  - Ensuring the safety and security of all Londoners
  - Improving transport opportunities for all Londoners
  - Tackling climate change
  - Delivering the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games

## **1.5 The Mayor's Statement to the Assembly Chair**

- 1.5.1 The GLA Act 2007 governs how the Mayor responds to the Assembly. It requires the Mayor to submit a written statement to the Chair of the Assembly prior to undertaking the public and stakeholder consultation on the draft Transport Strategy. This must identify which of the Assembly's submitted comments are accepted by the Mayor for implementation in the strategy and which are not, and must set out the reasons why any comments so submitted were not accepted.
- 1.5.2 The statement to the Chair of the Assembly (including the Assembly response) is set out in Appendix 4.

- 1.5.3 This statement will be submitted to the Assembly Chair prior to the publication of the draft MTS for public and stakeholder consultation. It will be available to the public on the GLA website.

## **1.6 The legislative framework for the Mayor's Transport Strategy**

- 1.6.1 The legislative framework for the MTS is specified by the GLA Act 1999 as amended by the GLA Act 2007. The Act sets out the general transport duties of the Mayor and the GLA. The MTS is required to contain policies and proposals as to how the Mayor will discharge his general transport duty to promote and encourage safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport facilities and services to, from and within Greater London.
- 1.6.2 The MTS must also contain the Mayor's proposals for providing transport that is accessible to mobility-impaired people. Mobility issues will be addressed in the Accessibility Plan, which will be incorporated into the draft MTS.
- 1.6.3 It is a statutory requirement that the Mayor, in preparing or revising any of his eight statutory strategies, must have regard to the need to ensure that it is consistent with each of his other statutory and non-statutory strategies. In addition, the GLA Act also requires the Mayor to have regard to the need to ensure that the new MTS is consistent with national policies and with such international obligations as the Secretary of State notifies to the Mayor.
- 1.6.4 In preparing the MTS, the Mayor must also have regard to:
- Equality
  - Planning out crime and disorder
  - The use of the Thames for passengers and freight
  - The resources available for implementation

and the GLA's principal purposes of:

- Promoting economic development and wealth creation in Greater London;
- Promoting social development in Greater London;
- Promoting the improvement of the environment in Greater London.

and each of the following on the four statutory cross-cutting themes:

- The health of persons in Greater London;
- Health inequalities between persons living in Greater London;
- The achievement of sustainable development in the UK;
- Climate change prevention and mitigation, and the consequences of climate change;

## **1.7 Background to the development of the new Mayor's Transport Strategy**

- 1.7.1 The first Mayor published his Transport Strategy in July 2001 ("2001 MTS"), with a 10 year timeframe, and this strategy has been successful in helping to drive the delivery of an improved and better integrated transport system in London. Limited revisions to the 2001 MTS were made in 2004 to provide for the implementation of the Western Extension to the Central London Congestion Charging Zone. Further revisions were made to the MTS and to the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy in July 2006 to allow for the introduction of a London-wide Low Emission Zone.
- 1.7.2 However, there remain major challenges for transport in London which cannot be adequately addressed within the current Strategy. A number of significant events have also occurred since the 2001 MTS was published including the successful bid to host the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, Parliament's approval for the commencement of work on Crossrail, the implementation of the Public Private Partnership for the renewal of the Underground and the election of a new Mayor in May 2008.
- 1.7.3 The MTS builds on TfL's ten-year Business Plan as published in November 2008, which sets out funded projects in the short and medium term, and the government's High Level Output Strategy for railway investment and service improvements for the period 2009-14 (HLOS 1). TfL will publish an updated Business Plan in late autumn 2009.
- 1.7.4 The Mayor set out his principles for the development of the new MTS in the consultation document, Way to Go! Planning for Better Transport, published in November 2008, namely:
- Respecting choice
  - Keeping people Informed
  - Developing outer London
  - Connecting transport and planning
  - Working with the Boroughs
  - Providing transport for all
  - Delivering value for money
- 1.7.5 The Statement of Intent built on these principles and also reflected the Mayor's intention to take a new approach to strategic transport planning for London. This looks beyond transport outputs to the outcomes for London as a city and understanding London's transport needs and priorities in a wider spatial context. To this end, the development of the new MTS has been closely aligned with the development of other Mayoral strategies, in particular the London Plan.
- 1.7.6 The Statement of Intent has formed a framework for developing the new MTS. It outlined, at a high level, potential policies and proposals which could be developed further in the new strategy. Primarily, it allowed the Mayor to invite and consider the views of the Assembly, Functional Bodies and ODA on key issues, but it also

enabled integration with the development of the Mayor's spatial strategy and economic development strategy.

## **1.8 The 'Strategy for London' / The Mayor's Vision for London: The London Plan, the Economic Development Strategy and the Outer London Commission**

- 1.8.1 The new MTS is being developed in parallel with the revision of the London Plan (the Mayor's spatial strategy for London) and that of the Economic Development Strategy, using a shared evidence base. This alignment provides an opportunity to facilitate the integration of strategic land use, transport and economic development planning decisions affecting London. The three documents together set out an integrated 'Strategy for London' with a single, long-term vision for the Capital.
- 1.8.2 The MTS will support the Mayor's vision for London, as set out in the initial proposals for the London Plan. Hence, the Transport Strategy Statement of Intent outlined potential land-use and economic development options for London, as well as the potential transport approaches.
- 1.8.3 The approach to the London Plan, and by extension to the MTS, is informed by the findings of the Outer London Commission. The Commission considered two broad land use options (without excluding other possible configurations):
- A focus on employment growth in central London, with population growth largely in inner and east London;
  - A more dispersed growth, with higher levels of growth in outer London, possibly centred on several 'strategic hubs.'
- 1.8.4 The Commission concluded in its interim findings, that, while growth should be supported in outer London town centres, this should be focussed on existing town centres, rather than on a smaller number of strategic hubs.
- 1.8.5 The Assembly and Functional Bodies were also consulted on initial proposals for both the London Plan (A new plan for London – Proposals for the Mayor's London Plan) and the Economic Development Strategy (Rising to the Challenge – Proposals for the Mayor's Economic Development Strategy) in a similar timeframe as for the MTS Statement of Intent. It is intended that the wider public and stakeholder consultation phases for both MTS and EDS will also take place within a similar timescale, and for both new strategies to be in place in 2010. However, the specific legal requirements for the London Plan mean that there will be a longer process, including an Examination in Public, with the London Plan expected to be finalised in 2011.
- 1.8.6 Also of relevance here is the development of the new Mayor's Air Quality Strategy, which will consider transport emissions within the overall London context. A draft Strategy is planned for consultation with the Assembly and Functional Bodies in autumn 2009, with a public consultation planned to follow in winter/spring 2010.

## **1.9 London boroughs and London regional strategy development**

- 1.9.1 London boroughs set out how they propose to deliver the MTS and address their local priorities in their Local Implementation Plans (LIPs). The way that TfL allocates money for LIPs has recently been reformed. With the publication of the new MTS, boroughs will be under a duty to revise their LIPs. The timetable for completion of this process is also aligned with the development of the MTS and other key strategies. Guidance on LIPs is currently being discussed with the boroughs and will be issued with the published MTS in the spring.
- 1.9.2 TfL, with the GLA and LDA, has also been working closely with the London boroughs and other partners to develop an integrated approach to sub-regional transport development and land-use planning based around five London regions (central, north, south, east and west London). In addition to the LIPs, Sub-regional Transport Plans will be put in place for each sub-region, to assist in the delivery of the new MTS. The MTS and the Sub-regional Transport Plans form a framework for the development of LIPs.

## **1.10 Integrated Impact Assessment of the Mayor's Transport Strategy**

- 1.10.1 When revising his strategies, the Mayor is required to have regard to the effect which the proposed strategy or revision will have on the health of persons in Greater London, community safety, climate change and the achievement of sustainable development in the United Kingdom.
- 1.10.2 TfL has been delegated responsibility for preparing and consulting on a strategic environmental assessment, in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of the Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (colloquially known as "the SEA Regulations"). The revision of the 2001 MTS must comply with a number of legal requirements concerning the preparation of environmental and other assessments of how the policies and proposals in the new MTS would be likely to affect people, places, habitats and the environment in Greater London. TfL engaged consultants to undertake an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) of the policies and proposals contained in the Consultation Document.
- 1.10.3 The IIA will integrate the following assessments to take into account all aspects of sustainability: Strategic Environment Assessment, Health Impact Assessment (HIA), Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) and Economic Impact Assessment. Community safety, including crime and disorder, will be considered as part of the HIA and EqIA. A Habitats Regulations Assessment screening exercise is also being undertaken to determine if there is potential for impacts to the integrity of Natura 2000 sites within the impacted area, and this will inform the IIA.
- 1.10.4 The consultants engaged by TfL produced a "scoping report" setting out the context and objectives of the assessment and setting baselines. Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency were consulted on the report over a 5 week

period, from 25 February to 1 April 2009. As outlined above, copies of the Scoping Report were made available to other organisations on request during the consultation on the Statement of Intent.

1.10.5 The Integrated Impact Assessment report process has informed the development of the draft MTS itself and the report will be publicly available during the public and stakeholder consultation.

## **2. TfL's analysis of responses from the Functional Bodies**

### **2.1 Introduction**

- 2.1.1 This chapter sets out the main issues raised in the responses from the GLA Functional Bodies. Responses were received from all four Functional Bodies: the London Development Agency (LDA); Transport for London (TfL); the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA); and the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA). The response from the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) will also be considered with the responses from the Functional Bodies.
- 2.1.2 This chapter sets out the relevant comments from each organisation in turn, identifying the key issues raised. Following each comment, a response from TfL (in bold type) is provided for the key issues, where this is considered appropriate. Each organisation's response is summarised in Appendix 1, and the copies of the responses have also been made available to the Mayor.
- 2.1.3 The Mayor is required to have regard to the comments from the Functional Bodies in the development of the draft MTS. There will also be further opportunity for these bodies to comment during the public and stakeholder consultation on the draft MTS in autumn 2009.

### **2.2 Summary of Functional Bodies' responses and TfL response**

#### **London Development Agency (LDA)**

- 2.2.1 TfL needs to be part of the investment and regeneration solution and, where appropriate, a participant in Homes and Communities Agency's Single Conversations to ensure that our investments are aligned and we maximise the benefits of our investments.

#### *TfL Response*

- 2.2.2 **The MTS supports the London Plan. It sets out a number of transport interventions to support economic growth and regeneration, with specific reference to enhanced accessibility to opportunity and regeneration areas. It highlights that the Mayor and TfL will work with the LDA, boroughs and others to prioritise measures in London's most deprived areas, as well as 'opportunity areas' and 'areas for intensification' as described in the London Plan, to support wider regeneration initiative across the city. TfL looks forward to working with LDA and organisations such as the Homes and Communities Agency, to ensure investment is aligned appropriately.**
- 2.2.3 MTS should look beyond 2017 and provide policy hooks and reference to TfL's sub-regional work, to develop projects that will support growth in the period within the newly aligned Mayoral strategies between 2017 and 2031

2.2.4 LDA supports the London Plan approach to accommodating growth. The MTS and sub-regional transport work will need to set out how key locations outside the CAZ which are identified for growth, might need a different and better transport offer, the economic changes which transport might create (or help to create) in these places, and how the delivery of new services and capacity might be achieved.

2.2.5 LDA is keen to work further with TfL and the London Plan team on the thinking evolving from the access to opportunities and services (ATOS) accessibility measures work led by TfL.

2.2.6 It is important that the MTS advocates regeneration, land use planning and behavioural change. The LDA will be working with partners to better understand the issues with accessing employment and other opportunities where worklessness is high but access to transport is still good.

*TfL Response*

2.2.7 **The draft MTS includes policies and potential schemes to 2031, and these are set out in the short, medium and long term in the Implementation Plan. This includes committed expenditure as per the Business Plan, but also additional schemes and initiatives needed beyond this to support growth and regeneration. The development of the MTS will continue to take place in parallel with the development of the London Plan and the EDS. Interventions for outer London town centres and areas of potential growth, including opportunity and regeneration areas, have been identified in the draft MTS. TfL is also working closely with the London boroughs and other agencies, including the LDA, to develop Sub-regional Transport Plans, which will provide more detail on potential interventions at the sub-regional level for central, south, north, east and west London. TfL welcomes the commitment from LDA to work together on ATOS and the issue of access to work more generally.**

2.2.8 The objective that refers to delivering the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games should be extended to refer to 'securing and spreading the Olympic legacy'

*TfL Response*

2.2.9 **The ODA has produced a Transport Plan for the 2012 Games, which includes ways in which the Olympic legacy will be secured, including infrastructure, regeneration and changing behaviour so that people are more likely to walk, cycle or use public transport. The draft MTS supports these aims and outlines how the Mayor will maximise the benefits of the Olympic and Paralympic physical and behavioural legacy.**

2.2.10 It will be important for the GLA family to provide policy support for the provision of adequate infrastructure and land toward sustainable growth in freight and logistics. Freight and logistics are important not only to London's growth but as a sector in itself. The LDA is working with East of England Development Agency and the South

East England Development Agency on initiatives to support the sector, roll out best practice on sustainability and better understand the sector's green credentials

2.2.11 The LDA is working with partners to develop practical proposals to encourage the use of the river and canals for freight. This, together with the work being carried out by the Port of London Authority on its Port Masterplan, will contribute to the evidence base for work on safeguarded wharves and the use of river transport for freight.

*TfL Response*

**2.2.12 The draft MTS recognises the importance of the freight and logistics sector to London's economy but also seeks to minimise the environmental impact of freight. It includes proposals to support the freight and logistics sector in a sustainable way, including enhanced use of the Thames and canals. It seeks to achieve increased freight movement efficiency and highlights that the Mayor will support freight industry land requirements for locally focussed consolidation break-bulk facilities and access to waterways and railways.**

2.2.13 The LDA is investigating whether we should get more involved in the strategic issues of the supply and management of energy to the grid and the technology required to do this effectively to support the roll out of electric vehicles in the capital and how this links to the work we lead on delivering the decentralised energy network.

*TfL Response*

**2.2.14 The draft MTS sets out a number of policies and proposals for encouraging the uptake of electric vehicles in the capital. The draft MTS seeks to enable and support the development and mass market uptake of low carbon transport through, for example, the delivery of infrastructure required for the distribution of alternative transport fuel sources (including at least 25,000 electric vehicle charging points by 2015) to meet the needs of users and further development of the London Electric Vehicle Centre of Excellence and Electric Vehicle Partnership.**

**2.2.15 It is important that the benefits of electric vehicles in terms of carbon-efficiency are maximised by ensuring that the energy supply is renewable. The Mayor has a target of 25 per cent decentralised energy supply for heat and power in the Capital by 2025. TfL will continue to work with other members of the GLA family to achieve this.**

### **London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)**

2.2.16 The London Fire Brigade attends road traffic incidents when requested by police... the Brigade has significant investment in the effectiveness of road safety initiatives and measures and always welcomes the opportunity to be engaged at an early stage about such plans.

*TfL Response*

**2.2.17 The London Road Safety Unit works with partners to develop and implement effective road safety initiatives and this is set out in the policies and proposals. TfL looks forward to ongoing engagement with LFEPA in the development and delivery of the draft MTS.**

2.2.18 Particularly in the area of accessibility, adaptations to access and egress at Underground and rail stations is something to which the Brigade can make a very positive contribution in terms of fire safety, escape plans and crowd control.

*TfL Response*

**2.2.19 TfL looks forward to continuing to work with LFEPA and other partners in maintaining and improving the operational safety of London's transport network. The draft MTS contains proposals to ensure that safety management systems are in place across the transport network and regularly reviewed and that there are plans in place to respond to major incidents. Contingency planning for crowd control and emergency access will also be important for the 2012 London Olympic & Paralympic Games, and this is reflected in the text of the draft MTS.**

2.2.20 In promoting walking and cycling, and delivering better conditions for pedestrians in London, there will be a need to ensure that the provision of suitable arrangement for access by emergency vehicles is taken fully into account in the design of individual schemes.

2.2.21 Safety needs to be in-built from the outset for new transport infrastructure projects in both the construction and usage phases. It will be important that the Brigade is fully involved from the earliest stage of project development.

2.2.22 The polycentric approach may have direct implications for strategic emergency cover arrangements for surrounding localities and the early involvement of the Brigade will enable timely and appropriate plans to be developed to reflect both the benefits that new transport facilities will provide and any additional demands they create.

*TfL Response*

**2.2.23 Changes to the physical environment are already subject to various Building and Planning Regulations, and the Fire Brigade (and other partners) would be included among the consultees for planning applications, so this is not covered specifically in the draft MTS. The Outer London Commission has recommended that growth should be supported across existing town centres in outer London rather than focused on 'strategic outer London development centres' as they were originally envisaged, and the draft MTS incorporates this recommendation.**

2.2.24 The aspiration to reduce congestion is welcome and is shared by the Brigade, for several reasons. The impact of traffic congestion on the ability of emergency services vehicles to deliver speedy attendance has been demonstrated and London Fire Brigade, like other urban fire services, has experienced a progressive (if small) deterioration in attendance times which it is unable to fully arrest without supporting measures from other agencies.

*TfL Response*

**2.2.25 Smoothing traffic flow is one of the Mayor's key priorities for transport and this is reflected in the draft MTS. In particular, the London Fire Brigade would benefit from the proposals in the draft MTS which seek to smooth traffic flows to manage congestion and improve journey time reliability.**

2.2.26 The Brigade's fleet of fire engines and other vehicles has been converted to be compliant with LEZ standards...The Brigade's current fleet is predominantly diesel in support of climate change actions and operational requirements. While the Brigade meets current LEZ requirements through to 2010, more stringent requirements such as those proposed for 2012 would require significant fleet alterations at considerable cost.

*TfL Response*

**2.2.27 TfL will continue to work with LFEPA to explore the options for ensuring that affected vehicles are compliant with Phase 4 of the London Low Emission Zone, which will be introduced in January 2012.**

**Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA)**

2.2.28 The Metropolitan Police Authority stated that it supports the objective of ensuring the safety and security of all Londoners, and wishes to work with the GLA on reducing crime and antisocial behaviour and improving safety and security on London's transport services. It supports the policy of reducing crime by allocating resources between different policing units and notes that Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) working in the Metropolitan Police Service's (MPS) 'Safer Transport Teams' will work alongside British Transport Police in achieving these objectives on the public transport system.

*TfL Response*

**2.2.29 The MPA's support for the objectives of ensuring the safety and security of Londoners is welcomed. The Mayor, through TfL, is committed to working with policing partners and other agencies to build on the success of recent years in crime reduction and community safety work across London's transport system. The draft MTS sets out how the Mayor and TfL propose to further improve safety and security and to reduce anti-social behaviour across the transport system.**

### **Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA)**

2.2.30 The Olympic Delivery Authority commented that there will be London 2012 competition venues in central, inner and outer London and that the MTS should reflect this.

#### *TfL Response*

**2.2.31 The draft MTS reflects the spread of Olympic and Paralympic activities across central, inner and outer London. It addresses different transport needs and priorities across all areas of London. More detail on transport priorities at the sub-regional level will be set out in the Sub-regional Transport Plans.**

### **Transport for London (TfL)**

2.2.32 Transport for London highlighted three issues which will shape the public consultation of the draft MTS: the outcome of the Outer London Commission and its influence on the pattern and extent of spatial growth contained within the public consultation draft for the London Plan; the likely availability of funding from both public and private sector sources in the MTS timeframe; and the level of detail that will be appropriate in the final MTS.

2.2.33 It notes that, as a long term strategy, the MTS should reflect the scale of growth set out in the London Plan, identify the challenges this presents and the solutions necessary. This entails delivering successfully the essential schemes which are already being progressed as well as identifying further interventions to enable a maximisation of the investments made by TfL, Network Rail and others.

2.2.34 The draft MTS should also emphasise the importance of effective bus services, especially for outer London, and there is a need for an agreed relationship between subsidies, fares and levels of service.

2.2.35 It states that this is an opportunity to set out the longer term investment priorities needed to meet the challenges, such as the need for additional river crossings in east London, and additional rail capacity, as well as longer term demand management measures.

#### *TfL Response*

**2.2.36 These issues have been reflected in the draft MTS.**

### **3. TfL's analysis of responses from stakeholders**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

3.1.1 This chapter sets out TfL's analysis of stakeholders' responses to the consultation. It is not intended to be exhaustive, but seeks to summarise the key issues raised. Comments made by the Functional Bodies are covered in Chapter 2; the response from the Assembly will be covered in the Mayor's Statement to the Chair of the Assembly. Appendix 2 provides summaries of the stakeholder responses received. The Mayor has been provided with copies of all of the responses received. Responses from individual businesses, other organisations and the public are not covered in this Report.

3.1.2 There are three main sections to this chapter:

- Section 3.2 provides an analysis of the responses to the consultation questions
- Section 3.3 identifies the additional issues raised by stakeholders
- Section 3.4 sets out TfL's response to these key issues.

3.1.3 For the sake of clarity, the consultation questions have in some cases been re-ordered and abbreviated in the sections below. Many respondents set out their responses so that several questions were answered together, and the approach below reflects this. For example, Question 4 posed a number of related sub-questions about outer London and it makes sense to consider the answers together. Appendix 3 of this report sets out the consultation questions from the Statement of Intent in full.

3.1.4 It is also worth noting that some of the issues raised by respondents address a number of different questions and areas. Comments about staffing at stations, say, apply to questions about rail services, safety and security and quality of life.

3.1.5 As described in Chapter 4, stakeholders and the public will have an opportunity to comment on the draft MTS during the 13 week consultation which is planned to take place from autumn 2009.

#### **3.2 Analysis of responses to the consultation questions**

##### **Question 1: Other challenges facing London**

3.2.1 Generally there was support for the high level transport outcomes and challenges as set out in the Statement of Intent however several stakeholders called for the challenges to be prioritised, especially when lobbying for government funding.

3.2.2 Most respondents felt that the Statement of Intent had identified the correct challenges, although there were comments about the detail within the six challenges. In particular, respondents stated that they would like more emphasis placed on regeneration within the challenge of economic growth; and some felt that there should be greater weight given to addressing the challenge of climate change.

- 3.2.3 With regard to identifying other challenges, reducing car use and car dependency was often identified as a potential additional challenge, and one respondent stated that there should be targets for traffic reduction. There was recognition that, in a time of constrained funding and conflicting demands, there is a need for financially sustainable transport provision. Another stakeholder stated that the MTS should recognise that one of the challenges is making choices and resolving conflicting demands.
- 3.2.4 Several respondents commented that regeneration and tackling deprivation should be part of the economic growth challenge, and noted that better transport can be a catalyst for regeneration through improved access to jobs and opportunities. Other challenges identified included maintaining London's role as a World City, and recognising that it is not only Londoners who travel in London. One respondent noted the fact of an ageing population, which might need to be addressed in terms of transport provision.
- 3.2.5 A few respondents stated that the needs of business, including freight and delivery services, needed to be explicitly considered in the development of the draft MTS and highlighted the relative importance of commercial vehicles on the road network.
- 3.2.6 Climate change, already identified as one of the key challenges facing London, attracted many comments, including the need to live within environmental limits. Some stakeholders emphasised that bridging the gulf between projected CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and the 60 per cent target reduction, from transport and other sectors, would be a major challenge.
- 3.2.7 Finally, a number of stakeholders commented on the issue of people's choice of modes and modal hierarchy. Some stakeholders had concerns about not having a modal hierarchy and how to achieve a reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions while respecting people's choice of mode.
- 3.2.8 Many London boroughs and other stakeholders identified area specific challenges. These are not covered here but will be addressed as part of the second phase of consultation, and as part of the ongoing process to agree LIPs and the London Sub-regional Transport Plans once the final MTS is published.

### **Question 2: the DASTS approach and London**

- 3.2.9 Several comments concerned the need to strike a balance between the different levels of transport networks as set out in the Department for Transport's Delivering a Sustainable Transport System (DASTS). While there was general support for the using the DASTS approach, there were a number of areas where respondents felt that the model did not fully meet London's needs. One respondent drew attention to the fact that many of the international, national and inter-regional networks identified in the national model had their key origin/destination in London, and stated that

access to airports, for example, needed to be considered on a London as well as a national level.

- 3.2.10 A number of respondents argued strongly that more attention should be paid to local trips, with some stating that more emphasis should be given to trips which take place within boroughs and between town centres. Some commented that local streets should be considered the most important category of network. Stakeholders stated that 'greenway' corridors should be included in the MTS and that water corridors, for example the Thames and London's canals, should not be overlooked. There was also a view that the focus on transport networks potentially excluded the beneficial effects that transport can have on particular locations, for example in achieving regeneration.
- 3.2.11 Some stakeholders stated that the spatial approach to transport planning should complement the national strategy where possible, but that London's needs should take precedence as there are some specific areas such as air travel and road user charging where there is not a coherent national strategy. Other stakeholders stated that clarification was needed on how the MTS will link to relevant strategies outside London. Another respondent stated that strategic transport projects in London should be controlled by TfL, and another called for clarification on how shared responsibilities work in the DASTS model. There was also a comment regarding the need to engage with boroughs outside London since many journeys cross the Capital's boundary.
- 3.2.12 Comments on the topic of spatial policies and planning related primarily to practical issues such as the fact that the Transport Strategy would be finalised before the spatial policies for the London Plan had been considered by the Examination in Public, and the need for the MTS to deliver a degree of certainty which will allow long term planning for infrastructure investment.

### **Question 3: Implementation of the MTS with boroughs and other stakeholders through London Sub-regional Transport Plans and LIPs**

- 3.2.13 There was strong support for the Mayor and TfL working in partnership with the boroughs and other stakeholders, particularly with regard to recognising the need to identify and address local issues and priorities. Respondents stated that the MTS should seek to identify and achieve strategic goals while reflecting the boroughs' local priorities.
- 3.2.14 With regard to monitoring the implementation of the MTS in the Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) and London Regional Transport Plans, there were a number of comments on their potential content, format and publication. Some respondents suggested specific items that should be monitored, for example CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, project costs, uptake of cycling and local increases in greenspace. One respondent commented that monitoring should focus on the issues that matter most to Londoners; another suggested that it could include social and regeneration

outcomes such as access to and creation of jobs and homes. There was agreement that any system needed to allow for local flexibility in identifying local priorities within the overall strategy.

- 3.2.15 It was suggested that a small number of straightforward targets and performance indicators should be set in order to monitor progress. One respondent stated that the focus should be on measuring outcomes rather than seeking to achieve a consistent level of progress across London, recognising that boroughs have different starting-points and priorities. With regard to publishing the results, there was a suggestion that borough data could be included in TfL's annual Travel in London report or that London boroughs could produce their own brief annual reports. There was a consensus that data collection should not be overly bureaucratic or onerous.
- 3.2.16 Respondents made several comments on the relationship between the MTS and the LIPs. There was a view that the Strategy should set out overarching targets but allow for flexible implementation locally by the boroughs. Also, the Strategy should be specific about what the Mayor intends to fund, what funding has already been secured, what projects are still in development and where alternative sources of funding might be used. With regard to the LIPs, again there was a call for clarity about what funding was available to boroughs. One respondent stated that it was important to have certainty about the funding for maintenance work; another suggested having 3-5 year budgets for each topic area; another asked for funding for consultations on local Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs). It was suggested that specific funds could be set aside for urban realm improvements and projects to encourage walking and cycling. There was recognition of the need to prioritise projects, and respondents stated that TfL needed to engage with boroughs on implementing the Strategy locally. The LIPs guidance should be clear in order to deliver MTS, but should not be prescriptive as to how outcomes were achieved locally.
- 3.2.17 One respondent queried how the timescale for LIPs would take into account the introduction of Sub-regional Transport Plans. Generally, respondents stated that, while they welcomed the introduction of a regional approach to transport planning, they would like more clarity on how the process would work. In particular, respondents asked how Sub-regional Transport Plans would be funded, and whether they would require Mayoral approval, or act as advisory documents. The 'fuzzy boundary' approach was seen as appropriate. Several noted that boroughs and regional stakeholders already work successfully in partnership to deliver local projects, for example in regeneration.

**Question 4: What is the balance between the three broad policy approaches: changing land use assumptions, managing demand and providing further transport capacity?**

**What transport interventions are required to support economic development focused on 'strategic outer London development centres'?**

**Where is additional transport capacity and connectivity most needed, in the context of proposals to alter land use assumptions and manage demand?**

**What transport interventions are required to support more growth in outer London generally?**

3.2.18 Respondents welcomed the mix of three policy approaches, although they stated that there would need to be more detail on specific schemes and measures. In terms of balance, a number of respondents commented that it would depend on local circumstances. In the shorter term, managing demand is an important tool, but there should also be priority given to additional capacity and connectivity in the longer term through investment.

3.2.19 There was little support from respondents for 'strategic Outer London development centres' as originally envisaged, especially where respondents were located in areas which had not been identified as potential locations. This aligns with the initial findings of the Outer London Commission, which have been released since the publication of the Statement of Intent, and are set out in Section 3.4.

3.2.20 Respondents suggested that public transport investment is needed to improve orbital travel in outer London. Suggestions included light rail and tram schemes, express bus services, Crossrail feeder- bus services, as well as greater capacity and frequency on the suburban rail system (particularly in south London). It was suggested that these connections would relieve pressure on existing radial links to central London as well as supporting growth in town centres. Town centres were suggested as a key focus for investment, particularly for the expansion of walking and cycling schemes for shorter journeys. Respondents made it clear that improving the interchange between modes is a priority for outer London. It was also suggested that links to airports from outer London were important.

3.2.21

3.2.22 Some respondents commented that the car is likely to remain the dominant mode of travel in outer London and therefore should be considered adequately in planning. They said that this should be done in a sustainable way without increasing car use, traffic congestion and emissions. Suggestions included running major road schemes underground to reduce severance and release land for development. Meanwhile other respondents suggested measures to manage demand, through car-free developments and by ensuring that housing growth takes place where there is sufficient public transport capacity to support it.

**If there were to be a greater focus on economic development in Outer London, what additional transport interventions would still be required to maintain central London's economic vitality?**

3.2.23 Respondents, particularly those from central London boroughs, emphasised the crucial role that central London plays in the London economy and stated that it must continue to be supported. Stakeholders emphasised that capacity would still need to be supported for central London routes as there would still be high demand for travel to central/inner London regardless of the focus on economic development in outer London. Proposed interventions focused on the delivery of committed transport schemes such as Crossrail and the East London Line extension and improvements to the London Overground network. They also suggested reconsideration of the Cross River Tram proposal and consideration of future schemes such as Crossrail 2, to provide a south-west to north-east public transport link.

3.2.24 A number of schemes to improve accessibility and support regeneration and growth were also highlighted, such as the Northern Line extension to Battersea. In addition, the importance of capacity at termini and interchanges within central London was emphasised, along with the need to cater properly for onward distribution of passengers. The need to improve the public realm and support walking was also stressed.

**Question 4b: For managing demand, your views would be welcomed on the following:**

**What is the role of pricing (eg targeted local road pricing or London-wide road pricing) to help manage demand?**

**Would your view of pricing change if there was more economic development in Outer London where car usage is higher and public transport less pervasive?**

3.2.25 Many stakeholders were supportive of road pricing schemes in principle, but specified a number of conditions that would need to be met before any such schemes were introduced. Among the main considerations was the availability of sufficient and suitable public transport alternatives in the area. Respondents also highlighted the need to include any road pricing as part of a package of measures to encourage people to reduce their need to travel, and support them in choosing more sustainable modes, such as public transport, walking and cycling.

3.2.26 Some respondents said that they would like to see more detail about potential road pricing schemes in the draft MTS, and information about the circumstances in which it would be considered, and the potential aims of any such scheme. Among those who favoured road pricing, some stated that it should be just one component of a comprehensive approach to managing demand, reducing the need to travel and encouraging the use of sustainable modes. Advocates commented that road pricing could bring benefits in terms of reducing congestion and emissions of air pollutants,

as well as encouraging active travel. In turn, these effects could be beneficial for health. A few respondents opposed road pricing in principle, however.

- 3.2.27 Respondents stated that in designing any scheme, attention would have to be paid to any potential boundary effects and the need for complementary measures. One respondent indicated that the charging structure for any such scheme could be linked to emissions levels, thereby helping to reduce emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and air pollutants. A few stated that any road pricing scheme would need to be sophisticated and use technology to charge according to usage, time of day, and vehicles' impact on congestion. Technologies such as 'tag and beacon' (which could allow more sophisticated charging policies to be implemented) and chargepayer accounts were mentioned. Those who commented on the use of charging income preferred that such a scheme be either revenue-neutral or the proceeds be ring-fenced for improving public transport.
- 3.2.28 There was a clear message that boroughs must retain the flexibility and power to use pricing schemes that would be appropriate for their locality. Boroughs should be involved in developing any schemes and could help to identify where schemes were most needed. That said, some respondents said that local schemes should operate within the context of a national or London-wide scheme.
- 3.2.29 With regard to managing demand for transport more generally, some respondents advocated measures to 'spread the peak' of public transport demand, for example via changes to ticketing and fares. In terms of incentivisation, some respondents supported the promotion of car clubs as a way of reducing overall car journeys. Respondents noted that parking charges, including a workplace parking levy, could also be used to manage demand, but there were concerns about the potential impact on economic competitiveness.
- 3.2.30 Several respondents made reference to making good use of the existing road network, which for some included having priority measures, such as bus lanes for high-capacity modes, or those with a less adverse environmental impact.
- 3.2.31 Many respondents noted that car use is higher in outer London because of a lack of public transport alternatives; however there was a strong view that increased development in outer London must not lead to increased car use and traffic volumes. Providing the necessary public transport infrastructure to accompany economic growth was seen as the main solution; and there was also recognition that enabling people to access employment and services locally could help to reduce the need to travel, and make walking and cycling a more viable option.
- 3.2.32 However, there was also a concern that road pricing, and parking charges, could make outer London relatively less attractive for businesses than out of London competitors. Again, respondents stressed the need to provide public transport alternatives, and to consider local circumstances.

**Question 4d: What role can be played by new technologies, for example electric vehicles, in tackling challenges such as climate change, air quality and noise? What steps should be taken to support their development and use?**

- 3.2.33 There was general support for electric vehicles, although respondents were keen to emphasise that they were only part of the solution to the problem of vehicle emissions, and not a panacea. Some stated that, given the growing number of light goods vehicles (vans) in London, a priority should be to develop electric (or hybrid or LPG) commercial vehicles. Developing a taxi with lower emissions was also identified as a priority, as was the need for a heavy goods vehicle (lorry) which was quieter and less polluting.
- 3.2.34 Many stakeholders indicated that there was a need to ensure the electricity to power electric vehicles came from renewable sources, because otherwise the overall impact on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions would be small. One stakeholder was concerned about the potential costs to local authorities of supplying power, while another noted that since the technology for electric vehicles is developing quickly, there should be care not to invest in charging points which may become obsolete once batteries are a more feasible option.
- 3.2.35 To support the uptake of electric vehicles, respondents suggested differential parking charges with lower charges for lower-emission vehicles; subsidies for purchase (although one questioned whether this was within the Mayor's remit); and the set-aside of specific parking bays.
- 3.2.36 Respondents raised some caution about electric vehicles, including the fact that they still require parking spaces and contribute to congestion. It was also suggested that since electric vehicle charging bays and charging points would use up road space, off-street charging facilities were preferable. There was concern about the impact on boroughs' parking spaces if concessions were made for electric vehicles and a desire that boroughs should be given the freedom to decide how electric vehicle incentivisation was implemented locally. Some concern was also raised about the safety of electric vehicles because their quietness means that pedestrians may not be aware of them.
- 3.2.37 Some respondents stated that electricity was not the only route for 'greener' fuels and that other vehicle and fuel technologies, such as LPG, hydrogen and biofuels, should also be promoted. Some said that there should also be a focus on improving the environmental performance of the conventional (diesel and petrol-powered) fleet, for example by greater use of hybrids and fuel-saving technologies.
- 3.2.38 Some noted that private vehicle use, even if with electric cars, is still a relatively less sustainable mode, and felt that overall the draft MTS should continue to make the case for reducing the need to travel and encouraging the use of public transport, walking and cycling.

3.2.39 Apart from electric vehicles, respondents were keen to see greater use of technology in both reducing the need to travel and improving journeys across all modes. Some respondents advocated greater use of traffic management technology (such as SCOOT), in-car navigation technology, and the provision of real-time information about the road network. Similarly, real-time information at public transport sites, including the bus countdown system, was welcomed. Some noted that the use of communications technology could reduce the need to travel by allowing people to work or shop from home, for example. Those who supported road pricing stated that technology could be used to implement a more sophisticated system of charging.

### **Question 5: Land-use options and transport**

3.2.40 The vast majority of respondents, with the exception of some central London boroughs, supported the approach of more dispersed growth across London (Option 2). However, respondents made it clear that this should not necessarily be based around 'strategic Outer London development centres' as envisaged in the OLC's consultation, and that car dependency must not increase. This led to various recommendations for an associated improvement in public transport provision and connectivity in outer London.

3.2.41 As highlighted in Question 4a, in its initial findings the Outer London Commission does not recommend that the 'strategic outer London development centre' approach as originally envisaged is pursued. Instead, it recommends dispersed growth across town centres, based around a "hub and spoke" network between town centres, the areas surrounding them and other centres.

### **Question 6**

**What are the policy priorities for each of the six themes set out in Chapter 4? Are there any other policies that should be included in the MTS under these themes?**

#### **6a: Economic development and population growth**

3.2.42 There were a very large number of comments in response to this question, so for the sake of clarity, these have been grouped into themes below: regional, national and international links; freight; public transport; use of the Thames and river crossings; Crossrail; connectivity and interchange; managing the road network and the efficiency of transport operations. Where respondents made comments about schemes and policies specific to a particular area, these have been noted in the context of the development of LIPs and Sub-regional Transport Plans.

#### ***Regional, national and international links***

##### *Runways/Airports*

3.2.43 Generally respondents were cautious about an expansion of air travel. Respondents stated that any increase in airport capacity should be considered very carefully,

particularly with regards to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and other environmental impacts. A number of stakeholders opposed the idea of airport expansion in principle, stating that the 'predict and provide' approach is outdated and induces additional demand, also having an adverse effect on the historic and natural environment. Opinion was divided on the expansion of Heathrow Airport; there was support for the Mayor's opposition to the third runway from some stakeholders while others stated that it was necessary for economic growth. There was some support for considering the option of an alternative airport in the South East (for example the 'Thames Estuary Airport' idea). There was also concern about the impact on the demand for local transport services as existing facilities are expanded, with the expansion of Stansted Airport given as an example.

3.2.44 A number of respondents stated the importance of improving access to airports by road and rail, and there was some support for Airtrack (a scheme to provide direct rail access to Heathrow from Waterloo); meanwhile, one respondent stated that if Gatwick were to be expanded, it would need increased rail access from Victoria.

3.2.45 Other comments relating to air travel included a suggestion that the Mayor should commit to extending the curfew on night flights at Heathrow; one stakeholder said that a heliport closer to the City was needed; another suggested that local airports such as Biggin Hill could have a greater role to play in terms of both national and international links.

3.2.46 Promoting rail alternatives to domestic and short-haul flights was identified as a priority by many respondents: the section below on High Speed Rail provides more detail.

### ***Freight transport***

3.2.47 Respondents were keen to minimise the adverse effects of freight traffic, while recognising that efficient distribution of goods was vital to London's economy. Some respondents stated that there should be an effort to reduce the volume of lorries on the network, in particular on residential roads. Increasing the use of rail to move freight was seen as an effective way to address this; as was increasing the use of the Thames and other waterways for freight transport. One respondent made the suggestion that rail heads should not be confined to bulk loads such as aggregates, but should instead be made available for other cargoes such as waste and container traffic. Several comments were made about the importance of having adequate consolidation centres, and that suitably-located land should be set aside for these. Comments relating to loading and deliveries are set out in a separate section below.

### ***Public transport***

#### *Trams and transit schemes*

3.2.48 Some respondents suggested that previously proposed schemes such as the Cross River Tram, the Tramlink extension to Crystal Palace, Greenwich Waterfront Transit,

the DLR extension to Dagenham Dock and the additional phases of the East London Transit should be reinstated in the draft MTS, or that alternatives should be considered. There was particularly strong support for Tramlink extensions. There was a concern that potential funding for such schemes could be lost if these were not proposed in the Strategy.

#### *High Speed Rail*

3.2.49 There was broad support for promoting high speed rail as an alternative to flying. Many respondents advocated the progression of High Speed 2, providing a rail link between London and the Midlands/North, although there were a number of options put forward for the location of the London hub. Generally, respondents said that airports should be accessible by high speed rail to discourage the use of domestic flights to connect to international flights, although stakeholders emphasised that high speed rail should not have an adverse impact on local services.

#### *London Underground*

3.2.50 Various suggestions were made for specific Underground line extensions, including potential links to Catford, Battersea and Camberwell, and there were a number of comments on the paucity of the Underground network in South London.

3.2.51 Some concern was raised as to whether TfL could be expected to manage the challenge of line upgrades given limited funding, and some speculation as to the length of time it would realistically take to complete these. Some representations suggested that TfL ought to demonstrate that the Metronet management contract is cost effective and that vital work will be completed within the available funding.

#### *Rail Services: London Overground and National Rail services into and within London*

3.2.52 Some stakeholders drew attention to the range of rail provision in London, where overground services are provided both by TfL and a number of different operators holding franchises for National Rail services. One stakeholder commented on the relatively greater dependence of South London on National Rail services and stated that the Mayor should seek greater control over these, and better integration with TfL-provided services. Another commented on how this system affected fares and zoning; while there was support for integrating fares and the widespread acceptance of Oyster card, there was a comment that commuter fares also needed to be safeguarded.

3.2.53 Suggestions for improvements to rail services included four-tracking on the Lea Valley / Stansted line, further line electrification, and improvements to station accessibility. There was a comment about enabling cycles to be carried on trains. Comments were also made about stations, including the need for more secure cycle parking, better information, and increased platform capacity.

### *Buses*

- 3.2.54 A number of stakeholders called for a review of bus services, stating that existing routes and services had been in operation for a very long time. Boroughs and others stated that they would be keen to be involved in any such review. There was wide support for increased bus priority measures including bus lanes, bus gates and priority traffic signals; one respondent suggested extending bus lanes onto certain motorways. There was some concern about the noise impacts of buses and a call for the development of quieter and less polluting buses.
- 3.2.55 Some stakeholders suggested that the Oyster card system should be used to provide more flexible bus ticketing: for example a system whereby a validated Oyster card would be accepted to board any number of buses for a period of one hour starting from the time it was validated, as opposed to the existing single-journey system. Others questioned whether the policy of providing free bus travel to children should be reviewed over concerns about the number of children using buses, and their behaviour onboard.
- 3.2.56 A number of issues were raised concerning bus accessibility including the need to improve staff training in the use of ramps and other equipment and in taking appropriate time and care when at bus stops. Respondents hoped that the New Bus for London would be designed with accessibility and environmental concerns in mind. Finally, some respondents noted that the introduction of express buses, or coaches, in outer London could provide a cheap and fast solution to the demand for orbital transport.

### ***Use of the Thames River and river crossings***

- 3.2.57 There was strong support for one or more new river crossings in the lower Thames, although opinion was divided with regard to the Thames Gateway Bridge, and there was some opposition to crossing options at Silvertown.
- 3.2.58 There was a general feeling that the potential of the river has been neglected and that the Thames, canals and other waterways should feature more prominently in the draft Transport Strategy.
- 3.2.59 To increase passenger usage of the Thames, it was suggested that Oyster Pay-as-you-go should be made available on river boat services, and that transport maps should include river routes and piers. It was also suggested that the river could also be more widely used for freight distribution, and has the advantage of relatively lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Another respondent noted the need to balance the different needs of leisure and business users on waterways, and to manage the impacts on biodiversity.

### ***Crossrail 1&2***

3.2.60 The implementation of Crossrail was welcomed by stakeholders, although some expressed concern about whether government funding would continue. One borough suggested that Crossrail's potential to regenerate the Thames Gateway could only be reached if the route was extended to Ebbsfleet. The need to minimise disruption during the construction of Crossrail was also mentioned; as well as the need to maximise access to Crossrail once it is in place, for example via 'feeder' bus services.

3.2.61 A number of stakeholders felt strongly that "Crossrail 2"/the Chelsea-Hackney line should be a priority for the future.

### ***Connectivity and Interchange***

#### *Outer London connectivity*

3.2.62 There was broad support for a more polycentric approach to London's development. However, stakeholders considered that there was a need for greater clarity regarding how improvements to orbital transport corridors would be achieved. Many stakeholders argued that polycentric growth would require a significant increase in and improvement in the public transport network, because car-based growth was seen as unsustainable; this was considered by many to be a priority. New rail links (including "Crossrail 2") were suggested by a number of stakeholders as a means to improve connectivity. It was also suggested that express buses and new Cycle Superhighway routes would be necessary to improve non car-based orbital transport in outer London.

#### *Radial corridors into metropolitan town centres*

3.2.63 There was general support for improving transport on radial corridors into London's metropolitan town centres, with some stakeholders commenting that improving both orbital and radial corridors in outer London should be a priority. The need to link town centres with areas outside London was also mentioned. Comments were also made about improving transport links to housing and employment sites.

3.2.64 As was the case regarding connectivity improvements in outer London, many stakeholders emphasised that improving public transport and cycle routes should be a priority. Specific mention was made of cycle priority and a "web" of rail lines providing radial and orbital connections between outer London stations.

#### *Integration of services / interchange*

3.2.65 There was strong support for better integration of transport modes, including between London Overground and National Rail, as well as bus, Underground and taxis and private hire vehicles. There was also particular emphasis on secure cycle parking and well-signposted walking routes.

## ***Managing the road network***

### *Parking*

- 3.2.66 There were mixed views on parking, with some stakeholders commenting that on-street parking is a barrier to smooth traffic flows and should therefore be further restricted, while others stressed the importance of ensuring parking is better able to meet the needs of residents and businesses. It was felt by some respondents that parking policies should be consistent across London. However, others had mixed views on whether more guidance on parking policy was needed or whether boroughs should be given freedom to determine their own policies. Some stakeholders commented that London's policy should more closely reflect policy outside London, because this could make outer London more attractive to businesses.
- 3.2.67 There was support for increased cycle parking facilities on the street, at stations and at new developments. Some also commented on the need for better short term parking arrangements for coaches and more motorcycle parking.

### *Smoothing traffic flow*

- 3.2.68 Some stakeholders considered that bus lane enforcement, pedestrian zones and traffic calming measures should be halted in favour of encouraging the traffic flow, but more were concerned that smoothing flow should not lead to increased traffic volumes or speeds which would increase vehicle emissions or disadvantage pedestrians.
- 3.2.69 A large proportion of stakeholders stressed that work to smooth traffic flow would have to be undertaken alongside efforts to reduce car use, and that any additional capacity created should be used for bus priority and cyclists.
- 3.2.70 Some stakeholders commented on the role of technology in smoothing the flow of traffic, for instance through intelligent traffic control, providing real-time traffic information and in-vehicle information.
- 3.2.71 Reference was made to the significant problem of road congestion and its cost to the economy. Two stakeholders called for improvements to the road network in order to cope with this, but most stakeholders commented on the need to reduce unnecessary traffic and reduce private car use. There was a suggestion that the responsibility for the Transport for London Road Network should be transferred to the boroughs; but there was also support for TfL retaining this responsibility.
- 3.2.72 There was support for the proposal to charge operators undertaking road or street works who do not take measures to bring roads or footpaths back into use as quickly as possible.

### *Loading and deliveries*

3.2.73 Some stakeholders emphasised the importance of considering the role of kerbside deliveries in road planning and design and called for a review of policy for loading and unloading on the Capital's roads. Some also said that lorries were not appropriate for use in London and that smaller vehicles should be introduced, with the potential for introducing electric vans

### **Efficiency of transport operations**

3.2.74 Several respondents noted that, especially given constrained financial circumstances, it was important to maintain and get best use from the existing infrastructure in relation to both public transport and the road network. One respondent was concerned that the budget for road maintenance had been cut which could potentially have an impact on road safety, while another called for more funding to be made available to boroughs, including funding for the maintenance of non-principal roads. It was also suggested that if further growth is to be supported in outer London, its existing infrastructure would require both enhancement and greater maintenance.

### **Question 6b: Quality of Life**

3.2.75 With regard to improving journey experience, many stakeholders stated that they would like to see an improvement in the provision of passenger information, in particular real time information about the network, including delays to services and information about the road network. The 'Countdown' bus information panels were cited as a good example. Respondents were also keen to see more wayfinding information such as Legible London, and more use of GPS and mobile phone technology to help people navigate the Capital. It was noted that these measures could help to encourage people to choose public transport, walking and cycling.

3.2.76 There was also support for fairer and more flexible ticketing: a number of stakeholders proposed that the Oyster card to be extended to cover all rail services and river transport.

3.2.77 Many respondents highlighted the need for better management of the road network. This included support for the removal of traffic signals on certain junctions, removing barriers for cyclists and prompt road maintenance.

3.2.78 With regard to the built and natural environment, many respondents suggested focusing on streets as 'places' where people want to be rather than just the 'link' functions of roads. This included such measures as shared space; getting rid of street clutter; the removal of gyratories; and making streets two-way. One respondent noted the importance of good street lighting. Again, it was suggested that these measures could have a positive effect in terms of promoting walking and cycling.

- 3.2.79 Also suggested was the concept of 'filtered permeability', with road closures at certain points to allow access for cycles, buses and pedestrians but restrict car access. In addition, there was mention of improving access to greenspace and introducing more 20 mph zones in residential areas, in order to create a safer and more pleasant environment. Some stakeholders were keen to ensure that development took place in a way that enhanced and respected the natural and built heritage of the area.
- 3.2.80 With regard to improving air quality, greater use of "green" vehicle technologies and fuels was suggested by a large number of stakeholders. This included the use of biofuels, hydrogen and electric power as well as improving the environmental performance of conventional vehicles, for example via hybrid engines or eco-driving. Many stated that reducing congestion and reducing absolute traffic volumes were policies that should be used to improve air quality. Moving journeys from road to rail was seen as an important approach, similarly, offering alternatives to air travel, particularly over short distances, could be beneficial to air quality. Local low emission zones, or defined areas that seek to restrict or deter access by vehicles that produce emissions over a specified level, were seen as important by some. Lastly, some stakeholders were concerned about the levels of particulate matter (PM) and oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) in London and the need to meet EU limit values for air pollutant emissions, and stated that this was a matter that should be addressed urgently.
- 3.2.81 There were a number of suggestions for reducing the noise impacts of transport, Most of these concerned road traffic but there was also concern about the noise created by aircraft. Suggestions included the use of new technologies such as electric vehicles; new bus design; encouraging a shift to non-motorised modes; alternative forms of noise barriers; 'whispering tarmac' to reduce aircraft noise; and the development of appropriate commercial vehicles for residential roads.
- 3.2.82 With regard to improving the health impacts of transport, the general view was that measures that encourage active travel such as walking and cycling, and discourage private car use, were vital. One respondent stated that there should be guidance on how to improve the physical environment in order to facilitate walking and cycling; others suggested greater support for cycling projects and cycle training.

### **Question 6c: Safety & Security**

- 3.2.83 With regard to improving safety and security on and around the transport network, many comments related to the fear and perception of crime and anti-social behaviour as being as much of a problem as actual levels of crime. There were a number of suggestions made as to how to address this on the public transport network. For example, all stations could be staffed, or staffed for longer periods of time; it was also suggested that having shops and services at stations could help to provide a sense of security.

- 3.2.84 With regard to reducing crime and the fear of crime, measures related to policing were raised by a number of stakeholders. Better integration of London's police forces and more visible policing on streets were seen as important. Some stated that police should help with the enforcement of parking rules and regulations (including Blue Badge parking infringements) and that more resources should be put towards tackling uninsured drivers.
- 3.2.85 There were many comments about improving road safety and reducing the number of road casualties, particularly among vulnerable road users. There was also a suggestion that there should be a focus on road safety in areas of deprivation. Many stakeholders said that there should be more 20mph zones in London, for example in shopping or residential areas, although one respondent stated that this limit should apply London-wide. Linked to speed reduction was a suggestion to include mandatory speed limiters on all buses in London. There was also a call for more road safety engineering measures (including alternatives to the speed hump); and the removal of railings and gyratories to create a safer environment.
- 3.2.86 Respondents also saw a role for education and training: children should be given road safety education and cycle training and encouraged to use safe cycling and walking routes. They should also be educated about the dangers of railway lines. Also identified was the issue of safety around lorries and cyclists, and the need to ensure that 'blindspots' at junctions are avoided. Creating an environment where people choose to walk and cycle would, overall, help to improve perceptions of safety.

#### **Question 6d: Transport Opportunities for All**

- 3.2.87 There were a large number of comments on the importance of improving all forms of transport accessibility and addressing physical and other barriers. Many stakeholders regarded step-free access as essential, and called for the step-free programme on the Underground to be extended or brought forward, while some felt that the programme should be accelerated at major interchanges or major tourist destinations. Stakeholders also urged the Mayor to ensure that all bus stops are upgraded to step-free access standards which complement the fully accessible bus fleet.
- 3.2.88 According to a number of respondents, the attitudes of transport staff to disabled passengers could be improved, as could the attitudes of other travellers. This could be achieved by raising awareness amongst other travellers, for example of the need to give up seats to others or ensure that the wheelchair space is not blocked, and by enhanced training for staff, particularly bus drivers.
- 3.2.89 A number of stakeholders also commented on the need to take disabled people's requirements into account when considering the use of shared space and other urban realm improvements, particularly with regard to the blind and visually impaired. A number of responses suggested that standards should be set to ensure that new

stations are fully accessible. Ensuring that the 'New Bus for London' is designed to meet the needs of all Londoners was also raised by a number of stakeholders. There was a comment that disabled people should not be overlooked in the promotion of walking and cycling schemes. Finally, one respondent noted that development in outer London will need to be accompanied by improved accessibility in local town centres.

- 3.2.90 The cost and affordability of public transport fares attracted many comments. According to many stakeholders these should be made more equitable across London and across different modes and set at levels that make public transport attractive and affordable for all Londoners. Stakeholders requested clearer policies in the MTS regarding fares and concessions, and whether there was a commitment to maintain existing schemes such as the Freedom Pass.
- 3.2.91 Several stakeholders indicated that access to services could be improved through changed land use, which could make journeys shorter and easier by enabling people to live, work and access services in the same place, as well as allowing local services to remain viable.
- 3.2.92 There were some comments regarding services such as Dial-a-Ride and the Taxicard scheme. These suggested that access to these services should be improved, and that there could be better co-ordination and integration of these schemes with community transport provision.
- 3.2.93 Finally, a number of respondents affirmed the importance of transport in achieving regeneration and improving access to key services. Ensuring that transport provision fitted in with the reconfiguration of health services was also highlighted.

#### **Question 6e: Climate Change**

- 3.2.94 With regard to reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, some respondents highlighted that radical and proactive measures will be required to meet the Mayor's 60 per cent overall reduction target as only a 10 per cent reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> will be achieved by current measures. Respondents focused on three main potential approaches to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from transport: behavioural change; managing demand for travel and developing technological solutions.
- 3.2.95 In terms of behavioural change, many respondents advocated encouraging people to switch to more sustainable modes, such as public transport, walking and cycling, and were keen to reduce car use overall. In order to realise modal shift away from the car and to manage demand, suggestions ranged from road pricing to using education to promote the environmental benefits of walking and cycling. Some respondents supported the promotion of electric vehicles and suggested ways that this could be achieved, for example CO<sub>2</sub> banded parking charges (with lower charges for lower emission vehicles); allowing electric vehicles to use bus lanes; tax subsidies; and establishing convenient charging points. In terms of technological solutions, cleaner

fuels and the 'greening' of the bus and taxi fleets were suggested. There were also calls for the greater use of sustainable energy sources to power the transport system.

3.2.96 Freight transport's contribution to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions was a concern to some stakeholders, and they suggested that this could be addressed with greater use of waterways; developing cleaner freight vehicles; and further use of freight consolidation centres.

3.2.97 Other respondents called for the prioritisation of climate change measures with cross-over benefits into other areas such as health and urban realm, for example walking and cycling initiatives. They also proposed borough wide carbon footprint monitors; carbon trading for surface transport and aviation; smaller, less centralised development; and milestones for achieving climate change targets. There was concern that smoothing traffic flow must not result in an increase in vehicle speeds and volumes.

3.2.98 With regard to climate change adaptation, specific measures suggested by stakeholders were new trees for shade; green roofs for substations; and source heat pumps. Another stakeholder stated that measures should be taken to ensure that adaptation measures must not add to the problem, for example air conditioning on the Underground could be supplemented by more sustainable measures. Additionally, it was stated that the risk of flooding on the public transport network should be addressed and there should be sufficient investment and contingency planning to ensure that the transport system is better able to cope with extreme weather events.

### **3.3 Other key issues raised by respondents**

#### **Walking and cycling**

3.3.1 Respondents welcomed the emphasis on walking and cycling in the Statement of Intent and noted that these approaches could bring manifold benefits in terms of improving health and air quality and, since they are very low-cost options, increasing access to transport. Some of these benefits are alluded to in the previous sections on Quality of Life, Climate Change and Transport Opportunities for All. There was, however, a call for greater detail in the draft MTS about how the ambitious targets to increase uptake would be achieved.

3.3.2 With regard to walking, there were a number of suggestions for making this a more attractive choice. These included widening pavements; addressing pedestrian congestion 'hot spots', for example at Waterloo Station; more use of Legible London; and increasing the use of traffic restrictions, including pedestrianisation of specific zones. One stakeholder called for the production of a London Walking Plan.

3.3.3 Proposals to increase cycling attracted a large number of comments, particularly with regard to ensuring that opportunities to increase cycling were available across the Capital, including in outer London. The cycle hire scheme was welcomed, and it was suggested that it should be expanded to Zone 2, the Olympic Park and town centres as appropriate. Boroughs in particular were keen to be involved in the development of cycle superhighways but there was concern about not completing the London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+). The need for more, secure cycle parking, both on the network and at interchanges, was repeatedly raised and there were various suggestions for encouraging people to try cycling, including car-free days and cycle training for children. It was also suggested that an increase in walking and cycling would be a fitting legacy from the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

### **Urban realm**

3.3.4 A number of stakeholders indicated that they supported the Mayor's commitment to improving the urban realm although it was suggested that the draft MTS should contain more detail on this. Some stakeholders indicated that they were already implementing similar policies. The importance of the urban realm on walking and cycling (and public transport) was raised by many stakeholders. A number of respondents suggested that road space be re-allocated or traffic free zones be created. Increased permeability such as two-way cycling on some one-way roads was also raised. Several stakeholders identified the removal of street clutter as a way of improving the public realm and one identified key interchanges as of particular importance. Cycle hubs, the removal of gyratory systems and public engagement in the design process were also mentioned by stakeholders.

### **Road user hierarchy / reducing private car use**

3.3.5 A number of respondents were critical of the move away from the road user hierarchy, which seeks to prioritise higher capacity and more sustainable modes and users over others. Typically, such a model would give priority to buses by, for example, allocating part of the road space for their exclusive use (bus lanes). Also, measures may be built in to protect more vulnerable road users, for example Advanced Stop Lines for cyclists.

3.3.6 Respondents understood and often welcomed the Mayor's commitment to respecting choice, but noted that this could undermine other stated aims such as reducing the need to travel and encouraging the use of more sustainable, low-carbon modes. Many preferred the use of 'carrots' over 'sticks', for example making public transport, walking and cycling more attractive options and removing barriers to their uptake, but there was some doubt as to how effective such an approach would be in terms of changing behaviour. Many argued that using disincentives to achieve modal shift away from the car (such as road user charging, covered in Question 4b) was the most effective way. This was seen as particularly important given the pressure to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and help to meet targets for air quality improvements; and as

described earlier there was a concern to avoid increased employment growth in outer London leading to increased car usage. There was some comment that the draft Transport Strategy should provide some clarity about the Mayor's objectives with regard to different modes of travel.

### **Smarter Travel**

- 3.3.7 There was strong advocacy for the greater promotion of the Smarter Travel programme, which uses marketing and information to help people make use of sustainable transport options. Respondents pointed to the success of existing schemes which help to put in place travel plans for schools and workplaces and raise people's awareness about public transport options. Car clubs, and potential restrictions on parking spaces at new developments were also identified as options to help to reduce overall car usage.

### **Removal of the Western Extension of the Congestion Charging Zone**

- 3.3.8 A small number of stakeholders raised the issue of the removal of the Western Extension with some supporting its removal and some opposing. Additional issues regarding its removal were also raised, including the impact of the removal on traffic levels, congestion, bus journey times and air pollution and the need to find other ways of addressing these. One stakeholder asked for a review of the buffer zones for residents and another considered that the Mayor's office could have proceeded with the removal more quickly.

### **Suspension of Phase 3 of the London Low Emission Zone**

- 3.3.9 A small number of stakeholders opposed the suspension of Phase 3 of the London Low Emission Zone and expressed concern about the impact of this on air quality, particularly given the growth in the number of light goods vehicles on London's roads. One stakeholder stated that environmental policies should not be de-prioritised during economic downturns. Other stakeholders welcomed consideration of future low emission zone schemes, stating that local air quality should be improved through their promotion, and that an extension of the London Low Emission Zone could be investigated along the A3.

### **2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games**

- 3.3.10 Many respondents stated that the Olympic and Paralympic Games should provide a lasting legacy that would benefit London. This legacy could include more cycling and adequate cycle parking provision in homes and workplaces as well as an extension of the cycle hire scheme to the Olympic park. Other respondents noted the opportunity to use the river to transport construction materials for the Olympics. Some respondents also wanted increased step free access at key tube stations near tourist attractions and an improved urban realm for visitors in London for the Games.

### **3.4 TfL's response to the key issues raised by stakeholders**

- 3.4.1 This section lists the key issues which were most commonly raised by respondents, and sets out TfL's response to them. More detail about each of these issues is given Sections 3.2 and 3.3.
- 3.4.2 This is not intended to be an exhaustive set of issues and responses. This first phase of consultation was primarily intended to provide an opportunity for the Assembly and Functional Bodies to comment on the Statement of Intent. The wider public and stakeholder consultation which follows the publication of the draft MTS will provide an opportunity for stakeholders, other organisations, businesses and the public to respond to a more developed set of policies and proposals. The Assembly and Functional Bodies will also be invited to respond to the draft MTS in the wider consultation. TfL will address the issues arising from the wider consultation in more detail in the Report to the Mayor following that consultation and will make recommendations to the Mayor for changes to the draft MTS arising from the consultation. However, this section addresses the key issues that were raised in the first phase of consultation and sets out how these issues have informed the development of the draft MTS.
- 3.4.3 Many respondents, particularly boroughs and economic partnerships, made comments or asked questions which were specific to their local area. These are not included here but will be addressed following the second phase of consultation, and as part of the ongoing process to agree LIPs and the London Sub-regional Transport Plans.

#### **Need to set out future plans, including unfunded schemes**

- 3.4.4 The draft MTS sets out committed schemes in the short and medium term, as set out in the TfL Business Plan, but it also sets out proposals for investment in long term infrastructure projects to increase capacity where there is a belief that the schemes, while unfunded, should be considered to support the population and employment growth of the Capital. For example, a proposal to separate the Northern line, the potential extension of the Northern line, and a review of the potential to extend the Bakerloo line. In addition, it will set out how the Mayor proposes to safeguard the Chelsea-Hackney line, which could provide additional capacity and improve connectivity on a south west to north east axis through London. The Implementation Plan sets out three timescales for potential implementation of the schemes identified in the MTS: short term (up to and including 2012); medium term (2013 up to and including 2020); and long term (2021 up to and including 2031).
- 3.4.5 The draft MTS highlights that the Mayor and TfL will make the case to Government for long term investment in the transport network to secure the outcomes set out in the MTS.

3.4.6 The draft MTS presents projects and initiatives required to meet a range of challenges and in the context of the long term population and economic growth predicted for London; the consequences of not delivering the investment will also be included.

#### **The need to revisit or provide alternatives to cancelled schemes**

3.4.7 The schemes most often referred to here were: the Thames Gateway Bridge, Cross River Tram, the Tramlink extension, the DLR extension to Dagenham Dock, Greenwich Waterfront Transit and the additional phases of the East London Transit.

3.4.8 Although Thames Gateway Bridge divided opinion, there was general support for an additional river crossing in the east Thames. The draft MTS sets out the Mayor's plans for river crossings and highlights the Mayor's support for greater access for cyclists and pedestrians in the short term and a package of improved Thames crossings in the longer term.

3.4.9 It is not proposed to progress Cross River Tram. However, TfL has been considering options for better public transport connectivity between inner north and inner south London. Some of these focus on the shorter term in relation to buses, but the draft MTS also includes a longer term option in relation to an extension to the Bakerloo line.

3.4.10 In relation to the DLR extension, the draft MTS sets out the plan for an extension of the DLR to Dagenham Dock, as part of the housing proposals for Barking Riverside. The draft MTS also highlights the scope to extend the DLR network in the longer term to provide better links to Stratford, improved orbital links and connectivity in the Thames Gateway, and better integration with the central London transport system.

3.4.11 In relation to alternatives to the Greenwich Waterfront Transit, a series of workshops between TfL and the London Borough of Greenwich have now been scheduled to look at alternatives following the cancellation of the route from North Greenwich to Woolwich. The workshops are also intended to agree an approach for the development sites where S106 monies have been secured for the transit scheme.

#### **Crossrail 1 and 2**

3.4.12 There was a very positive response to the advent of Crossrail and a concern that access to it was maximised. While it is not yet practical to start looking in detail at potential additional bus services, for example, the intention to get the best value from Crossrail is reflected in the draft MTS and will remain an important focus for TfL.

3.4.13 Many stakeholders stressed that Crossrail 2 should be a priority for the future. The draft MTS recognises that a new line may be needed in the longer term to reduce crowding on existing routes but also to provide capacity to meet London's growth and provide connections to the national rail network. While funding for any Crossrail 2 scheme is not yet available and would depend on a much more detailed

assessment of its costs and benefits, the draft MTS sets out the Mayor's support for new rail capacity in the south west to north east corridor, for example using the Chelsea-Hackney safeguarded alignment. However, the nature of the transport problem in London has changed since the line was first proposed and variants to the scheme will be considered to ensure that the most effective solution is developed. Therefore it is important that the route for the Chelsea-Hackney line is reviewed to ensure that it is providing the maximum benefits and value for money.

### **High Speed 2**

3.4.14 High Speed 2 is a national scheme and as such is the responsibility of Government rather than the Mayor or TfL. However, the draft MTS highlights that the Mayor is supportive in principle of the development of a new high-speed rail line to the North and that locating the London terminus in central London would maximise access to jobs and London's population, and enable efficient onwards dispersal of high-speed line passengers. Integrating the line with the rest of the transport network in London would in part be within TfL's remit.

3.4.15 The draft MTS highlights that the London terminal should be centrally located, well connected to the existing public transport network and accessible to the whole of London in order to maximise access to jobs and London's population. It also recognises that there would need to be detailed consideration of the impact on the networks within central London and how onward distribution of passengers to and from the central terminal would be managed.

### **Transport in outer London**

3.4.16 The Outer London Commission has now published its initial recommendations; these and the ongoing work of the Commission have informed the development of the draft London Plan. Since the draft MTS has been closely aligned with the development of the spatial planning proposals, the initial findings of the Outer London Commission have been reflected in the draft MTS. The Commission does not recommend development centred on a few hubs in outer London, which was one of the scenarios originally considered.

3.4.17 Instead, it has indicated that future growth in outer London should be based around the existing town centres network. This will require improving connections to these, rather than identifying new development centres. This approach is reflected in the draft MTS which identifies the need for improvements to connectivity to local town centres. More detailed development of this approach will be progressed through the London Sub-regional Transport Plans, LIPs and the modal planning process.

3.4.18 Furthermore, the draft MTS contains measures to support growth in outer London and provide access for people to opportunities and services as close as possible to where they live. It also emphasises the importance of maximising access into and between town centres, including by walking and cycling.

### **Road user hierarchy**

3.4.19 The draft MTS sets out the Mayor's guiding principles, including the need to respect Londoner's choice. Whilst it does not advocate a generic road user hierarchy, the draft MTS recognises that there are clear social, economic and environmental imperatives to reduce the reliance on private car travel and to encourage the use of more sustainable modes such as cycling, walking and public transport. This includes a target of increasing the overall mode share of public transport, walking and cycling to 64 per cent, or further should road user charging be required to meet the strategy's goals. It aims to achieve this through a flexible approach which is appropriate for the particular circumstances to deliver clear progress in improving conditions for different types of travel.

3.4.20 The draft MTS highlights the importance of smoothing traffic (see section below). It also sets out that the Mayor will seek to develop London's transport system and to promote measures that encourage behavioural change in order to support sustainable economic growth. It seeks to achieve an increase in public transport, walking and cycling mode share by reducing the need to travel, encouraging the use of more sustainable, less congesting, modes of transport (public transport, cycling and walking), setting appropriate parking standards, and through investment in infrastructure and service improvements and through promotion of smarter travel initiatives. Any potential solution must be appropriate to the particular context.

### **Walking and cycling**

3.4.21 The draft MTS sets out a range of measures to encourage walking and cycling, with the aim of increasing the share of walking to 25 per cent and cycling to five per cent over the strategy period. The draft MTS sets out the commitment to make it easier for Londoners to walk and cycle and to encourage them to do so. There is scope for 'big wins' at local level; the draft MTS, while setting out a number of high-level policies and proposals for walking and cycling, is still sufficiently non-prescriptive to allow boroughs to identify what works best in their area, and put these measures in place via their LIPs.

3.4.22 The draft MTS seeks to encourage walking by changing the way people think about their transport options. Specific walking schemes include further roll-out of the Legible London programme, improvements to the urban realm and the development of the Key Walking Route approach in partnership with the boroughs. The draft MTS also sets out the commitment to create major 'balanced streets' initiatives in central London and outer London town centres.

3.4.23 With regard to cycling, the draft MTS recognises that there is great potential to increase cycling in outer London. Consequently it makes clear that a variety of cycling initiatives will be required to realise the cycling potential of the whole of London, reflecting the different circumstances of people in central, inner and outer areas. Plans include creating cycle hubs in town centres in outer London, and 'Biking

Boroughs' to help to realise this. While the cycle hire scheme is due to begin operation in central London from 2010, in the future there is potential to extend the approach to other parts of London.

### **Smoothing traffic flow**

3.4.24 The draft MTS recognises that there is a need to maximise the efficient use of the road network, through measures designed to smooth traffic, while also recognising the need to encourage modal shift towards more sustainable and less congesting modes of transport. It sets out measures to smooth traffic flows and improve journey time reliability ensuring expeditious movement of people and goods. Measures include:

- Investment in intelligent traffic control systems
- A trial period of allowing motorcycles and scooters in TLRN bus lanes
- The continued roll out and development of SCOOT signal timing technology
- Better management of planned interventions on the road network
- Using LondonWorks to improve street works planning and coordination
- Developing a road works permit system and potential "lane rental" charges.

3.4.25 A number of respondents highlighted that measures to smooth traffic must not lead to increased traffic levels or speeds. The draft MTS allows for the flexible use of several measures to help manage demand on the road network by reducing the need to travel and encouraging modal shift to more sustainable and less congesting modes. These include Smarter Travel initiatives, but also, if required, the use of pricing, for example in relation to parking and road user charging. With regard to road safety, the draft MTS sets out a number of measures to continue to improve London's record on reducing road casualties.

3.4.26 London's road network serves a variety of purposes. It is the means by which people travel from point to point; by foot, cycle, taxi, car, bus and also is of major importance for freight. Therefore, the Mayor's focus on 'smoothing traffic flow' applies to all of these user groups. The draft MTS recognises that there needs to be a balance between the needs of the different road users and to consider the need to smooth traffic both for road traffic and for pedestrians.

### **Roads and parking/road maintenance**

3.4.27 The draft MTS recognises the need for consultation when defining parking regulations. It sets out that parking and loading provision and controls should be managed through a balanced assessment of the economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the London Plan, the EDS and the MTS.

### **Freight**

3.4.28 The draft MTS recognises both the importance of the freight and logistics sector to London's economy and the need to minimise the environmental impact of freight. It

includes proposals to support the freight and logistics sector in a sustainable way, including enhanced use of the river and canals. It seeks to achieve increased freight movement efficiency and highlights that the Mayor will support freight industry land requirements for locally focussed consolidation break-bulk facilities and access to waterways and railways.

### **Road user charging**

- 3.4.29 The draft MTS includes road user charging amongst the measures that can be used to manage demand for transport. While pricing is a powerful tool for managing demand, it is one of many possible options for addressing transport and environmental issues. There are of course a number of complexities and acceptability challenges associated with this measure, but further road pricing may be considered if other measures at the Mayor's disposal were deemed insufficient to meet the objectives set out in the Strategy. Any potential road user charging scheme would be defined only once the specific aims of the scheme and the context within which it may be taken forward were known.
- 3.4.30 The draft MTS provides flexibility for demand management measures to be introduced in the future. It sets out that any road pricing scheme would need to be fair, tailored to local conditions, and provide a reasonable balance between its objectives, costs and other impacts. It also describes the types of benefit that a road user charging scheme could be expected to bring.
- 3.4.31 Before any road pricing scheme could be introduced, or removed, there is a statutory requirement to consult with the public and stakeholders. Additionally, the draft MTS recognises the need to work in partnership with the boroughs to evaluate the potential for road user charging schemes to support the delivery of the desired outcomes set out in the Strategy. The draft MTS also highlights the need for a sophisticated approach to any road pricing scheme.

### **Accessibility**

- 3.4.32 While there are funding constraints, the draft MTS sets out the commitment to improve access for mobility impaired and disabled passengers. Accessibility improvements will be delivered as part of the Tube upgrades, as well as step-free access at key LU 2012 Games stations (such as Stratford, Green Park and Southfields) and through major interchange schemes such as Bank and Victoria. Crossrail will also revolutionise step-free and gap-free access in central London. However, the draft MTS highlights that accessibility is not exclusively about big investment schemes. It takes a 'whole journey' approach and proposes a range of initiatives to improve the journey experience for all. This includes better safety and security, information provision and staff training, developed in consultation with disabled groups. The draft MTS includes a timetable for the implementation of relevant proposals; TfL's Disability Equality Scheme (DES) also sets out what action

TfL will take to ensure that its services are accessible to disabled people and a new three-year DES will be in place by the end of 2009, following public consultation.

### **Regeneration**

3.4.33 The MTS has a role in enhancing and protecting the built environment and supporting regeneration. The draft strategy recognises that alignment between transport and regeneration priorities is vital. Poor transport is often a significant barrier, for example in restricting access to jobs, services, education and training opportunities, and social networks. The draft MTS supports the London Plan to expand opportunities for all and to help address the significant issue of deprivation in London's poorest communities. It includes a policy to prioritise measures in London's most deprived areas, as well as 'opportunity areas' and 'areas for intensification' as described in the London Plan to support wider regeneration initiatives across the city. It also recognises the potential regeneration benefits that can be achieved from planned schemes, such as Crossrail, from the legacy of the Olympics and Paralympics and from potential future schemes such as Crossrail 2.

### **Better streets/"shared space"**

3.4.34 The draft MTS recognises that separating pedestrians and vehicular traffic for perceived safety reasons, streets filled with clutter and the large number of traffic signals have all resulted in pedestrians being marginalised. It recognises that designing streets primarily for motor vehicles has a detrimental effect on the ability of pedestrians to move, the setting and amenity value of the historic environment and the enjoyment which people derive from them. The draft MTS therefore includes a proposal to apply the principles of "better streets" in town centres, working closely with the boroughs.

3.4.35 The underlying aim is to achieve a better balance between the needs of vehicles and other road users and to improve the look, feel and quality of the urban realm. In all cases, safety and the needs of different road users remains a key issue. It is vital that all stakeholder groups, including groups representing blind and visually impaired people, are consulted on better streets initiatives at every stage in the development process to ensure there is community-wide buy in.

### **Electric vehicles**

3.4.36 The promotion of electric road vehicles is a Mayoral priority. The draft MTS recognises that the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with electric vehicles is ultimately determined by electricity generation. First generation electric cars powered by current National Grid electricity supply account for around 40 per cent less CO<sub>2</sub> per kilometre travelled when compared to the average of the current London car fleet. As electricity generation becomes more efficient (through a combination of the Mayor's target for 25 per cent decentralised energy supply in London by 2025 and Government ambitions for expansion of renewable energy provision to the National

Grid), the carbon efficiency of electric vehicles will improve further. In addition, the draft MTS also recognises the additional benefits of electric vehicles in terms of reduced air pollutant emissions and noise.

3.4.37 A framework, setting out the principles for new electric vehicle charge point standards at new developments, is currently being developed for the London Plan public consultation. These principles will link required provision at new developments to the uptake of electric vehicles and will include standards for passive provision (putting electricity distribution cabling in place to provide electricity supply to parking spaces in the future). They will also be responsive to future technological advances. There will be higher standards for residential locations to encourage night-time charging (and avoid 'peak' electricity usage periods).

3.4.38 However, the draft MTS also recognises that promoting a switch to electric vehicles must also go hand in hand with policies to reduce the need to travel and to encourage the use of more sustainable and less congesting modes, as set out above. Electric vehicles are therefore just one part of a wider package of measures.

### **Specific local schemes**

3.4.39 Many London boroughs and other organisations highlighted a number of interventions which they identified as important for their area. These are set out in the individual summaries in Appendix 2. They are not summarised here but will be addressed in the draft MTS, the LIPs and the Sub-regional Transport Plans.

## **4. Next Steps**

### **4.1 Introduction**

- 4.1.1 TfL has been delegated to prepare the revision to the MTS. The MTS Statement of Intent set out a framework for developing the new Strategy, outlining potential policies and proposals which could be developed further in the draft MTS. This Statement of Intent allowed the Mayor to fulfil his duty to consult with the Assembly and Functional Bodies in advance of a wider public and stakeholder consultation on a draft Strategy.
- 4.1.2 The Mayor is required to have regard to the comments submitted to him by the Assembly and the Functional Bodies (alongside the ODA), in developing his draft MTS. The Mayor is also required to submit a Statement to the Chair of the London Assembly, setting out which of the Assembly's comments are accepted for implementation, and set out the reasons why any comments so submitted are not so accepted. The Statement is a discrete document which emanates from the Mayor rather than TfL, and is subject to particular legal requirements. The Statement will be made publicly available once it has been submitted to the Chair of the Assembly.
- 4.1.3 Initial proposals for both the London Plan (A new plan for London – Proposals for the Mayor's London Plan) and the Economic Development Strategy (Rising to the Challenge – Proposals for the Mayor's Economic Development Strategy) were consulted on with the Assembly and Functional Bodies on a similar timeframe as for the MTS Statement of Intent. This was intended to enable the integration of strategic land use, transport and economic development planning decisions affecting London. It is to be expected that the Mayor will wish to consider the responses to all three strategies before proceeding with the consultation on the draft MTS.
- 4.1.4 This report is intended to assist the Mayor in the development of MTS by presenting TfL's analysis of the responses received to the first phase of the consultation, and outlining TfL's recommended approach for proceeding with the draft MTS in light of the key issues raised.
- 4.1.5 As described in Chapter 1, it is planned to consult with the public and stakeholders on the draft MTS in autumn 2009. The draft MTS will contain more detailed policies and proposals. However, given that MTS will cover the period up to 2031, these will still be set at a relatively high level in order to maximise the Strategy's relevance over time. The public consultation will provide another opportunity for the Assembly and Functional Bodies to comment on the draft MTS, as well as inviting comments from a wider range of stakeholders, members of the public, organisations and businesses. TfL will provide detailed responses to the issues raised in public consultation in its report to the Mayor following the consultation, including recommendations to the Mayor for alterations to the draft MTS.

## **4.2 Next Steps for the draft MTS**

- 4.3 The public and stakeholder consultation on the draft MTS will take place for 13 weeks from autumn 2009. TfL will then analyse the responses submitted and present the results to the Mayor. The Mayor will consider comments made by the public, businesses, other organisations, stakeholders, and the Assembly and Functional Bodies on the draft MTS. The development of the MTS will also be considered in light of the consultations on the draft London Plan, Economic Development Strategy and Mayoral environmental strategies.
- 4.3.1 The development of the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy and MTS will also need to be aligned. The Air Quality Strategy is being revised and will consider how to address London's air quality challenges. Reducing emissions from transport will play a key role in this. Any impacts on air quality emissions from the proposed removal of the Western Extension to the Congestion Charging zone will be considered as part of this broader approach to reducing emissions and improving London's air quality.
- 4.3.2 Subject to the outcome of the public consultation, the MTS is expected to be published in spring 2010.
- 4.3.3 TfL's Business Plan will be revised annually (the next publication will be in late autumn 2009) to reflect the MTS priorities.
- 4.3.4 In summer 2010, detailed London Sub-regional Transport Plans will be produced for each sub-region, to assist in the delivery of the new MTS.
- 4.3.5 London boroughs will need to draft new Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) which demonstrate how they will tackle local priorities in compliance with the new MTS. The MTS and Sub-regional Transport Plans will provide the overarching framework for the development of LIPs. However, it is important that the LIPs also link with other documents and mechanisms, for instance, Local Area Agreements, Local Development Frameworks and Local Strategic Partnerships to ensure integration with wider community and economic development priorities. Detailed guidance for boroughs on funding and how to prepare their LIP will be contained in the Second London LIP Guidance, to be published following consultation with the boroughs and key partners.
- 4.3.6 Transport outcomes will be monitored and reported annually in the Travel in London report. Subsequent revisions of the strategy may be required to ensure outcomes are achieved.

## **4.4 Next steps for the Western Extension Zone and Low Emission Zone**

### **The Western Extension of the Congestion Charging zone**

- 4.4.1 Following an informal, non-statutory consultation in autumn 2008, the Mayor confirmed his intention to proceed with the legal processes required to remove the

Western Extension of the Congestion Charging zone. It is intended that the draft MTS published for public and stakeholder consultation will contain provisions allowing for its removal. Subject to this revision to the Transport Strategy, a Variation Order would be consulted on from spring 2010, which will include detailed proposals for its removal.

### **The Low Emission Zone Phase Three**

- 4.4.2 The Mayor has also announced his intention to suspend Phase 3 of the London Low Emission Zone (LEZ). LEZ Phase 3 was scheduled to come into force from September 2010, and would have imposed emission limits on Light Goods Vehicles (LGVs) and minibuses. The intention is to defer the implementation of Phase 3 to 2012. This will require a revision both to the MTS and the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy. Subject to these revisions, TfL would consult on a draft Variation Order to amend the current LEZ Scheme Order to defer Phase 3. It is expected this consultation would take place broadly in parallel with the consultation on the Western Extension removal.
-