

# **Draft Mayor's Transport Strategy**

**Statutory consultation with the public and  
stakeholders**

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

**Appendices 1, 2 and 3**

**Annexes B and C**

March 2010

## **Contents**

Appendix 1 - List of Stakeholders consulted .....	3
Appendix 2 - List of Stakeholders who responded to the consultation .....	14
Appendix 3 – List of meetings relevant to the development of the draft Mayor’s Transport Strategy.....	19
Annex B – Summary for each stakeholder response received.....	24
Annex C - TfL’s consideration of late responses to the consultation .....	75

## **Appendix 1 - List of Stakeholders consulted**

(441 in total)

### **Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic Representative Organisations (37)**

1990 Trust  
African Caribbean Business Network  
Al-Hasaniya Moroccan Womens Centre  
Al-Muntada Al-Islami Trust  
Asian Business Association  
Bait al-Mal al-Islami  
Bangladesh Welfare Association  
Beit Klal Yisrael  
Bengali Workers Association  
Black Londoners Forum  
Black Neighbourhood Regeneration and Renewal Network (BNRRN)  
Black Training and Enterprise Group (BTEG)  
Centre for Armenian Information & Advice  
Chinese in Britain Forum  
Confederation of Indian Organisations  
Consortium of Bengali Associates  
Council of Ethnic Minority Voluntary Sector Organisations (CEMVO)  
Eritrean Support Group  
Institute of Race Relations  
Iraqi Community Association  
Irish Support & Advice Service  
Islamic Universal Association  
Jewish Care  
Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants  
London Chinese Community Network  
Monitoring Group  
Moroccan Community Welfare Group  
National Assembly Against Racism  
Naz Project  
Operation Black Vote  
Race Equality Foundation  
Race on the Agenda  
Refugee Council  
Society of Afghan Residents  
Somali Welfare Association  
Zimbabwe Community Association  
Zoroastrian Trust Funds of Europe

### **Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) (8)**

Angel BID  
Croydon BID  
E11 BID  
Ealing Broadway BID  
Kingston First  
London Bridge BID  
London Riverside BID

Paddington BID

**Business Representative Groups (19)**

British Chamber of Commerce  
British Retail Consortium  
Camden Town Unlimited  
Canary Wharf Group  
Confederation of British Industry (CBI)  
Covent Garden Market Authority  
Federation of Small Businesses (FSB)  
Forum of Private Business  
Heart of London  
In Holborn  
Islington Chamber of Commerce  
London Chamber of Commerce and Industry (LCCI)  
London First  
New West End Company  
Oxford Street Association  
Regent Street Association  
Southwark Chamber of Commerce  
Visit London  
Wandsworth Chamber of Commerce

**Children/Young People (13)**

4Children  
Action for Children  
Barnardos  
British Youth Council  
Catch 22  
Kids Co  
London Youth  
National Children's Homes (NCH)  
National Council of Voluntary Youth Services  
National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC)  
Prince's Trust  
Save the Children  
Tamezin Club

**Cycling/Pedestrian Organisations (3)**

Living Streets  
London Cycling Campaign (LCC)  
Cyclists' Touring Club (CTC)

**Disability and Mobility Groups (30)**

Asian People's Disability Alliance  
Association of Disabled Professionals  
Black Disabled Londoners Association  
British Council of Disabled People  
British Deaf Association  
Community Transport Association UK (CTA)

Deafblind UK  
Disability Alliance  
Disability Resource Team  
Disabled Drivers Motor Club  
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee  
Employers' Forum on Disability  
Guide Dogs for the Blind Association  
Inclusion London  
Independent Disability Advisory Group (IDAG)  
Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind & Partially Sighted People (JCMBPS)  
Joint Mobility Unit  
London Community Interest Company of Deaf and Disabled People's Organisations  
Mencap  
Metropolitan Society for the Blind  
Mobilise  
National Autistic Society  
Organisation of Blind Africans & Caribbeans (OBAC)  
People First  
Royal Association for Disability Rights (RADAR) - London Access Forum  
Royal National Institute for Deaf People (RNID)  
Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB)  
SCOPE  
SENSE  
Spinal Injuries Association

#### **Economic and Regeneration Partnerships (8)**

Better Bankside  
Central London Partnership  
Hainault Business Partnership  
London Thames Gateway Development Corporation  
Restore Peckham  
Thames Gateway London Partnership (TGLP)  
Waterloo Quarter Business Alliance  
West London Partnership

#### **Education (5)**

Heriot-Watt University  
Imperial College  
University College London (UCL)  
University of East London (UEL)  
University of Westminster

#### **Emergency Services Providers (6)**

Association of Chief Police Officers  
British Transport Police  
City of London Police  
Maritime & Coastguards Agency  
Metropolitan Police Service  
Metropolitan Police Transport Service

## **European Government (2)**

Gerard Batten MEP  
Syed Kamall MEP

## **Faith Groups (14)**

Archdiocese of Southwark  
Archdiocese of Westminster  
Bah'i Community of the UK  
Board of Deputies of British Jews  
Buddhist Society  
Chinese Church in London  
Church of England  
Evangelical Alliance  
Holy Mission  
Interfaith Network  
Jain  
Muslim Council of Britain  
National Council of Hindu Temples  
Network of Sikh Organisations

## **Freight/Haulage Representative Organisations (4)**

British International Freight Association  
Freight Transport Association (FTA)  
National Courier Association  
Road Haulage Association (RHA)

## **GLA Functional Bodies & Commissions (8)**

London Development Agency (LDA)  
London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority  
London Sustainable Development Commission (LSDC)  
London TravelWatch  
Mayor's London Equalities Commission  
Metropolitan Police Authority  
Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA)  
Transport for London (TfL Board)

## **Government (6)**

Cabinet Office Social Exclusion Task Force  
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs  
Department for Transport (DfT)  
Foreign and Commonwealth Office  
Government Office for London  
MoD Defence Movements and Transport Policy Division

## **Health Organisations (20)**

Asthma UK  
British Lung Foundation  
British Red Cross

Care Quality Commission  
Carers UK  
Cystic Fibrosis Trust  
Health Protection Agency  
London Health Observatory  
Muscular Disease Society  
National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence  
National Patient Safety Agency  
National Patient Transport Modernisation Group  
National Performance Advisory Group for the NHS  
National Treatment Agency  
NHS Blood and Transplant  
NHS London  
NHS Professionals Special Health Authority  
Regional Public Health Group London  
St John Ambulance - London (Prince of Wales's Division)  
Stroke Association

### **London Assembly (11)**

25 London Assembly Members  
Assembly Planning and Housing Committee Secretariat  
Assembly Transport Committee Secretariat  
Greater London Assembly Conservative Group  
Greater London Assembly Green Group  
Greater London Assembly Health  
Greater London Assembly Labour Group  
Greater London Assembly Liberal Democrats Group  
Greater London Assembly One London Group  
London Assembly  
London Assembly Transport Committee

### **London Boroughs (34)**

City of Westminster  
Corporation of London  
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham  
London Borough of Barnet  
London Borough of Bexley  
London Borough of Brent  
London Borough of Bromley  
London Borough of Camden  
London Borough of Croydon  
London Borough of Ealing  
London Borough of Enfield  
London Borough of Greenwich  
London Borough of Hackney  
London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham  
London Borough of Haringey  
London Borough of Harrow  
London Borough of Havering  
London Borough of Hillingdon

London Borough of Hounslow  
London Borough of Islington  
London Borough of Lambeth  
London Borough of Lewisham  
London Borough of Merton  
London Borough of Newham  
London Borough of Redbridge  
London Borough of Richmond upon Thames  
London Borough of Southwark  
London Borough of Sutton  
London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
London Borough of Waltham Forest  
London Borough of Wandsworth  
London Councils  
Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea (RBKC)  
Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames

**Motoring Organisations (11)**

Association of British Drivers (ABD)  
Association of Car Fleet Operators  
Automobile Association (AA)  
British Motorcyclists Federation  
Chartered Institute of Logistics & Transport (CILT)  
Federation of British Historic Vehicle Clubs  
Green Flag Group  
Institute of Advanced Motorists (IAM)  
Motorcycle Action Group  
Motorists' Forum  
RAC Foundation

**NHS Trusts/Health Authorities within Greater London (80)**

Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust  
Barnet & Chase Farm Hospitals NHS  
Barnet Primary Care Trust  
Barnet, Enfield & Haringey Mental Health NHS Trust  
Barts and The London NHS Trust  
Bexley Care Trust  
Brent Teaching Primary Care Trust  
Bromley Hospitals NHS Trust  
Bromley Primary Care Trust  
Camden & Islington Mental Health & Social Care Trust  
Camden and Islington Mental Health and Social Care Trust  
Camden Primary Care Trust  
Central & NW London NHS Foundation Trust  
Chelsea and Westminster Hospital NHS Foundation Trust  
City & Hackney Teaching Primary Care Trust  
Croydon Primary Care Trust  
Dartford and Gravesend NHS Trust  
Ealing Hospital NHS Trust  
Ealing Primary Care Trust



East London NHS Foundation Trust  
Enfield Primary Care Trust  
Epsom & St Helier NHS Trust  
Great Ormond Street Hospital  
Greenwich Teaching Primary Care Trust  
Guy's & St Thomas' Hospital NHS  
Hammersmith & Fulham Primary Care Trust  
Hammersmith Hospitals NHS Trust  
Haringey Teaching Primary Care Trust  
Harrow Primary Care Trust  
Havering Primary Care Trust  
Hillingdon Hospital NHS Trust  
Hillingdon Primary Care Trust  
Homerton University Hospital NHS  
Hounslow Primary Care Trust  
Islington Primary Care Trust  
Kensington and Chelsea Primary Care Trust  
King's College Hospital NHS Trust  
Kingston Hospital NHS Trust  
Kingston Primary Care Trust  
Lambeth Primary Care Trust  
Lewisham Hospital NHS Trust  
Lewisham Primary Care Trust  
London Ambulance Service NHS Trust  
Mayday Healthcare NHS Trust  
Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Trust  
Newham Primary Care Trust  
Newham University Hospital NHS Trust  
North East London Mental Health NHS  
North Middlesex University Hospital NHS Trust  
North West London Hospitals NHS  
Oxleas NHS Trust  
Princess Alexandra Hospital NHS Trust  
Queen Elizabeth Hospital NHS Trust  
Queen Mary's Sidcup NHS Trust  
Redbridge Primary Care Trust  
Richmond and Twickenham Primary Care Trust  
Royal Brompton & Harefield Hospital  
Royal Free Hampstead NHS Trust  
Royal Marsden NHS Trust  
Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital NHS Trust  
South London & Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust  
South West London & St Georges Mental Health NHS Trust  
Southwark Primary Care Trust  
St George's Healthcare NHS Trust  
St Mary's NHS Trust  
Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Trust  
Surrey and Sussex Health Care NHS Trust  
Sutton & Merton Primary Care Trust  
Tavistock & Portman NHS Foundation Trust

The Hillingdon Hospital NHS Trust  
The Lewisham Hospital NHS Trust  
Tower Hamlets Primary Care Trust  
University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust  
Waltham Forest Primary Care Trust  
Wandsworth Primary Care Trust  
West London Mental Health NHS Trust  
West Middlesex University Hospital  
Westminster Primary Care Trust  
Whipps Cross University Hospital NHS Trust  
Whittington Hospital NHS Trust

**Non Departmental Government Bodies/Executive Agencies/Public (17)**

Commission for Equality and Human Rights  
Commission for Racial Equality  
Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency  
Driving Standards Agency  
Environment Agency  
Equalities and Human Rights Commission  
Equality and Human Rights Commission (formerly Disability Rights Commission)  
Highways Agency  
Low Pay Commission  
Office of Rail Regulation  
Parking and Traffic Appeals Service  
Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety  
Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution  
Sustainable Development Commission  
The Royal Parks  
Vehicle and Operator Service Agency (VOSA)  
Vehicle Certification Agency

**Older People (5)**

Age Concern  
Association of Greater London Older Women  
Greater London Forum for the Elderly  
Help the Aged  
National Pensioners Convention

**Other (11)**

Argall Avenue  
DHL International Ltd  
Hammersmith London  
Health Commission  
J Doorman Associates Ltd (IIA)  
Kimpton  
Partnership Solutions  
Routemaster Association  
South London Sub Regional Strategy Board  
Tellings Golden Miller Limited  
United Parcel Service (UPS)

### **Professional Organisations (11)**

- Association for Consultancy and Engineering (ACE)
- Association of Town Centre Managers
- British Medical Association
- Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management
- Finance and Leasing Association
- Institute of Directors
- Institution of Highways and Transportation
- Royal Academy of Engineering
- Royal College of Nursing
- Transport Planning Society (TPS)
- Transport Research Laboratory

### **Regional Government (2)**

- East of England Development Agency (EEDA)
- South East England Development Agency (SEEDA)

### **Trade Associations (9)**

- British Vehicle Rental and Leasing Association (BVRLA)
- Guild of British Coach Operators
- Licensed Taxi Drivers' Association
- Natural Gas Vehicle Association Limited (NGVAL)
- Society of Motor Manufacturers & Traders Ltd
- Telecommunications Industry Association
- The Despatch Association
- The Society of London Manufacturers (SOLOMAN)
- UKLPG (UK Liquefied Petroleum Gas)

### **Trade Unions (10)**

- Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen (ASLEF)
- Communication Workers Union
- Fire Brigades Union Regional Office
- National Farmers Union
- National Union of Rail Maritime and Transport Workers
- National Union Students
- Public and Commercial Services Union
- Trades Union Congress (TUC)
- Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers (USDAW)
- Unite

### **Transport and Environment Representative Organisations (25)**

- Alliance Against Urban 4x4s
- Campaign for Better Transport
- Campaign for Clean Air in London
- Capital Transport Campaign
- Cenex
- Cleaner Transport Forum
- Confederation of Passenger Transport (CPT)
- Energy Saving Trust (EST)

Environmental Protection UK (formerly NSCA)  
Friends of the Earth  
Greenpeace  
Kensington & Chelsea Environment Round Table  
London Civic Forum  
London Sustainability Exchange (LsX)  
London Sustainable Development Forum  
Low Carbon Vehicle Partnership  
National Federation of Bus Users  
Natural England  
North London Transport Forum  
Passenger Focus  
Ramblers  
Road Peace  
Sustrans  
Transport for All (TfA)  
Walk London

**Transport Operators (6)**

Abellio (formerly Travel London)  
London Bus Operators' Forum  
Port of London Authority  
South & West London Transport Conference (SWELTRAC)  
Stagecoach London  
Universitybus Limited

**Transport Partnerships (1)**

South-East London Transport Strategy (SELTRANS)

**Transport Research Groups (2)**

Centre for Independent Transport Research  
Institute for Transport Studies

**Utilities (5)**

British Gas Group  
British Telecom (BT)  
National Grid  
Royal Mail  
Thames Water

**Voluntary/Community Groups (18)**

Bassac  
Central London CVS Network  
Garratt Park  
Greater London Volunteering  
London Advice Services Alliance (LASA)  
London Citizens  
London Community Recycling Network (LCRN)  
London Forum of Amenity & Civic Societies  
London Tenants Federation

London Voluntary Service Council  
National Trust  
Off the Streets and into Work (OSW)  
School for Social Entrepreneurs  
Stonewall  
Toynbee Hall  
Volunteer Bureau  
Volunteering England  
Women's Resource Centre (WRC)

## **Appendix 2 - List of Stakeholders who responded to the consultation**

(151 in total)

### **Business Representative Groups (4)**

Confederation of British Industry (CBI)  
Federation of Small Businesses (FSB)  
London Chamber of Commerce and Industry (LCCI)  
London First

### **Contiguous Local Authorities (3)**

Hertfordshire County Council  
Kent County Council  
Tandridge District Council

### **Cycling/Pedestrian Org (4)**

Cyclists' Touring Club (CTC)  
Living Streets  
London Cycling Campaign (LCC)  
Walk England

### **Disability, Mobility and Older People (9)**

Age Concern  
Community Transport Association UK (CTA)  
Guide Dogs for the Blind Association  
Inclusion London  
Independent Disability Advisory Group (IDAG)  
London Disability Cycling Forum  
London Visual Impairment Forum (LVIF)  
Royal National Institute for Deaf People (RNID)  
Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB)

### **Economic/regeneration partnerships (7)**

Better Bankside  
London Thames Gateway Development Corporation  
North London Strategic Alliance  
Park Royal Partnership (PRP)  
South London Partnership (SLP)  
Thames Gateway London Partnership (TGLP)  
West London Partnership

### **Education (1)**

University of East London (UEL)

### **Freight/Haulage Representative Organisations (3)**

Central London Freight Quality Partnership  
Freight Transport Association (FTA)  
Road Haulage Association (RHA)

### **GLA Functional Bodies & Commissions (5)**

London Development Agency (LDA)  
London Sustainable Development Commission (LSDC)  
London TravelWatch  
Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA)  
Transport for London (TfL Board)

### **Government (2)**

Department for Transport (DfT)  
Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety

### **Health (8)**

Commissioning Support for London  
Enfield NHS Trust  
London Primary Care Trusts  
NHS Lambeth  
NHS London  
NHS Tower Hamlets  
North West London Hospitals NHS Trust  
Royal Free Hampstead NHS Trust

### **London Assembly (6)**

Jenny Jones AM  
London Assembly  
London Liberal Democrats (The London Assembly Liberal Democrat group and Liberal Democrat London spokesperson Tom Brake MP)  
Richard Tracey - London Assembly Conservative Group  
Steve O'Connell - Assembly Member  
Val Shawcross - Assembly Member

### **London Boroughs (34)**

Corporation of London  
London Borough of Barking & Dagenham  
London Borough of Barnet  
London Borough of Bexley  
London Borough of Brent  
London Borough of Bromley  
London Borough of Camden  
London Borough of Croydon  
London Borough of Ealing  
London Borough of Enfield  
London Borough of Greenwich  
London Borough of Hackney  
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham  
London Borough of Haringey  
London Borough of Harrow  
London Borough of Havering  
London Borough of Hillingdon  
London Borough of Hounslow

London Borough of Islington  
London Borough of Lambeth  
London Borough of Lewisham  
London Borough of Merton  
London Borough of Newham  
London Borough of Redbridge  
London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames  
London Borough of Southwark  
London Borough of Sutton  
London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
London Borough of Waltham Forest  
London Borough of Wandsworth  
London Councils  
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC)  
Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames  
Westminster City Council

**London Councillors (4)**

Councillor Jonathan Glantz - Westminster City Council  
Councillor Liz Santry - Haringey  
Councillor Peter Morgan - Bromley  
Councillor Rahman Khan - Haringey

**Motoring Organisations (5)**

Association of British Drivers (ABD)  
Automobile Association (AA)  
British Motorcyclists Federation  
Institute of Advanced Motorists (IAM)  
RAC Foundation

**MPs (2)**

Clive Efford MP  
Greg Hands MP

**Non Departmental Public Bodies (5)**

British Waterways  
English Heritage  
Environment Agency  
Highways Agency  
Natural England

**Other (2)**

Royal Parks  
The Crown Estate

**Professional Organisations (6)**

Association for Consultancy and Engineering (ACE)  
Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH)  
Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport (CILT)  
Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT)



Institute of Civil Engineers (ICE)  
Transport Planning Society (TPS)

**Regional Government (2)**

East of England Development Agency (EEDA)  
South East England Development Agency (SEEDA)

**Trade Associations (6)**

Association of International Courier and Express Services (AICES)  
British Vehicle Rental and Leasing Association (BVRLA)  
Licensed Private Hire Car Association (LPHCA)  
Private Hire Board  
Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders Limited (SMMT)  
UKLPG (UK Liquefied Petroleum Gas)

**Transport and Environment Representative Organisations (16)**

Aviation Environment Federation  
Campaign for Better Transport  
Campaign for Clean Air in London (CCAL)  
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)  
Confederation of Passenger Transport (CPT)  
Energy Saving Trust (EST)  
Friends of Capital Transport Campaign  
Friends of the Earth  
London Civic Forum  
London Civic Forum and Youth Campaign for Better Transport  
London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies  
Railfuture  
Ramblers  
Roadpeace  
Sustrans  
Transport for All (TfA)

**Transport Operators (11)**

Association of Train Operating Companies (ATOC)  
First Capital Connect  
Heathrow Airport Limited  
Heathrow Hub Limited  
London City Airport  
London Gatwick Airport  
National Express East Anglia and c2c  
Network Rail  
Port of London Authority  
South & West London Transport Conference (SWELTRAC)  
South East England Regional Transport Board

**Unions (4)**

Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen (ASLEF)  
Trades Union Congress (TUC)  
Transport Salaried Staffs' Association (TSSA)  
Unite

**Utilities (2)**

British Telecom (BT)  
National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG)

## Appendix 3 – List of meetings relevant to the development of the draft Mayor’s Transport Strategy

Date	Event
<b>2009</b>	
29 June	Pre-engagement roundtable - <i>attended by Living Streets, London Cycling Campaign and Natural England +8 other organisations</i>
2 July	Pre-engagement roundtable for community, voluntary and disability groups- <i>attended by Royal National Institute of Deaf People, Age Concern, Independent Disability Advisory Group +34 other organisations</i>
1 October	Confederation of British Industry / London First briefing
7 October	Central London Chief Executives / Greater London Authority Officers
13 <sup>th</sup> October	London First Mayor’s Transport Strategy event with Deputy Chair of TfL
13 October	City of London
14 October	London Borough of Islington
15 October	London Councils TEC – Local Implementation Plans and Cycling Revolution
16 October	Age Concern, Help the Aged and the Greater London Forum for Older People - ‘Break the Barriers’
19 October	Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
20 October	London Borough of Tower Hamlets
20 October	Urban Transport World Europe - ‘Matching National and Local Government plans with the needs of the city’
21 October	London Borough of Bexley
21 October	The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport
22 October	London Thames Gateway Development Corporation
24 October	Youth Participation event - <i>attended by London Youth, London Civic Forum and British Youth Council + 4 other stakeholders</i>
26 October	Thames Gateway London Partnership

Date	Event
27 October	London First
28 October	North London Transport Forum – (Assistant Directors)
28 October	Croydon multi agency regeneration meeting - <i>attended by London Development Agency, National Rail and Homes and Communities Agency</i>
28 October	London Borough of Bexley
2 November	South & West London Transport Conference
2 November	London Development Agency - New Urban Agenda
4 November	Central London Forward
4 November	Integrated Transport Conference
5 November	Passenger Transport Group
5 November	Kent County Council
6 November	Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
6 November	London Borough of Camden (Leader and Chief Executive)
8 November	London Borough of Barnet
9 November	South London Strategy Board
10 November	Haringey Transport / Mobility Forum
10 November	London Travelwatch
10 November	Smarter Travel Sutton
10 November	Environmental Agency
11 November	Road Safety Expo
12 November	London Borough of Merton
12 November	London Borough of Barking & Dagenham
12 November	London Council TEC members and Borough Officers
17 November	Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
17 November	Community Transport Association
17 November	London Borough of Wandsworth
17 November	'London Calling' - <i>attended by Friends of the Earth, London Forum of Amenity &amp; Civic Societies, Living Streets +56 other stakeholders</i>

Date	Event
17 November	Public and Stakeholder event at New London Architecture
17 November	Greater London Authority Chief Executives (North Sub-region)
17 November	London Voluntary Services Council
18 November	Thames Gateway London Partnership
19 November	London Borough of Newham
20 November	London Borough of Bromley
23 November	Association of Train Operating Companies and Train Operating Companies
23 November	London Borough of Lewisham
26 November	Follow up on the MTS workshop with the West London Strategic Transport Group
26 November	London Borough of Lewisham (attended by Mayor)
27 November	Roundtable discussion for Disability and Equality Groups - <i>attended by Royal National Institute of Blind People, Guide Dogs for the Blind and Kingston Centre for Independent Living (KCIL)</i>
27 November	London Borough of Greenwich
27 November	London Borough of Richmond - (Director of Environment)
27 November	London Councils – (South London boroughs)
30 November	Corporation of London – (Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee)
30 November	Air Quality Summit: Department for environment food and rural affairs / Department for Transport
1 December	Passenger Transport Executive Group
1 December	Roundtable discussion with Health stakeholders - <i>attended by the Greater London Authority, NHS London and London Ambulance Service NHS Trust +16 other stakeholders</i>
1 December	London Councils
1 December	London Sustainable Development Commission
2 December	North Region Follow-on workshop from 12 Nov
2 December	West London Partnership

Date	Event
3 December	London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
3 December	Launch of the Disabilities Equality Scheme
3 December	London Environment Coordinators Forum
7 December	London Borough of Enfield
7 December	London Thames Gateway Development Corporation
7 December	London Councils - (Central London boroughs)
8 December	London Borough of Barnet
9 December	East Region Follow-on workshop from 12 Nov
9 December	Meeting with London Councils
10 December	Meeting with London Councils TEC
10 December	London Borough of Havering
11 December	Environmental Group Stakeholder Meeting - <i>attended by Campaign for Better Transport, Living Streets, Walk England +4 other stakeholders</i>
11 December	London Borough of Hillingdon
12 December	Transport for London / London Councils - Sub Regional Transport Planning Event
14 December	Third sector London Civic Forum Event - <i>attended by London Forum of Amenity &amp; Civic Societies, Guide Dogs for the Blind Association and Inclusion London + 13 other stakeholders</i>
15 December	Network Rail
15 December	London Borough of Hackney
16 December	Federation of Small Businesses and London Chamber of Commerce
17 December	London Borough of Barking & Dagenham
17 December	Meeting with Tom Brake MP, Liberal Democrat, Spokesperson on Home Affairs, the Olympics and London

Date	Event
<b>2010</b>	
5 January	London Borough of Tower Hamlets
5 January	Meeting with Ibero-American Community Group
6 January	City Property Association / Westminster Property Association Seminar
7 January	London Borough of Southwark
7 January	Meeting with Conservative MPs
8 January	London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Note: Transport for London has regular meetings with the London boroughs, and other stakeholders, and the above is not an exhaustive list of these. The table above includes meetings organised by stakeholders and representatives from the Mayor's office as well as Transport for London officers.

## **Annex B – Summary for each stakeholder response received**

### **Age Concern**

Age Concern London supports the goals of improving transport opportunities for all Londoners, improving physical accessibility and access to services. Age Concern London also welcomes the concept of a joined-up 'whole journey' approach. It urges the Mayors Transport Strategy (MTS) to include a timeline for increasing step-free access to the Underground but states the planned accessibility improvements to the Underground are welcome. It states that there needs to be continued attention to bus driving standards and driver behaviour, as well as making disability and age awareness part of the assessment of driver performance, and that bus timetables should allow drivers to take the time to ensure passenger safety. Age Concern London states that the acknowledgement of the role of community transport and the commitment to work with the boroughs and other stakeholders is welcome. It states that the MTS should support inclusive access to the Blue Badge scheme and calls for a public information campaign on the Freedom Pass. It states that many older people could benefit from travel-mentoring; and that there needs to be better coordination between door-to-door services provided by Transport for London (TfL) and Patient Transport Services commissioned by the NHS.

### **Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen (ASLEF)**

ASLEF states that the Oxford Street tram, Thames Gateway Bridge and cancelled transport schemes must be re-examined and funds should be used to improve reliability and capacity on the transport system as well as continue to be available for Crossrail and Underground upgrades. It states that Crossrail should not be jeopardised by short term savings, but welcomes support for the development of rail freight terminals and high speed rail. ASLEF states there is a need for capacity upgrades on the North London Line and that the commitment to the electrification of the Gospel Oak to Barking line is welcome but the line would also benefit from capacity increases. It states that escalating costs on Tube projects should not affect other projects within London and that the transport system requires long term investment in infrastructure and rolling stock.

### **Association for Consultancy and Engineering (ACE)**

ACE welcomes the overall objectives of the MTS but is concerned about affordability and suggests there needs to be creative ways to find investment, and also that there should be more detailed timescales for the implementation of the schemes listed. It advocates a long-term approach to asset maintenance and suggests that schemes need to be considered as short, medium or long-term depending on a balance of their benefits and affordability. For example, it welcomes a national high speed rail network, and further extensions to Crossrail, Docklands Light Railway (DLR) and Tramlink, but these must be considered long-term aspirations. In the short term, it would like further Tube station enhancements, work on strategic interchanges, smoothing of road journey flows and the incorporation of features to improve the resilience to climate change effects.

### **Association of British Drivers (ABD)**

ABD states that MTS needs to cater more for drivers by: reversing measures that reduce road speed and remove road space; providing innovative parking relief; trialling the removal of some traffic signals; and reviewing the usage of bus lanes, including the potential for allowing cars to use these lanes more often. It states that physical and engineering design on the road network needs to be done in a manner that is driver-friendly and that MTS should require transport authorities to remove road humps and other 'street furniture'. The ABD also states that the Congestion Charging Western



Extension Zone should be removed and expresses doubts over Cycle Superhighways due to the reallocation of road space.

### **Association of International Courier and Express Services (AICES)**

AICES states that there should be further recognition of the needs of express services including international aviation, while welcoming proposals for smoothing traffic flows, a roadworks permit scheme and easing congestion. It states that access to loading and unloading bays needs to be improved and supports the decision to remove the Western Extension Zone. AICES states that any further road user charging should differentiate between commercial and domestic vehicles and that the use of rail, waterways and outer-city consolidation centres would not be appropriate for express services. It welcomes the promotion of delivery and service plans, construction logistics plans and the Freight Operator Recognition Scheme as well as the need for noise abatement measures and greater flexibility in out of hours delivery times.

### **Association of Train Operating Companies (ATOC)**

The Association of Train Operating Companies states that there is a need for cooperation between TfL and the Train Operating Companies in order to facilitate improvements and effective long-term planning for the rail system in London. It welcomes the work done so far and states that TfL can most effectively ensure alignment between the MTS and TOCs' objectives by influencing the Department for Transport's franchise specification process, without micro-management of the TOCs. It supports the Mayor's approach of using both infrastructure development, improved integration and demand management in order to meet growing demand and would be pleased to work with TfL on strategic interchanges. It would like more investment in orbital rail; supports providing information for pedestrians and cyclists at termini; and supports changes to franchises so that TOCs could take greater responsibility for station improvements.

### **Automobile Association (AA)**

The AA notes that the majority of London's goods or people use the road network for a part of their journeys and states that there should be a greater appreciation of the road system as a transport asset especially for those who are less mobile. It states that there should be better management of road and building works that affect the operation of the road network; improvements to traffic light phasing; reallocation of removed road space back to traffic; and improvements to incident management with clearance targets and the creation of fast response units to deal with incidents that create congestion as well as a review of special events and the disruption that they cause. It states there should be an assessment of the performance of key road junctions and the causes of congestion hotspots with a view to developing solutions. It calls for an assessment of bus lanes, including their operating hours, and the potential removal of these where they are ineffective; better coordination between TfL and the boroughs on their respective road networks; improved road maintenance, particularly around traffic signal fault repair and road surface skid; and supports the removal of the Western Extension Zone. It would welcome more car drop off points at interchanges and considers that while the need for tidy streets is appreciated, temporary signs can alleviate the need for permanent signs and play an important traffic and safety role. It does not support the principle of London-wide road user charging.

### **Aviation Environment Federation**

The Aviation Environment Federation focuses its response on those aspects of the strategy that relate to aviation. It agrees that Heathrow expansion should be resisted and suggests that there should be an evidence base for the assertion that not providing additional runway capacity in the South East of England would undermine London's competitive position. With regard to surface access to airports, it supports schemes to increase the proportion of public transport trips but suggests that there should

be a coordinated approach whereby road and parking capacity is constrained. It strongly supports research into the relative environmental impacts of alternative transport modes, such as high-speed rail.

### **Better Bankside**

Better Bankside states that the proposed targets and framework of indicators do not capture all of the aspiration of the strategy, particularly in relation to 'better streets' and smarter travel. It welcomes the establishment of the River Service Concordat; states that services for commuters should be improved at Bankside Pier and endorses further extension of Oyster pay as you go to other river operators besides Thames Clipper. It welcomes proposals that will result in improvements to London Bridge station and proposals to regularly review the development of the bus network and introduce a permit scheme for road and street works. It suggests that proposals to encourage cycling and walking should be clearly linked to 'better streets' proposals and states that the targets to increase the mode share for cycling and walking are not ambitious enough. It welcomes proposals regarding Cycle Superhighways, Cycle Hire, cycle safety measures and cycle parking but also raises concerns about each initiative.

### **British Motorcyclists Federation**

The British Motorcyclists Federation states that it would like to see more references to motorcycling within the MTS, and calls for improved provision of parking facilities for motorcycles. It states there should be greater access to existing facilities, more consideration of motorcycles when designing road infrastructure, access for motorcyclists to bus lanes and access for motorcyclists to advance stop lines across London.

### **British Telecom (BT)**

BT states that Information and Communications Technology (ICT) can help to reduce carbon emissions from transport in a number of ways. These include providing people with real-time information about transport such as likely journey times and the carbon impacts of different modes; and encouraging businesses to switch from using vans to walking and cycling, as do BT's 'walking engineers'. It also advocates the adoption of home and flexible working to reduce overall travel, and the establishment of remote working centres in outer London, to boost business and reduce the congestion and emissions impacts of commuting.

### **British Vehicle Rental and Leasing Association (BVRLA)**

The BVRLA states its support for offering incentives for the uptake of short term rental vehicles and electric vehicles such as exemption from the Congestion Charge and free parking for electric vehicles. It also states that there should be an expansion of car clubs and be better information provision about travel options. The BVRLA also states that local authority low emission zone schemes as well as the approach to electric vehicles should be consistent across all boroughs; and that local authorities should not negatively affect businesses with the introduction of local road pricing schemes or unnecessarily penalise commercial vehicles. The BVRLA expresses support for the removal of the Western Extension Zone and states that any changes to the LEZ standards should be signalled well in advance of implementation.

### **British Waterways**

British Waterways states that the MTS should take into account the most relevant and up-to-date national policy frameworks for waterways and supports the inclusion of the Blue Ribbon Network and opportunities for passenger and freight transport on waterways. It states that more information should be provided on cycling and walking on the Blue Ribbon Network.

## **Campaign for Better Transport**

Campaign for Better Transport welcomes the coordinated publication of the strategies. It supports plans to increase walking and cycling, improve access to town centres and strike a new balance between the different users of streets. It considers the MTS is seriously flawed as it claims to promote sustainable transport and work towards environmental improvements but is unwilling to tackle the volume or speed of traffic. It calls for clarification on smoothing traffic flow but supports the principle provided that provision for cyclists, pedestrians and people with disabilities is genuinely protected and improved. It supports keeping the Western Extension Zone, further road user charging and the use of parking charges to manage demand. It states that expenditure on physical accessibility should be maintained and commends the recent transformation of the bus network but states that there is no recognition of the role that buses play in outer London. It states that proposals for buses should be more detailed and include measures for bus priority and interchange. It states that the MTS lacks proposals for planning the expansion of the public transport network after the completion of the current TfL investment programme. It states that improving connectivity and facilities should not be limited to metropolitan town centres but all town and local centres. It welcomes Crossrail, Tube modernisation, the modernisation and expansion of London Overground and the expansion of the DLR and states that improving provision and service on rail services and stations should also include safety and security, access to pedestrians and cyclists and cycle parking at stations and on trains. It supports the development of orbital rail services and improved interchange between orbital and radial services and considers that interchange between the rail network and other modes, including cycling, needs urgent improvement. It calls for a change to the law to presume driver responsibility in collisions involving pedestrians or cyclists and supports 20mph speed limits and the use of average speed cameras. It states that cycle and walking mode share targets should be more ambitious and that the potential for cycling and walking in outer London has been neglected. It supports shared space provided the needs of different users are addressed and states that proposals to improve London's environment should include expressions of support for car-free initiatives.

## **Campaign for Clean Air in London (CCAL)**

CCAL states that the Mayor's strategies fail to grasp the magnitude or urgency of the public health crisis caused by poor air quality in London and that the Transport and Air Quality strategies fail to include an adequate environmental assessment of the likely impact of key measures such as the removal of the Western Extension Zone or the delay of the implementation of Phase 3 of the Low Emission Zone, both of which it opposes. It states that both WEZ and LEZ Phase 3 are good measures in their own right and that WEZ could be improved by the adoption of dynamic road pricing and LEZ improved by the introduction of one or more additional inner LEZs combined with the earlier tightening of the standards for the current London-wide LEZ. It considers that the package of mitigation measures to ameliorate the air quality impacts of the removal of WEZ and delay of LEZ Phase 3 are largely unspecified and likely to be small in effect and that daily limit values for PM<sub>10</sub> would be breached in West London if the WEZ is removed.

## **Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)**

CPRE London welcomes a number of the high-level ideas, such as better quality public space and making the Thames effectively a new Tube line, as well as initiatives including public transport upgrades, and the rolling out of car clubs and cycle hire. However, it is concerned that many of these policy areas are not backed up with detailed analysis and, while the MTS proposes halving the rate of modal shift from car use achieved over the last decade, it reverses policies fundamental to London's success, such as relaxing strict controls on road building and the rolling back of congestion charging. It states that, as it stands the MTS would hinder rather than deliver the most important aspects of the Mayor's vision for London, its economic development and improvements in quality of life. It is concerned that the MTS underestimates the costs of physical inactivity, air pollution and carbon

emissions that are individually as great as those of congestion and considers that despite plans for a cycling revolution London's cycle hire share will continue to compare badly with other European cities.

### **Central London Freight Quality Partnership**

Central London Freight Quality Partnership supports, the promotion of strategic rail / water freight interchanges; the acknowledgement of the importance of multi modal freight and the further implementation of Delivery and Servicing Plans. It states that there needs to be a more proactive approach to safeguarding sites for break bulk and consolidation as freight consolidation can improve freight transport and reduce freight emissions. It states that measures are needed to encourage the uptake of electric and low emission vehicles and that the importance of kerbside deliveries needs to be considered in the design and planning of the road network. It states that 'out of hours deliveries' can improve freight delivery in the right circumstances.

### **Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH)**

The CIEH welcomes the MTS and focuses its response on areas which have an impact on climate change and air quality. It states that there should be better links between the MTS and the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy and would also like to see improved links between the sections on CO<sub>2</sub> and air quality in order to ensure that all efforts to reduce the former do not have a negative impact on the latter. It supports all efforts by the Mayor to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and to adapt to climate change but would like to see the contribution transport makes to air quality in addition to climate change recognised throughout. It supports proposals to reduce the noise impacts of transport in London. The CIEH welcomes further work to investigate options for road based river crossings in east London but stresses that these should include opportunities for improved walking and cycling crossings. It supports all schemes to encourage cycling but notes that road safety needs to be improved. Additionally the CIEH welcomes the smarter travel initiatives and efforts to reduce freight transport within the capital. It considers it essential that any proposals to charge for road use does not disproportionately affect those who can least afford it.

### **Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport (CILT)**

CILT states that land use changes must be considered in a balanced way and that within the MTS and that there is not enough of a focus on air transport. It also states that demand management should be considered as part of the main response to increasing congestion, with road and parking pricing reflecting the differential costs between peak and off peak. It also states its support for safeguarding sites for logistics and freight interchanges as well as increasing the use of London's wharves and waterways for freight. It states that the MTS should have an electric car scheme to zero carbon generation and it would like outer London orbital travel patterns which are currently inadequately catered for to be identified in a proposal and for proposals for public transport or road improvement to be brought forward. It considers the MTS should recognise the role of smaller airports within the Greater London Authority (GLA) boundary and the impact of High Speed 2 on demand for air travel. It states the MTS should concentrate on providing a high quality interchange between National Rail and interconnecting services at the termini in lieu of new orbital rail routes.

### **Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT)**

CIHT support the overall direction of the MTS but raises concerns over the Mayor's rejection of the Thames Gateway Bridge scheme and the demotion of the fixed link at Gallions Reach. It supports proposals to ensure transport provision is accessible to people with mobility impairments and states that all bus stops should meet TfL's standard bus stop kerb height requirement, that the MTS should include Shopmobility schemes in its 'better streets' proposals and that step-free access should be prioritised in London's premier shopping streets. While it supports the strategy to develop locally

agreed improvements that enhance the viability of outer London, it does not support the greater emphasis on a few outer London developments and suggests that this could be detrimental to other town centres in Inner London. It states that there is a need for improved orbital public transport links in outer London. It supports proposals for road user charging but has concerns about proposals to remove the Western Extension zone if no measures are put into place to mitigate any resultant negative impacts in air quality and traffic congestion. It supports the provision of an additional runway at Heathrow and would welcome further assessment of the impacts of congestion at airports. It advocates improvements of surface access to airports but notes that no such proposals are outlined for Gatwick airport. It stresses the need for clarification on what steps the Mayor is willing to undertake to reduce the adverse impacts of climate change. It recommends that Phase 3 of the Low Emission Zone begins in 2010 with completion by 2011 and it calls for an implementation strategy to be identified and determined in 2010.

### **Clive Efford MP**

Clive Efford MP has concerns about congestion in southeast London and Kent and particularly in relation to the approaches to the Blackwall Tunnel. He considers that a third tunnel from North Greenwich peninsula to Silvertown should have been the priority, instead of the Thames Gateway Crossing, because it generates the least amount of opposition locally and would create the least amount of disruption in terms of generating new traffic problems across the existing network. He considers that North Greenwich has developed into a major interchange and that additional transport links will be required in southeast London to support growth in the Docklands and Thames Gateway. He proposes that any crossing between Greenwich peninsula and Silvertown should have the capacity to include the DLR and that a feasibility study should be undertaken to extend the DLR into southeast London to Eltham.

### **Commissioning Support for London**

NHS Commissioning Support for London acknowledges that the MTS can contribute to improving health by encouraging cycling and walking but would like more emphasis on the importance of physical activity for mental wellbeing. It suggests that TfL work with the NHS to promote healthy travel, further develop walking and cycling routes to and from health facilities and meet the high demand for public transport for accessing health facilities. It notes that consideration should be given to patients who are not able to travel by walking; cycling or public transport and that provision for parking should be made for such patients at health venues. It welcomes the Mayor's commitment to the provision of community transport.

### **Community Transport Association UK (CTA)**

The CTA welcomes the vision of better transport integration but would like to see a stronger commitment to community transport in the Capital with clear guidance for boroughs and associated funding. It welcomes London-wide connectivity improvements but wishes to engage with the boroughs and TfL to ensure that the most vulnerable Londoners have access to the most appropriate forms of transport to meet their needs and it is keen to ensure that local transport issues are addressed through clear guidance to the boroughs. It is also keen to see stronger leadership in ensuring that public transport accessibility levels (PTALs) are adhered to and that issues relating to street furniture, traffic calming measures and accessibility guidelines for public transport should all be consistent. It would like to see further developments in travel training and assisted travel options for those who are currently unable to use public transport; welcomes the concept of integrated transport and would like the boroughs and TfL to ensure that a consistent approach to community transport is adopted across London. It is pleased that training has been highlighted within the MTS and would be keen to see this strengthened using the skills and experiences of CTA members to deliver high quality services to older and disabled Londoners. Finally, it would like to see stronger support for the role community

transport could play across London if further developed, particularly if further emphasis was placed on community transport in the LIP process.

### **Confederation of British Industry (CBI)**

CBI supports the six goals of the MTS and states that its priorities for transport include the delivery of Crossrail and Tube upgrades to 2018; additional capacity on Tube and rail; improving the road network; and increased aviation capacity. It also supports enhanced interchange, more modal integration and smarter use of travel information systems. With regard to future capacity enhancement, it lists the Northern line upgrade, further extensions to Crossrail and Crossrail 2, improving strategic interchanges and a Bakerloo line extension as priorities. It would like schemes to be prioritised, and welcomes possible further Tramlink enhancements and supports river crossings in the east. It would like more focus on parking and loading issues and a thorough review of the bus network.

### **Corporation of London**

The Corporation of London states support for the development of a national high speed rail network but also believes route alignment and connections to Heathrow are important factors which should be considered in the MTS. It states support for Crossrail, the Chelsea-Hackney line (although not a high priority) and the development of river services. It states that the Cross River Tram should be reinstated and that the MTS should emphasise a focus on affordable. It states that it is important that planned improvements to the rail network and services in London are delivered within the High Level Output Strategy (HLOS) 1 period to 2014 and states that it will support lobbying for adequate funding for capacity enhancements including Liverpool Street station. It states that it is supportive of the concept of a westward DLR expansion towards Charing Cross and Victoria as well as the Northern line upgrade 2 but states it is not convinced that the proposed possible extension to Battersea will be beneficial to the existing Northern line and its passengers. The Corporation of London would like a 'grassroots' review of bus routes and services and states that allowing taxis to use bus lanes in the City of London would be detrimental to bus services. It states that the MTS should clarify a plan for reducing taxi emissions and supports taxi marshalling in the City of London. It cautiously welcomes smoothing traffic flow in principle because of air quality benefits but any potential increased delays for pedestrians must be mitigated. It states that 'lane rental' as a concept should be further investigated; that the MTS should ensure that all new residential developments provide adequate cycle storage; and supports the proposed licensing of pedicabs, improved information to aid the take up of walking and the provision of increased provision of cycle training and cyclist awareness campaigns. It supports the proposals for mitigating transport related noise, in particular quieter buses and replacing road surfaces with low noise surfacing and encouraging companies to operate quieter vehicles. The Corporation of London supports emissions reductions from the public transport fleet but states that no specific targets or measures have been set; it would be pleased to work with the Mayor to introduce targeted local measures at air quality hotspots. It is concerned that encouraging the take up of electric vehicles may encourage a shift of people from public transport into electric vehicles and about the effect on Air Quality of deferment of Phase 3 of the Low Emission Zone to 2012. It welcomes further controls on taxi emissions and supports improvements to public information on journey planning.

### **Councillor Jonathan Glantz - Westminster City Council**

Councillor Jonathan Glantz proposes that the Oyster card is adapted to allow cardholders to change buses as many times as necessary within a given time period to complete their journey as this would address some of the issues of bus flow and bus numbers, principally on Oxford Street.

## **Councillor Liz Santry – Haringey**

Councillor Liz Santry is concerned about the above inflation increase in TfL fares and also questions why the Western Extension Zone and a levy on 'gas guzzling' vehicles are being removed if there is a deficit in TfL's finances.

## **Councillor Peter Morgan – Bromley**

Councillor Peter Morgan states that there should be a connection between the DLR and Bromley North (via Lewisham), noting that the line already exists and requires joining up.

## **Councillor Rahman Khan – Haringey**

Councillor Rahman Khan is concerned about the above inflation increase in TfL fares and also questions why the Western Extension Zone and a levy on 'gas guzzling' vehicles are being removed if there is a deficit in TfL's finances.

## **Cyclists Touring Club (CTC)**

CTC states that there are serious omissions in the MTS around specific means to deter motor transport and is concerned that the commitment to get rid of physical barriers to cycling does not include the TfL road network. It states the MTS gives little attention to 20mph zones and that these zones need to be pursued more thoroughly. It states that improvements to public transport should be concentrated at interchange points, and cycle parking should be improved at interchange points; that rather than removing WEZ the Mayor should seek to extend the charging area; and is concerned over proposals which suggest new crossing for motor traffic at Silvertown and Gallions Reach and suggests that only river crossings dedicated to non-motorised traffic should be permitted. It supports measures to reduce freight journeys by using consolidation centres, using alternative vehicles and working with the boroughs to alter the restriction on freight delivery times. It states that there needs to be better planning to ensure people can live close to the services they need and believes that if measures to deter car use and reduce freight were stronger it would strengthen interventions to promote cycling. CTC states that it is important to improve the perceptions of personal safety and this should be enlarged to encompass the risk to cyclists and pedestrians from illegal driver behaviour.

## **Department for Transport (DfT)**

DfT welcomes the fact that the MTS clearly aligns with its own strategic goals and it shares the Mayors enthusiasm for Crossrail and acknowledges the commitment to further improve the Tube and rail services. It states that it recognises the importance of reducing congestion by coordinating roadworks and is pleased to see commitment to lowering CO<sub>2</sub> emissions with electric vehicles and encouraging modal shift. It states that the MTS should be consistent with national policy over Heathrow and would like more clarity on unfunded schemes such as a southbound Bakerloo line extension, a Northern line extension to Battersea and new river crossings at Silvertown and Gallions Reach.

## **East of England Development Agency (EEDA)**

EEDA supports the goals of the MTS and considers it aligns well to DaSTS national goals set by DfT, although a more explicit link between national and London policy would help together with an explicit reference to improvement in productivity growth within the goals. It supports proposals for enhanced radial rail capacity, for increased rail terminal capacity and for improved onward connectivity including Tube, bus and cycling / walking. It recognises Heathrow Airport as a nationally important airport hub and supports the expansion proposals advocated through the Air Transport White Paper subject to maximising environmental mitigation measures. It supports the collaborative approach with regional,

sub-regional and local authorities and agencies in the East and South East of England to secure the sustainable development and management of growth in the wider metropolitan area and the greater South East of England and coordinate approaches to other strategic issues of common concern. Finally, it seeks greater reference in all three strategies to the Greater South East prospectus which is being developed to reduce barriers to growth and improve opportunities for international competitiveness.

### **Energy Saving Trust (EST)**

EST focuses its response on the impact of the strategy on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Overall it welcomes the strategic vision set out in the document and commends that climate change issues are a key tenet in it. It strongly supports policies that encourage reduced car use and modal shift towards walking, cycling and public transport. It states that unprecedented levels of investment in cycling are required and welcomes the Cycle Hire and Cycle Superhighway initiatives though stresses the importance of safety in order to encourage uptake. It states that the cycling mode share targets are not ambitious enough; notes that awareness raising and consumer engagement to encourage modal shift are essential; and is keen to work with the Mayor to help promote smarter travel and 'eco-driving'. It welcomes the targets to reduce London's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and is pleased to see a balance of climate change mitigation and adaptation proposals within the strategy but stresses the focus should be on mitigation methods in the short to medium term. It supports air quality policies for transport that also have significant CO<sub>2</sub> reduction benefits and it welcomes proposals to support the uptake of lower carbon vehicles to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of both private and public sector vehicles. It suggests including a proposal which encourages public sector fleets to take up its Fleet Advice Services and it supports further development of car clubs and car sharing initiatives and the uptake of electric vehicles. It opposes removal of the Western Extension Zone and states that further developments on schemes such as congestion charging will be needed in the future. It supports policies to manage demand and is pleased that the Mayor will keep the option of road user charging open. It states that pricing should reflect the cost to society and the climate and that low polluting modes that reduce congestion should be the most affordable.

### **Enfield NHS Trust**

Enfield NHS Trust states that while there are several interventions in the MTS that could increase cycling, there should be more ambitious targets for walking and cycling and further measures to increase levels of cycling. It also states walking and cycling could bring significant health benefits to people as well as helping to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

### **English Heritage**

English Heritage is pleased to see the intention to protect and enhance the historic environment but states that this could be strengthened. It calls for a coordinated approach to managing streets and spaces including the need for good design that respects London's character for example, balancing measures to combat crime and climate change with their impact on the character of the local environment. It states the removal of traffic signs will help enhance the urban realm and states that further careful consideration needs to be given to the heritage value of stations as part of the development of proposals to increase capacity. It states that road schemes and Thames crossings need to be considered in terms of impacts before they go ahead; that clarity is required on how future expected increases in air travel serving London will be accommodated; and states its support for the general improvement in the provision for cycling but would like to see the infrastructure designed so that it contributes to the local context and character. English Heritage states that there is a need to consider how pedestrians interact with other modes of transport in the same space and hence manage and change the 'fabric' of the street accordingly and states that there is an opportunity to increase access to the historic environment through the use of modern technology and information



points. It states that it is important to ensure that key stakeholders including English Heritage are engaged in the development and implementation of tree planting schemes, Sub-regional Transport Plans and the development of borough Local Implementation Plans.

### **Environment Agency**

The Environment Agency supports the six goals of the MTS, and in particular supports the integration of transport and land-use planning, the promotion of modal shift to public transport, walking and cycling and the recognition of transport's role in the quality of the environment and in addressing inequalities, especially health inequalities. It states its reservations with regard to the reliance on encouragement rather than specific target-setting or compulsion for measures in the MTS (for example, at borough level for walking and cycling), and is also uncertain if lack of funding means that some projects will not be delivered. It is concerned about the impact of airport expansion on air quality and climate change and while it welcomes the measures to improve air quality here and in the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy, it states that forecast emissions of NO<sub>2</sub> are not supported by recent monitored trends. It supports the London Low Emission Zone, but is doubtful about local emission zones and instead advocates a 'central zone' LEZ with tougher emission controls. The Environment Agency states that there may need to be additional demand management measures may be needed to reduce transport's contribution to air pollution and climate change. It supports the aim to make the 2012 Games as environmentally friendly as possible.

### **Federation of Small Businesses (FSB)**

The FSB strongly believes that the best outcome for London businesses will be achieved through an integrated and practical approach to the realities of London's transport, spatial, and economic needs. It is disappointed the three strategies are more disconnected than suggested in the Statement of Intent and that the MTS appears contains many unfunded schemes without obvious links between transport needs / future provision and economic growth. It is concerned that scant regard is given to how businesses might transport the goods and equipment needed for services. It welcomes the efforts made to extend orbital links but remains concerned about radial links. It is extremely disappointed no timeline has been given on the removal of the Western Extension and is concerned the MTS opens the way for further road user charging with very little detail about what this might involve. It is disappointed that while the third runway at Heathrow is unsupported, there is no plan for an alternative but plans to increase transport links to Heathrow. It is disappointed that the plans for freight are not relevant to small scale freight or transport of goods and it remains concerned that businesses will be penalised with unfair costs in relation to complying with LEZ Phase 3 and may still be non-compliant with future emissions standards despite remedial measures already taken. It welcomes the introduction of the lane rental scheme but would like to see better communication with small business to make them aware of works ongoing and, while it is happy with the introduction of SCOOT, it is disappointed about the lack of any details of further roll outs. Finally, it welcomes any efforts to improve public transport but would like to see better integration with cars to encourage multi-modal journeys.

### **First Capital Connect**

First Capital Connect states its support for the High Level Output Specifications (HLOS) schemes including, HLOS 2, Thameslink and relieving London of freight by developing a new rail route but has concern about its location and impacts. It states that there should be careful consideration when implementing an integrated fare system and also encourages rail routes to go to Gatwick and London Luton. It states that it believes it will be difficult to replace all stock with stock compliant with the Rail Vehicle Accessibility Regulations.

## **Freight Transport Association (FTA)**

The FTA is concerned about the dissolution of the Freight Unit and states that it could potentially result in a loss of focus on freight issues at a time of major developments such as Crossrail. It is concerned over the emphasis the MTS places on the Freight Operator Recognition Scheme and states that there is not adequate importance given to air freight. It states that the Delivery and Serving Plans methodology has the potential to underpin the Cycle Superhighways project and in a more general application would provide benefits in terms of general traffic flow.

## **Friends of Capital Transport Campaign**

Friends of Capital Transport Campaign states that there is a lack of practical measures in the MTS to tackle congestion and emissions and suggests that where there are significant conflicts between goals or different users it should be openly acknowledged in the MTS. It welcomes the acknowledgement of the conflicting demands for road space in central London and the disruption that will be caused during the investment programme but questions what the solutions are to this. It states that the MTS should specifically mention linking bus routes as a way to improve orbital public transport connectivity; welcomes proposals regarding seven day travel; is concerned about the lack of funding for the South London line; suggests that consideration should be given to stations and interchange with passing lanes rather than looking at additional rail lines; does not believe that a review of Chelsea-Hackney line is a good use of funding; warmly welcomes the strong support for railway electrification, in particular the Barking / Gospel Oak line; and welcomes the proposal for strategic interchanges, but only if not implemented at the cost of severing direct radial routes. It considers that there is a conflict between a mass transit system and full accessibility and is concerned that the plans for step-free access schemes have been halted. It states that managing demand for travel is fundamental to delivering decent transport infrastructure and states that seeking to reduce emissions of air pollutants from transport should be secondary to achieving modal shift away from private vehicles and to public transport. It states that the fare increase falls most heavily on outer London, which is most vulnerable to adverse mode-shift and questions why there is a lesser shift to sustainable modes put forward in the strategy than had been planned when Transport 2025 was published. It states that road user charging is essential if the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions target is to be met. Before reaching a decision on the future of the Western Extension Zone it would like to see the data on any adverse impacts on the original zone and contends that the loss of funding as a result of WEZ removal would have a significant negative impact on the Mayor's ability to meet his policies and proposals.

## **Friends of the Earth**

Friends of the Earth has a number of concerns regarding the London Plan, MTS and EDS including the need for outer London to contribute to the sustainable development of London, encouraging more people to live and work there, maximising access by walking and cycling and addressing car dependence, not exacerbating it by relaxing car parking standards or new vehicle river crossings. It is concerned that transport will only achieve a 10 per cent cut rather than the 60 per cent needed if it is to play its full role in meeting CO<sub>2</sub> targets and expresses concern that WEZ is being removed and that LEZ phase 3 is being deferred. It considers that the Mayor should reconsider introducing the CO<sub>2</sub> related Congestion Charge and expresses concern that while road user charging has the greatest potential to fill the CO<sub>2</sub> policy gap, along with road vehicle efficiency, its possible application is not set out in specific proposals. It is concerned that there will be an increase in congestion, despite Crossrail, Tube improvements and increased cycling. It considers that road building criteria must not be relaxed and no new large roads or vehicle crossings allowed, which would add to traffic and associated problems, and that public transport improvements should be pursued to provide any additional capacity required. It opposes growth in airports, including City Airport. It also considers that the Western Extension Zone provides an important revenue resource which would be lost at a time

when the Mayor has put up fares on public transport, a move that could force some to drive rather than use public transport. It welcomes the inclusion in the London Plan of reducing the need to travel, especially by car and the need to make it easier for people to access jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport.

### **Greg Hands MP**

Greg Hands MP states that there is a clear need to remove the Western Extension Zone; that the driving force behind Congestion Charging should be the reduction of congestion and not emissions; that TfL should continue to examine more innovative systems of payment and collection of the Congestion Charge; and that emissions related congestion charging is ineffective and needs modification.

### **Guide Dogs for the Blind Association**

The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association states its concern over shared spaces for partially-sighted or blind people and the use of shared spaces by electric / hybrid vehicles that do not produce much sound to warn of their approach. It states concern over curtailment of step-free access on the Tube and states the need for accessibility improvements at Overground stations such as tactile platform edges.

### **Heathrow Airport Limited**

Heathrow Airport Limited states that there is a strong economic case to expand Heathrow and details how a third runway could be added by 2020 and enable EU air quality limits for PM<sub>10</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> to be met without the need for further mitigation measures yet there is no proposed solution for further growth at Heathrow. It states support for high-speed rail as complementary to additional airport capacity rather than as a substitute as it would only free up 2 per cent of Heathrow's capacity. It supports Airtrack and states that Heathrow should be served by a high speed rail station at the airport rather than a spur off the main route. It states that it would be premature to publish the final MTS without having considered the Government's forthcoming proposals over High Speed 2 and it states the overarching connectivity policy ignores airports completely. Heathrow Airport Limited states that there is no recognition that the M4, M25 and A4 are also major contributors to noise and air quality impacts in the Heathrow area and that it is inappropriate for a London-only review of national aviation policy.

### **Heathrow Hub Limited**

Heathrow Hub Limited wants to ensure proper consideration is given to Heathrow interchange between High Speed Rail, existing rail services, proposed rail services including Crossrail and Airtrack, the road network and the airport itself. It states that consideration should also be given to the location of strategic freight interchange related to the Great Western Mainline, High Speed 2, Heathrow and the road network. It states that the MTS should reference work undertaken by Arup and HHL on the advantages to be obtained by seamless interchange between rail and air and the potential for rail / air substitution.

### **Hertfordshire County Council**

Hertfordshire County Council supports the MTS in general, and welcomes any improvement to London's transport network as it is used by a large proportion of Hertfordshire's residents on a regular basis. It supports the proposals relating to rail and welcomes the inclusion of Finsbury Park in the priority list for improved capacity but would also like capacity improvements at Tottenham Hale, Farringdon, Euston and Moorgate stations. It supports extra capacity to assist orbital movement on the Overground network and wishes to ensure that this includes the route to Watford Junction and

that service upgrades to local services should be considered in conjunction with any future upgrade of strategic rail services on the West London line. It has concerns about Watford Junction Overground services being diverted to Stratford and considers that it is important that four-tracking on the West Anglia line provides for improved services at Hertfordshire stations. It supports the proposals to improve the Underground network, welcomes the inclusion of the interchanges at Finsbury Park, Highbury and Islington, Old Street and Moorgate in any future improvements and welcomes the continued support for the Croxley Rail Link scheme. It has concerns over the financial stability of cross-boundary bus services and would welcome opportunities to work with TfL to improve cross-boundary services and community transport and to continue to share journey planning and real-time information. It welcomes proposals to improve the management of traffic flows in London provided that traffic is not diverted out of London on to the already congested roads in southern Hertfordshire, including the M25. It would welcome discussion with TfL regarding use of the Grand Union Canal and River Lee Navigation canal and better dialogue to promote and deliver cross-boundary cycling schemes. It urges TfL to ensure that all stations are brought up to accessibility standards as soon as possible, in particular the stations that provide a gateway into the network for Hertfordshire residents including Stanmore, Edgware, High Barnet and Cockfosters. It opposes expansion at Stansted and Luton airports.

## **Highways Agency**

The Highways Agency states that it is essential that the effects of growth and development on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) are mitigated and that there needs to be adequate public transport provision in place seeking to improve cross regional boundary connectivity. It notes that it is not against park and ride schemes in principle, but that it would oppose any that had an adverse impact on the trunk SRN. It proposes hard shoulder running on some sections of the SRN. It states that road travel demand needs to be carefully managed. It supports proposals to reduce existing demand on the network by implementing a range of measures aimed at influencing travel behaviours, combined with measures to manage residual traffic. It states that proposals regarding land use development should contain a reference to road safety.

## **Inclusion London**

Inclusion London is concerned that accessibility, affordability and safety have not been given specific targets or timescales in the MTS. It states the steps taken by TfL to involve deaf and disabled people in developing the Disability Equality Scheme have not been taken in the development of the MTS; it also states that the Mayor should reinstate the step-free access programme as existed in the original strategy as well as encourage central London boroughs to adopt the Blue Badge scheme. It states that instead of developing a New Bus for London funds could be better spent on meeting the transport needs of disabled people and states that the proposed removal of the Western Extension Zone would result in a significant loss of revenue, and that plans for accessibility including Dial-a-Ride should not be delayed or abandoned. Inclusion London states concern over the removal of traffic lights, controlled crossings, allowing cyclists to cycle both ways along one way streets and shared spaces. It states that there should be no reduction in the range or scope of concessionary fares available.

## **Independent Disability Advisory Group (IDAG)**

IDAG states that clear leadership is needed from the Mayor on the Disability Equality Duty and engagement with older and disabled people. It would like to see mention of hidden impairments and the use of clearer language with regards to terms for disability, impairment and accessibility. IDAG states that it wishes to see improvements in accessibility in the next 5-10 years such as London Overground being fully step-free and more London Underground stations being step-free, and a list of all stations where step-free access will be available. It states that there should be a standard approach to eligibility for Freedom Pass and concessions across London and wants more mention of

disabled cyclists and disabled hate crime in the MTS. It states that it is not convinced about the value of the New Bus for London and that the MTS should promote the Safer Travel at Night initiative to disabled and older people.

### **Institute of Advanced Motorists (IAM)**

IAM welcomes the MTS and is pleased to see proposals for major improvements to public transport into and within London. It also welcomes the recognition of the importance of personal mobility and the need to encourage walking and cycling. However, it is concerned about the absence within the MTS of either recognition of the importance of cars and motorcycles to personal mobility, or positive proposals for the inclusion of cars and motorcycles in the strategy. It notes that cars remain the predominant form of personal transport for journeys outside the central London area and that motorcycles are growing in importance as a form of commuter transport. It welcomes proposals to tackle congestion but notes the shortcomings of the present single charge cordon operation of the Central London Congestion Charging Scheme and states that the system can be unfair. The IAM is pleased to see an emphasis on improving the quality of life and safety of those who live and / or travel within the Capital and feels that while emphasis is rightly placed on infrastructure improvements and the introduction of technological developments, greater emphasis needs to be placed on the responsibility of all road users for their own safety and that of those around them.

### **Institute of Civil Engineers (ICE)**

ICE states that tough targets, to build upon the aim of the previous strategy by implementing modal shift from private to public transport, seem to be missing and it is concerned that the strategy offers no clear incentive for modal shift. It suggests that the quality and range of bus services need to be improved, that more signage and information is required at street level and that more information should be provided at bus / rail interchanges. It commends the iBus network and the existing Countdown system and notes that not all passengers will find mobile communication practical or convenient, so clear information needs to be provided at points of transit as well. It also states there should be a more recognisable way of providing bus service information. It commends the Mayor's commitment to Cycle Highways and Cycle Hire Schemes but notes that the barrier caused by road safety issues needs to be removed if any hope of a major increase in cycling is to be achieved. It is disappointed in the Mayor's decision not to go forward with the Thames Gateway Bridge and therefore welcomes the announcement of a review of the potential of river crossings in east London and urges that any Thames crossing provides a viable route for bus services, cyclists and walkers. It is supportive of demand management systems but notes that while public transport should be the only attractive option for accessing central London, in outer London the private car will still need to play a role. The ICE states that a stop-start approach to planning is causing delays in too many important infrastructure projects.

### **Jenny Jones Assembly Member**

Jenny Jones welcomes much about the MTS but has concerns that long term problems are not matched by a definite plan, interim targets or a package of solutions: while there will be growing congestion of the roads in the future, there is no expressed desire to promote road pricing or to generate sufficient funding to implement larger scale traffic demand management; there is no plan or funding to promote cycling in outer London and hit the target of a 400 per cent increase in cycling; and there is no package of measures to reduce the policy gap in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. She considers that the MTS threatens London's success in reducing traffic and encouraging people to shift from car to public transport by cancelling a package of improvements to deliver a further 10 per cent increase in public transport capacity ahead of 2025; the proposed removal of the Western Extension; making motoring cheaper in London, while public transport fares are raised above inflation; increasing capacity on the roads through traffic light rephasing; the proposed increase in car parking in outer

London town centres; and not including targets for traffic reduction. She considers that parking standards should be tightened in developments and that the impacts of traffic on air pollution, noise and road casualties should be more clearly set out. She agrees that planning is the key to the MTS, but considers there should be a dispersal of economic activity to inner and suburban centres with an improved web of rail lines linking the radial lines. She considers that the Mayor should reinstate a number of schemes in order to attract government and private funding with an additional focus on light rail and transit in outer London. She considers the emissions related congestion charge should be reinstated, that there should be a move to 100 per cent renewable energy and a zero carbon aim for TfL's fleet by 2025. She welcomes the cycling target and believes that cycling in London could ultimately take a larger modal share than Underground and rail and suggests an aspiration to have a level of investment in cycling over the next 15 years that is comparable to that being planned for rail and Underground. She supports borough wide 20mph zones and welcomes the trial of speed limiters on buses and taxis. She considers that air quality is worsened by the dropping of six-monthly licensed taxi inspections and the proposed removal of the Western Extension; considers that the 2010 implementation date for LEZ Phase 3 should be retained and that further measures are needed targeted at light goods vehicles. She has concerns about the impact of fare increases and reduction to the bus network on modal shift to sustainable transport.

## **Kent County Council**

Kent County Council states that in general the proposals in the MTS are comprehensive and innovative but it calls for more references to areas outside and including the M25. It would like to know more about plans for Thames Estuary Airport; welcomes support for rail freight and support for new road / rail terminals in or near to London; is disappointed that the MTS will only consider, rather than support, the Crossrail extension beyond Abbey Wood to Dartford, Ebsfleet and Gravesend and that no reference has been made to potential new services available after completion of Thameslink works in 2015. It states that there is considerable scope to improve connectivity between Kent and London; and supports extensions of the DLR south of Lewisham and the Bakerloo line beyond Elephant & Castle; and calls for a new interchange at Lewisham and the wider utilisation of Beckenham Junction.

## **Licensed Private Hire Car Association (LPHCA)**

The LPHCA is pleased that the MTS proposes working closely with London boroughs and other stakeholders to support improvements to Private Hire services with a focus on minicabs, but would like to point out that many other private hire vehicle services are also provided in the delivery of London's 'Door to Door' services. It will continue to support the Safer Travel at Night scheme and the campaign against touting and urges for ongoing action against illegal activity, followed by prosecution in the courts. As well as working to prevent street touting it would like to see further action to help stop the illegal invitation for the provision of drivers, vehicles and services on the internet and promotes the 'joining up' of drivers, operators and vehicles in order to aid this process. The LPHCA welcomes the proposal to provide facilities to pick up as well as drop off passengers where appropriate but stresses the importance of being able to park legally once passengers are set down. It also welcomes improvements to the licensing service and supports the proposal regarding lower emissions from private hire vehicles; and urges that licensed private hire vehicles should have bus lane access in order to reduce emissions and improve services.

## **Living Streets**

Living Streets states that the MTS needs to be more ambitious for walking and cycling; there must be a cycling target of 10 per cent and support for more car clubs and road user charging. It states concern about proposals for smoothing traffic flow and the impact of countdown times on pedestrians. It states that powered two wheelers in bus lanes will reduce safety for pedestrians; that it is important

to consider walking at all interchanges and that it states support for Cycle Hire as well as stating that cycle training should include how to act around pedestrians; and that there should be a more permeable network for walking with informal crossing points on streets as well as making street design more pedestrian friendly. It states support for keeping the Western Extension Zone and would prefer the Low Emission Zone Phase 3 to start in 2010. Living Streets states that there should be more attention given to promoting car free development in London, emphasis on 20mph speed limits and would like walking in London to be benchmarked against other cities.

## **London Assembly**

The London Assembly welcomes the fact that the MTS has incorporated some of the recommendations it made in its response to the Statement of Intent, but sets out a further four main issues which it would like to see addressed in the final Strategy. The first concerns unresolved challenges: it notes that the MTS forecasts rising population and employment and increased demand for travel resulting in public transport crowding and road congestion, even with the measures set out in the MTS. Additionally, there will be increased CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. It notes that the Mayor has said he will not implement further road user charging and calls on him to set out what alternatives there are to address the 'policy gap' for both congestion and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In its second point, it recommends the adoption of interim targets for public transport usage, walking and cycling. It also considers that, given that new infrastructure investment takes many years of hard work to secure, the final MTS should include information about how potential schemes will be progressed and funding secured for them. It states that there should be a discussion about the possibility of the Thames Estuary Airport. Finally, the London Assembly comments that, in the context of falling fare income and increased costs, it will be a challenge to pay for future transport improvements. Alongside planned increases to capacity (including Crossrail), programmes to modernise stations and provide step-free access have been reduced, and TfL plans to reduce the bus network by 8m km by 2017/18. It states that the Strategy should set out the Mayor's thinking on these challenges, stating the relative priority of schemes, the basis for future decision-making (e.g. on fares), the balance between improving conditions for different road users, and the potential for using financial incentivisation to bring about behavioural change.

## **London Borough of Barking & Dagenham**

The London Borough of Barking & Dagenham states that there is much to welcome in the MTS but raises concerns about the plans for outer London and in particular the London Riverside Opportunity Area. It states that there needs to be enhanced access to local jobs, and identifies three key regeneration areas: Barking Town Centre, Barking Riverside and South Dagenham, and calls for better public transport links to and within these areas, including the Dagenham Dock DLR extension. It questions the figures shown in the MTS for the projected population and homes growth in the area and states that the transport investment proposed in the MTS does not support the planned new homes set out for London Riverside in the London Plan. It states that its policy is to maximise development opportunities around committed or proposed transport infrastructure, and that the Strategy should reflect this. It supports increased walking and cycling as a means to improve health as well as transport opportunities, and that improving access to jobs will also address health inequalities. It supports Crossrail, a more even implementation of Countdown across London, and plans to improve strategic interchange, calling for the prioritisation of Barking station and Dagenham Dock. With regard to river crossings, it favours a Gallions Reach option, but any scheme must be self-financing and there need to be appropriate improvements to the road network, namely the A13 at Renwick Road and Lodge Avenue. It is interested in becoming a Biking Borough and piloting a borough-wide 20mph zone. In future it would like to work with TfL on potential river services and how local routes (such as East London Transit) can benefit from a new hydrogen refuelling facility. It states that the MTS should recognise ways to reduce travel by encouraging, for example, home working, and says that parking regulations and charges should remain a borough issue.

## **London Borough of Barnet**

London Borough of Barnet endorses the position set out in the London Councils response. However, it emphasises that car travel will continue to play a significant role in outer London and priority has to be given to making other modes more attractive or in improving the performance of less sustainable modes through reduced emissions, rather than penalising road users. It emphasises the importance of orbital movement to the borough and believes that improved high quality bus links should be provided where it is not possible to provide rail links, including limited stop express buses for journeys that cannot be easily made by rail. Improved travel choices on orbital routes have to play a key role in supporting the increase in population and demand for travel given the scale of regeneration and development in Barnet. It considers that improved bus services are the only realistic public transport option for these movements and that express services joining town centres, station and key interchanges will be necessary to provide an attractive alternative to car journeys. Barnet also consider there is a role for carefully targeted road schemes in delivering improvements in orbital movement, supporting regeneration and development, more generally in reducing congestion and achieving other benefits. It believes that further improvements along the North Circular Road, particularly at Henly's Corner and Golders Green Road have to be considered. It considers that the MTS should more clearly acknowledge the investment that may be required to implement the Sub-regional Transport Plans.

## **London Borough of Bexley**

The London Borough of Bexley states that the MTS should be more streamlined and should focus on giving strategic direction, with more detailed analysis or proposals to be considered elsewhere. It stresses the importance of ensuring consistency between the three Mayoral strategies, as well as policies and proposals within the MTS. It calls for a review of all funding to meet the growth agenda in the Thames Gateway and the needs of outer London. It states that the MTS should recognise the pressing need for long-term public transport infrastructure improvements in Bexley, including the borough's aspiration to be connected to the London Underground network. It calls for a firm commitment to the Crossrail extension to Gravesend. It states that the flexibility for outer London boroughs to set local parking standards for offices should be extended to other use classes. It welcomes the intention to work with the boroughs but states that this needs further recognition in order to overcome the directional approach of the MTS. It stresses the importance that the MTS reflects the full recommendations of the outer London Commission when they are published. It welcomes the aim for a mode shift to walking, cycling and public transport but suggests a more realistic and progressive approach on the improvement of infrastructure, training and safety for cycling, in conjunction with walking. It calls for the MTS to recognise that orbital transport corridors are less developed in outer London than in Inner London. It states that little reference has been made to travel patterns in the east sub region, given the expected growth in the area. It stresses the importance that improvements are not limited to metropolitan town centres but also serve major town centres and other important centres of retail or employment activity. It states that the MTS should consider the potential for further tram schemes. It remains opposed to a fixed link at Gallions Reach. It supports the need for better cycle parking facilities and the possible use of Cycle Hire schemes in outer London town centres but notes that more needs to be done in outer London than Inner and central London to create a dramatic mode shift. It states that overemphasis on schemes such as Cycle Superhighways or Cycle Hire may detract from more substantive solutions. It welcomes proposals to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour, deliver significant investment to improve walking conditions and proposals for freight consolidation centres to facilitate the use of more environmentally friendly vehicles in urban town centres. It states that it should be recognised that charging schemes cannot be applied 'on a level playing field' across London. It notes that the level of bus subsidy is relatively small compared to the support given to rail based services



## **London Borough of Brent**

The London Borough of Brent broadly supports the approach set out in the MTS, notes that the policies and proposals align with its own aspirations for transport and endorses the response provided by London Councils. However, it is concerned that there is insufficient detail in the MTS as to how town centres, Opportunity Areas and major developments are to be served with transport infrastructure and services and states that outer London town centres need improved orbital links as well as continued investment in radial connectivity. It welcomes recognition that decisions on local transport are often best made by boroughs and agrees that there is a need to invest in improved interchange. It states that there needs to be better integration of the National Rail network with other transport modes and that stations and service frequency must be improved. It notes that there are gaps in the west London orbital bus network and calls for the development of high-speed bus services and new infrastructure to address this. Brent supports further investment in orbital rail transport on the North and West London (London Overground) lines, but calls for these to be better linked to radial lines, particularly Crossrail. It welcomes the emphasis in the MTS on walking and cycling and supports proposals for cycle training, cycle parking, better journey information and the seven Strategic Walking Network Routes. However it is concerned about the apparent lack of a hierarchy of transport modes or a London Walking Plan, and is concerned that the promotion of electric vehicles could increase car dependency and increase congestion. Finally, while it supports the objective of a 60 per cent reduction in London's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 2025, it notes that continuing road traffic bottlenecks will affect air quality and calls for further measures to address this problem.

## **London Borough of Bromley**

The London Borough of Bromley supports much of the Mayor's vision for transport, but is concerned that, even with the planned capacity upgrades, there will continue to be crowding on public transport and congestion on the roads, given the level of growth forecast. It states it will have little direct benefit from Crossrail and calls for more local rail capacity and for more priority to be given to improving orbital connectivity in outer London. It would like an extension of the DLR from Lewisham to Bromley Town Centre and a Tramlink extension to Bromley Town Centre, and more rail-based park and ride provision. It calls for a fundamental review of bus routes, with a view to securing greater value from the service, for example by changes to the timetable. It supports smoothing traffic flow and suggests further measures that could be used here. It supports the intention to increase cycling, and would like further development of recreational cycling routes, but believes that allowing cyclists to cycle up a one way street is a matter for national Government rather than the Mayor. Bromley opposes the proposal to set emissions-related parking charges, and states that this is a matter for boroughs to decide; similarly it states that boroughs must be allowed to decide on the location of infrastructure related to alternatively-fuelled transport. It does not believe that there is a case for road user charging and rejects this as a potential solution in Bromley. Finally, it notes uncertainty about future funding levels, and seeks assurance that the Mayor will not compel boroughs to raise additional funds for implementation of the LIPs programme.

## **London Borough of Camden**

The London Borough of Camden welcomes sub-regional transport studies as an opportunity to examine local issues in more depth and is particularly keen to consider freight, taxis and buses. It is concerned about the lack of a road user hierarchy which prioritises pedestrians, cyclists and public transport and the drop in LIP funding to the borough. It is pleased to see proposals to enhance rail and Tube capacity but notes that even with these there will still be crowding and states that there is a case for further investment in Camden Town Tube station; it also advocates further encouragement of cycling and walking as a way of relieving pressure on public transport in central London and is keen to see alternatives to Cross River Tram. It calls for a strategic review of the bus network; more emphasis placed on developing electric and hybrid taxis as a means to address carbon emissions; and while it

supports smoothing traffic flow in principle, this must not induce more traffic nor be at the expense of pedestrians, cyclists and mass transit modes. Camden would like to have the Cycle Hire scheme locally and is supportive of 'better streets' initiatives, noting that it has pioneered these and that there must be scope for local adaptation; it also suggests that 'shared space' is a misunderstood term and could be re-defined. It welcomes proposals to improve air quality but states that there needs to be funding for emissions control schemes, and while it welcomes electric vehicles, these must not lead to a shift from more sustainable modes such as public transport. It would like more work on the use of freight consolidation centres in the Central Activities Zone; it is neutral on the proposed removal of the Western Extension and states that any further road user charging schemes must be developed in conjunction with the boroughs.

## **London Borough of Croydon**

The London Borough of Croydon supports and endorses the basic premise and principles of the three strategies. It would welcome more flexibility on planning parking standards; regards the extension of Tramlink as essential to provide greater orbital connectivity; considers greater emphasis is needed of Croydon's relationship with Gatwick; and that recognition of Croydon as a major factor in the resurgence and growth of South London should be matched by appropriate investment in infrastructure. It welcomes the six overarching goals of the MTS and the increased emphasis on improving transport in outer London but is concerned at the deliverability of the proposals given the level of funding and delayed programming. It welcomes the strong line that is taken on sustainability and recognises that choice has to be a key principle but has concerns over the ability to persuade people to leave their cars at home. It welcomes the commitment to improve orbital movement for outer London, but beyond the completion of the East London line extension, particularly in light of the decision not to progress work on the Crystal Palace Tramlink extension. It feels the strategy does not adequately address the need to improve access to jobs, services and opportunities and believes that local transport services should be prioritised. It welcomes the Mayor's principle of improving the integration of economic development, transport, spatial and land use planning as a means of affecting travel patterns and reducing the need to travel and considers that transport policy should also be integrated with other policy areas including health, education and duties under the Traffic Management Act. It welcomes the renewed emphasis on a better allocation of surface space between pedestrians, cyclists and motorised modes, together with an improved public realm and hopes that TfL will continue to allocate adequate funds to boroughs to implement high quality integrated schemes to support local trips by sustainable modes. It considers that severe congestion at East Croydon station has been overlooked and that policies within the strategy are predominantly supportive of improvements to radial capacity with little commitment to enhancing orbital movements.

## **London Borough of Ealing**

The London Borough of Ealing stresses the need for clarity on and commitment to transport investment and states that emphasis should be given to identifying and providing appropriate investment. It is concerned that the policies and proposals in the MTS will not provide sufficient transport capacity to meet forecast demand. It states that there is no ambition to cut journey times or support for removing bottlenecks on the road network except through smarter travel initiatives. It states that there are not enough proposals to support the Outer London Commission's recommendation of developing a 'hub and spoke' network. It suggests that the orbital transport provision in west London should be connected with Crossrail at the Old Oak Common interchange. It states that there are no proposals to improve orbital public transport near Ealing even though the strategy recognises the need for orbital travel to Heathrow. It states that there is no detail on how town centres, Opportunity Areas and major developments are to be served by transport infrastructure and public transport services. It states that there is a need for better communication and partnership working with TfL over the development of bus services and that there needs to be a review of the existing bus network and of the proposals that provide improved connectivity to Crossrail. It states

that there is a major potential role for orbital buses on key corridors, in the absence of orbital rail links, and notes that there is no reference to express bus services in the strategy. It states that some major interchanges and interchange proposals in Ealing are not mentioned in the strategy. It would welcome encouragement in the strategy for 20mph zones and shared space schemes. It considers that the draft MTS lacks a plan to improve accessibility and is disappointed by the cancellation of the step-free access project at Greenford station. It states that aviation plans are not satisfactorily detailed in the strategy, opposes expansion of Heathrow and would support fully developed proposals for alternatives. It would welcome an attempt to reform smarter travel initiatives to reduce carbon emissions by focussing on movements that are carbon intensive. It states that there is no mention of the role of freight quality partnerships in addressing freight problems in the strategy. It stresses the importance of ensuring that there is consistency between the objectives of the three Mayoral strategies.

## **London Borough of Enfield**

The London Borough of Enfield substantially agrees with the MTS as it accords well with its own aims and aspirations. It supports the recognition of the importance of outer London; the recognition that a high proportion of the population is dependent on car travel; the London Street Works Permit initiative; proposals for improving physical accessibility; the inclusion of an Implementation Plan; and the Mayor's criteria based approach to road schemes. It supports the broad perspective of the MTS to induce and encourage mode shift to public transport, cycling and walking without disproportionately penalising car drivers. However, it is concerned about the level of economic and employment growth used for the strategies and considers that MTS must make clear provision for the required development of new transport infrastructure implied by and concomitant with the anticipated growth as measures to extract more capacity from the existing infrastructure are unlikely to be adequate, as evidenced by the West Anglia rail corridor. It considers that orbital routes are poor or non-existent in many sectors of North London and that the lack of orbital transport is a crucial factor in the development opportunities in areas such as North East Enfield, being frustrated by inadequate accessibility by both public and private transport and proposes a fully integrated package of measures including the Northern Gateway Access Package. It considers that a comprehensive review of the bus network is required, including an audit of costs and benefits, with the provision of buses, bus priority, bus stops and bus stands based on audited bus usage figures and kept under regular review. It does not consider young people should receive free travel other than for school journeys. It considers that clear policy guidelines relating to parking and consistent standards across London are required. It considers the MTS proposal on door-to-door transport should be based on the recommendations of the London Councils commissioned report. It considers that uninsured or untaxed vehicles should be excluded from controlled parking zones and favours a return to effective traffic policing dealing with careless driving instead of focusing on speed cameras. It considers that there is a strong case for access to health care to be explicitly recognised as a transport need. Enfield supports the MTS cycling initiatives but has reservations over cycle superhighways in terms of the viability of cycling for commuting in outer London and the implications for other traffic of reducing road capacity. Enfield lists local areas of concern including the need for grade separation of the North Circular Road; North Eastern Enfield including Ponders End; connectivity in Central Leaside, the importance of four-tracking of the London-Cambridge railway for regeneration, problems with level crossings and the extension of the Victoria line to serve Central Leaside; and congestion on the Great Cambridge Road / A10.

## **London Borough of Greenwich**

The London Borough of Greenwich concurs with the broad goals of the MTS but is concerned that there is a lack of long-term infrastructure investment for the Thames Gateway and South East London areas. While it welcomes Crossrail, it indicates that this will not improve certain links in the borough and calls for the extension of the DLR from Woolwich both into the Thames Gateway and south

towards Eltham; it also states that options for Bakerloo line extensions should cover the south west of the borough or consider a further extension of the Jubilee line. It also calls for a review of the bus network, measures to address local congestion caused by the Blackwall Tunnel and a commitment to the development of river services in the east. It states that the new High Speed 2 terminal should be in Stratford so that it connects with both High Speed 1 and Crossrail. The borough would like to see replacement proposals for the Greenwich Waterfront Transit and states that Tube upgrades should not be at the expense of other modes of transport such as buses.

## **London Borough of Hackney**

The London Borough of Hackney considers that the MTS is not ambitious enough and lacks forward thinking proposals, although it supports previously publicised proposals such as encouraging cycling, improving the public realm and improving orbital interchanges. It expresses disappointment that additional demand measures, such as road user charging, will be required to meet the objectives of the MTS when the Mayor has already publicly ruled out implementing additional road pricing schemes while in power. It considers the MTS is not ambitious enough to counter the problems of traffic congestion, public transport overcrowding and poor air quality that disproportionately affect Hackney. It also considers the MTS fails to fully embrace the commitments to the Olympic legacy in East London, as set out in the Five Host Borough Strategic Regeneration Framework. It welcomes the commitment to the Chelsea-Hackney Line but would like to see an early timetable for completing the strategic review of the route and, while supporting the current route, considers that it may be prudent to reserve alternative more deliverable policy options to ensure that population growth will be matched by infrastructure improvements and would also like to see commitment to orbital (London Overground) and radial (West Anglia rail corridor) rail networks improvement. It considers decisions on investment in transport infrastructure should reflect the parts of London where significant population and employment increases will take place. It welcomes the updating of climate change targets but would like to see interim targets set. It considers that the MTS should address the potential for worsening congestion as a result of regeneration and economic development and should make mode shift from cars to more sustainable modes a priority. It strongly opposes the Mayor's intention to continue to increase bus fares and reduce total kilometres of the bus network and considers this will disproportionately impact on Hackney residents where bus is the main mode of transport. It supports the electric vehicle delivery plan proposals but believes that pedestrians, cyclists and public transport should be prioritised over private vehicles and that control of parking policy and charges for electric vehicle charging bays needs to remain with boroughs. It is concerned about the removal of the Western Extension Zone because of the potential impacts on bus journey times, traffic and air quality and that this contradicts the Mayor's proposals to improve air quality, reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and generate income to fund transport improvements in London. Finally, it believes that continued growth at Heathrow is unrealistic.

## **London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham**

The London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham reiterates its support for the removal of the Western Extension of the Congestion Charging Zone and states that measures to improve traffic flow on the borough's north-south roads should accompany this removal. It welcomes Crossrail but is disappointed that there has been no mention of a possible interchange at Old Oak Common, where the confluence of several railway lines offers a good opportunity for interchange; it also states that this could be a hub for High Speed 2, and stimulate regeneration in this part of London. It also calls for the relocation of the A40 northwards, to release land for development and smooth traffic flows. With regard to borough priorities, it identifies the following: improved traffic flow on north-south roads; upgrading of the District line; and improved east-west links at Fulham Riverside, including a re-routing of the Chelsea-Hackney line and a cyclist and pedestrian bridge at Imperial Wharf / Chelsea Harbour. It welcomes initiatives to encourage cycling but states that superhighways need to be agreed with boroughs and for cycling training to be targeted on enabling more women, children and older people

to cycle. Finally it calls for quieter, low-emission buses, a restoration of the through service to Gatwick on the West London line and for electric vehicle charging points to be provided off-street.

### **London Borough of Haringey**

The London Borough of Haringey welcomes the broad perspective of the MTS and the coverage of accessibility, safety, the importance of public realm and support for the role of outer London. It welcomes the proposals for infrastructure improvements to address the predicted increase in demand for travel, the continuing importance of works at Tottenham gyratory and the opportunity to work with TfL on infrastructure proposals such as the review of the Chelsea–Hackney line. However, it is concerned that all three of the Mayor's strategies are based on the prediction that employment growth will be concentrated in inner London, the Central Activities Zone and along the Crossrail route, which will reinforce the existing radial travel patterns on overcrowded transport links and not reduce the need to travel or lead to shorter journeys being made. It is concerned that the planned growth could lead to more journeys over 5km, particularly car journeys which will exacerbate the severe traffic and environmental problems Haringey already experiences due to the number of strategic radial routes through the borough. It is not convinced that the measures in the MTS will help tackle increases in medium and long car journeys and considers that a polycentric approach to growth around London metropolitan town centres and interchanges with investment in orbital routes could promote less car travel. It considers that the MTS should set out how specific infrastructure measures will be promoted and delivered to support the predicted growth and support policies on road congestion and climate change. It welcomes the identification of Wood Green as a metropolitan centre and considers it should be identified as a priority strategic interchange, which would also assist promotion of orbital movements. It is concerned no funding has been committed to lengthening trains on the Gospel Oak-Barking line with the implication that growth will lead to overcrowding; does not support replacing road humps with other speed reduction alternatives; considers more support is needed for transport behavioural change in outer London; considers that measures for improving and managing congestion on the North Circular Road should smooth traffic and not lead to road capacity being increased; and considers the priority for public transport improvements must support internal London movement and not commuting.

### **London Borough of Harrow**

The London Borough of Harrow agrees with much of the MTS, noting that many issues are reflected in its own plans. It particularly welcomes the principle of encouraging higher-density housing in areas with good public transport accessibility; it also supports the wider use of Smarter Travel and travel plans and agrees that the climate change agenda should have a high priority. With regard to road user charging, it states that outer London boroughs will have to consider the viability of their town centres if they are to consider it. The borough supports initiatives to reduce street clutter and improve the environment for pedestrians and cyclists. However, there are a number of matters related to West London and Harrow which it states are insufficiently addressed in the MTS: the need for accessibility improvements at Harrow on the Hill station and the distinction between potential metropolitan centres and major centres compared to metropolitan centres. Additionally, it states that there must be specific funding provided to boroughs for initiatives including Legible London and cycle superhighways, or there is a risk that these will not be implemented. It calls for better connectivity to airports (including Harrow to Gatwick); orbital links from Crossrail to the borough; and the completion of the Strategic Walking Network.

### **London Borough of Havering**

The London Borough of Havering is pleased that the MTS has generally acknowledged the challenges facing outer London. It supports the encouragement of further modal shift towards walking, cycling and buses and commends the Mayor's willingness to work with the boroughs to implement the

strategy. It states that the delivery of Crossrail in full by 2017 is its top priority and that extra funding should be available for boroughs in which Crossrail stations are located. It states that the MTS should include mention of Mayoral support towards a new station at Beam Park on the Fenchurch Street line. It supports the aspiration for common service standards to be achieved on London's National Rail services. It asserts that the Dagenham Dock extension of the DLR should be given priority over other potential extensions. It welcomes all proposals regarding London Underground. It supports the proposal to keep the development of the bus network under regular review and states that high priority should be given to the implementation of Countdown 2. It welcomes proposals regarding coach services, taxis and private hire vehicles and is pleased to see support cited for taxi marshalling measures. It supports the rationale of proposals for managing the road network and states that the utilisation of advances in intelligent transport systems technology warrants priority. It supports proposals regarding the Blue Ribbon Network but states that ferry crossings are poor alternatives to fixed crossings. It supports the Mayor's approach to aviation, especially the proposal to improve access to London's airports by public transport and the absence of any proposal for a Thames Estuary Airport. It accepts proposals for a more accessible transport system and stresses the need to maximise the accessibility benefits of new transport schemes and better streets initiatives. It considers the definition of strategic interchanges to be too narrow and that Romford should be identified as a strategic interchange. It states that more support is required if the proposed increased cycling levels in outer London are to be achieved. It states that wayfinding in outer London should extend to cyclists and equestrians as well as pedestrians and that Legible London is not appropriate for more rural locations. It welcomes the range of actions and initiatives to improve public transport and road safety and reducing crime and terrorism threats. It commends the proposal to integrate local policing structures on the transport system. It notes that while the introduction of average speed cameras would be preferable, in the absence of funding the introduction of road humps might be worthwhile. It supports the aspiration to extend car clubs and proposals regarding low carbon infrastructure and adapting to climate change. It is broadly supportive of proposals for demand management and proposals relating to better journey planning and information. It stresses the importance of a fully-integrated London fare-collecting system and welcomes flexibility for outer London in terms of applying parking standards. It maintains its view that road user charging should not be introduced to further areas unless it follows comprehensive consultation and has clear support from the relevant London local authorities. It states the views of those local authorities covered by and bordering the Western Extension Zone should be given considerable weight when deciding the future of the Zone.

## **London Borough of Hillingdon**

The London Borough of Hillingdon is generally positive about the MTS, although it raises a number of specific local issues which it states have been insufficiently addressed, in particular how public transport connectivity and services to key town centres like Uxbridge will be improved. It welcomes the upgrade of the rail network and the Metropolitan line and suggests that Airtrack could be extended to Hayes and a re-consideration of the business case for the Central line diversion to Uxbridge. It is concerned that the proposed requirement for bus services to provide good value for money could lead to less emphasis being placed on accessibility and deprivation and makes a number of suggestions for local improvements, including interchange, orbital services and potential bus priority measures. It states that there needs to be improvements to taxi driver behaviour, including an Operator Recognition Scheme similar to that available for freight, and that TfL could consider supporting the Community Transport Association as a means of improving demand responsiveness. With regard to Heathrow, it opposes capacity increases and suggests that the Mayor's support for High Speed 2 be linked to reduced short-haul flights and less local road congestion; there should also be proposals for reducing emissions from ground-based operations. It would like to see more on addressing emergency issues - such as flooding - in the MTS, and would welcome guidance to councils on improving access to town centres, shared-space schemes and 20mph zones. Also, it states that there needs to be more detail on freight strategy and is keen that electric goods vehicles, break-bulk

facilities and consolidation centres are all deployed. It welcomes emissions-based parking charges and agrees with a fair charging system for managing demand and it supports alternative measures to the Western Extension.

## **London Borough of Hounslow**

The London Borough of Hounslow states that the MTS has limited provision for notable investment in orbital transport in west London. It suggests that provision should be made in the strategy for a feasibility analysis of the West London Orbital Railway. It states that the strategy should provide detailed evaluation of additional interchanges to link the North London line to Crossrail and that a new outer London north-south rail route should be a priority after the completion of Crossrail. It supports the seven day railway initiative. It states that the development of an orbital network of express bus routes should be considered. It questions why parking policies are not referenced in detail in the strategy. Its key areas of interest are improvements to street scenes, journey time reliability and transport safety. It states that improving information is one of the most cost effective ways of achieving modal shift. It supports the promotion of sustainable transport, especially cycling and the decarbonisation of transport. It supports Electric Vehicles, but it notes that these are unlikely to yield significant benefits in the short term. It welcomes targets for modal shift and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions but states the need for interim targets and fundamental changes to the CO<sub>2</sub> efficiency of vehicles and travel behaviour. It requires clarification on support available to authorities wishing to develop their own road user charging schemes or Low Emission Zones but notes that the schemes would be best implemented at a regional level. It calls for clarity on the likely trigger points determining when London-wide road user charging would need to be introduced. It welcomes the focus on smoothing traffic flow. It strongly opposes expansion of Heathrow and supports the promotion of reduced aviation emissions and sustainable transport to airports. It stresses the need for more concrete and funded proposals to meet cycling targets and more incentives to become a 'Biking Borough'. It encourages the roll out of Cycle Hire in outer London. It supports measures to make walking count but warns that methods to smooth traffic flow might create barriers for walking. It encourages working in partnership with the NHS to promote walking. It supports aspirations to reduce the need to travel and the environmental impacts of transport. It stresses the need to develop infrastructure to support smarter travel, and suggests the introduction of High Occupancy Vehicle lanes. It supports the upgrading of the Tube network, especially the Piccadilly line. It states that improving the accessibility of suburban stations should be a priority, with at least four fully accessible Tube stations in each outer London borough. It supports the improvement of perceived safety and security at unmanned stations and the development of new interchanges to link existing lines. It states that there is potential for growth in freight and waste traffic on the Thames and additional crossing options for pedestrians and cyclists in west London.

## **London Borough of Islington**

The London Borough of Islington identifies the following measures as being of most benefit: more frequent trains and further extensions of the Tube; building more rail lines and the use of Oyster pay as you go across all rail; improvements to interchanges including public realm improvements and providing more capacity. It supports measures for cycling and walking but seeks funding for the London Cycle Network; and notes that it has delivered many public realm improvements in the borough and needs TfL to work with boroughs on improving the TfL Road Network (TLRN). It advocates the provision of good quality information at bus stops and on buses, supports shared space schemes and is critical of the disbandment of the Commercial Vehicle Education Unit (CVEU). It states that accessibility is important but would like to see an exploration of other ways of delivering this on the Tube in place of the step-free programme. It agrees with a fair system of demand management and calls for the MTS to include interim targets that, if not met, will trigger the introduction of these measures, including road user charging. It disagrees with the proposal to remove the Western Extension, stating that this will undermine the achievement of the Mayor's carbon

reduction target. It is disappointed that schemes to enhance local Tube station capacity are not in the TfL Business Plan and is keen to work to remove more gyratories. It advocates a 20mph speed limit in all residential areas and is concerned that smoothing traffic flow and reducing congestion is not pursued at the expense of making cycling and walking less safe. It states that its LIP funding is insufficient for Islington's projected growth; urges a review of door-to-door bus services; and does not support the proposed delayed implementation of Phase 3 of the Low Emission Zone. Finally, it opposes any significant expansion of airport capacity and recent bus fare increases, calling for a more flexible ticketing system.

## **London Borough of Lambeth**

The London Borough of Lambeth identifies a number of common concerns regarding the MTS, the London Plan and the Economic Development Strategy, these are: an insufficient link between planning and transport provision; a lack of identified investment; and the need for development of particular parts of the borough. It stresses the need for the strategy to include clear targets for the Boroughs. It supports the proposal to relieve London of 'through' rail freight and proposals to seek further capacity on National Rail and London Overground services but notes that the Thameslink Programme will negatively effect Lambeth commuters. It stresses the need to improve radial link services across Lambeth. It emphasises the need for a stop on the East London line at Brixton and states that Brixton should be included as a strategic interchange. It states that ceasing the operation of the South London Line will adversely affect Lambeth residents and regeneration plans in the Vauxhall area. It welcomes the intent to develop Crossrail 2 provided it will not have any adverse impact on Lambeth. It strongly welcomes proposals to improve station environments at London's most congested stations. It stresses the importance of a Tramlink extension to Lambeth. It supports the proposals regarding coaches, taxis, minicabs and extensions to London Underground and would welcome the development of the bus network. It acknowledges that it is not possible to fund the construction of the Cross River Tram at present but is keen to see alternatives that would offer the same transport and regeneration benefits. Lambeth broadly agrees with the principles behind the proposals to make London a cycling city but stresses that additional provision for cycle parking must not conflict with priorities to remove street clutter. It recommends provision for cycle parking at workplaces, residential areas and outside key areas for services. It supports the principle of cycle superhighways but has concerns about road safety. It would be interested in becoming a 'Biking Borough'. It is disappointed at the removal of the Commercial Vehicle Education Unit and urges its reinstatement. Lambeth supports measures to encourage more people to walk and stresses the importance of information campaigns and improved signage. It believes in certain circumstances that road space will need to be transferred from motorised forms of vehicles to pedestrians and cyclists. It also supports a Road Danger Reduction strategy to overarch all policies, the reinstatement of the road user hierarchy, 20mph zones on all residential streets, cycle permeability, wider publicity of cycle training and more thorough enforcement of the law on speeding and driving while using a mobile phone. Lambeth agrees with the proposals put forward to improve public transport safety. It suggests that road safety education for drivers should be provided in the workplace. It is concerned that the Mayor's vision to smooth traffic flow may be to the detriment of pedestrians and cyclists. Lambeth agrees with the proposals to reduce crime, the fear of crime and antisocial behaviour as well as responding to the threat of terrorism. It endorses proposals for better streets. It agrees with the proposals to improve noise impacts and enhance transport's contribution to the natural environment. It is pleased to see that proposals to improve air quality contain smarter travel interventions as opposed to just technological improvements. It disagrees with proposals for the relaxation of parking regulations for electric vehicles. It is supportive of technological advances to improve air quality and the environment. It agrees with the proposals put forward for demand management and would support road pricing in principle providing certain conditions are met. Lambeth states that it would be detrimental to remove the Western Extension Zone.



## **London Borough of Lewisham**

The London Borough of Lewisham welcomes many of the policies with the emphasis on improving public transport accessibility and capacity, commitment to improving walking and cycling, the emphasis on reducing carbon emissions, and the desire to have greater influence over National Rail services. It supports the need to integrate Crossrail with the transport network, in particular with the London Overground network at Whitechapel. It supports the planned rail improvements and considers that the London Overground concept should provide a template for common service standard across London. It welcomes the improvements to the London Overground network but is disappointed the construction of Surrey Canal station was not included in the original announcement. It considers that the Bakerloo line extension is preferable over a south DLR extension and would allow the line to serve inner and outer southeast London serving areas of poor transport accessibility and freeing up National Rail capacity at London Bridge. It considers a Victoria to Orpington service via Catford and Bromley South to be an ambition and that Lewisham station requires significant investment as a key interchange. It supports London Councils' proposal for the development of a bus strategy for London. It is concerned about the impact of allowing motorcycles to use bus lanes and strongly supports the street works permit scheme. It wishes to be involved in discussions on future river crossings and in the development of cycling superhighways. It is unclear about what the biking borough approach means in practice and is interested in understanding the effectiveness of the cycle hire scheme and the practicalities of extending it to Lewisham. It considers that it will be difficult to enforce 20mph limits when the speed limit is much higher and would like a greater understanding of the effectiveness and public acceptability of time distance enforcement cameras. It considers that safety should be paramount when considering the removal of traffic signals.

## **London Borough of Merton**

The London Borough of Merton is disappointed that there is no guidance in the MTS on how Merton as an outer London borough can deliver the transport improvements it requires to achieve as part of its 2030 vision. It is particularly concerned about the lack of information on when the issue of dysfunctional gyratories will be addressed, including those in Morden and Colliers Wood. Additionally it notes that extending Tramlink is particularly important to Merton and is therefore disappointed that no extensions to the tram network are proposed. It also believes there is a strong business case for re-designating Morden Tube station as Zone 3 in order to support regeneration of the town centre. It suggests that there needs to be a separate funding pot for outer London transport infrastructure in order to bridge the gap in quality between that in outer London and that in central London. Merton is pleased to see the proposals on the promotion of common service standards across London's rail network, the consideration of Crossrail 2, improved capacity on Thameslink routes and the commitment to cycling. However it would like to see more on the importance of transport regeneration in South London, a stronger emphasis on the tram and on walking, a clearer message on the future of bus services in outer London, a further commitment to orbital routes, clarity on the future of the Thameslink loop and its services and more on community transport to reflect the ageing population. It states that there are too many policies in the MTS and that those in the London Plan do not need to be duplicated. It suggests that proposals be rationalised where possible, for example combining proposals related to air quality and climate change. Additionally it states that there is a lack of clarity on the role of boroughs in delivering the strategy. Merton would like to see addressing climate change as the overarching theme of the strategy.

## **London Borough of Newham**

The London Borough of Newham emphasises the importance of delivering the Olympic legacy via the principle of convergence, and states that the MTS should set out the transport policies and actions to achieve this. It welcomes the aim to have High Speed 1 services at Stratford International and calls for this to be directly linked to High Speed 2. With regards to DLR, it calls for an extension northwards

from Stratford International and is disappointed about the postponement of the Dagenham Dock extension. It agrees that good logistics infrastructure is important and states that local businesses could benefit from facilities next to High Speed 1 in Barking. It notes the economic role that transport fulfils both as a local employer and in bringing visitors to the area. With regard to river crossings, it states that a Silvertown crossing alone would be insufficient and looks forward to working with TfL on the future options, particularly a crossing at Gallions; it also sees merit in a new Gallions ferry. It supports cycling schemes but is keen that initiatives that reallocate road space are assessed on their individual merits on a site-specific basis and with a consideration of their impacts on other road users; it also welcomes proposals to encourage walking and enhance the public realm. Finally, it notes the importance of buses in the borough and calls for clarification of Stratford's status as a Metropolitan Centre.

## **London Borough of Redbridge**

The London Borough of Redbridge welcomes the proposals to bring about a cycling revolution by raising awareness and improving cycle amenity in the boroughs. It would welcome a rapid roll out of the Cycle Hire Scheme in outer London, a feeder network for the Aldgate to Ilford Cycle Superhighway and the introduction of high quality, waterproof shelters at stations. It has some concerns about air quality and accident prevention on parts of the Strategic Road Network. It supports the introduction of Legible London and the use of emerging technologies to assist in dissemination of local travel information. It states that pedestrian access to stations and interchange need to be improved as well as access to town centres and local amenities. It supports proposals to address crime and fear of crime issues through better design of public spaces and supports the de-cluttering of the urban realm. It states that improving safety and security is a high priority. It supports initiatives to address HGV and freight safety and promotional initiatives and campaigns that target vulnerable groups. It welcomes proposals to improve London's environment through the better streets campaign, targeting noise impacts, public transport's contribution to the natural environment and generally targeting improvements to air quality. It supports the London Low Emission Zone and subject to technical feasibility would support the roll out of Phase 3. It welcomes proposals to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. It supports proposals to manage the demand for travel, notably through better journey planning and information incorporating smarter transport for both people and freight. It would like to see a business case before consenting to any road user charging scheme but notes that if a fair system could be developed and revenue was distributed to address congestion along the busy arterials into London then this proposal may have merit. It opposes the removal of the Western Extension Zone and notes that further measures, including improved traffic control systems and a road works permit scheme, should also be considered to mitigate the growth of traffic. It is concerned that schemes such as Crossrail, Transforming the Tube and the Cycling Revolution have dominated the strategy and states that there is a need to invest in the development of a polycentric London with significant radial routes, notably a river crossing in east London.

## **London Borough of Richmond upon Thames**

The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames welcomes the recognition of the role of boroughs in identifying and delivering transport improvements to the road network. It is fully committed to cycling and walking and their integration with other modes of travel. It supports the Cycle Superhighways initiative and the principle of providing a dedicated road-space to cyclists but would like to see a network of orbital, as well as radial routes and feeder routes. It supports Airtrack and states that appropriate technologies can help mitigate the impact of constructing it. It welcomes the Crossrail proposals but wants to see a similar level of commitment to invest in promoting new orbital rail routes. It opposes expansion of Heathrow Airport. It states that it is important to keep an appropriate level of funding in London Bus Priorities Network, particularly in the context of outer London boroughs that are not well resourced with Underground and Overground rail networks. It suggests that Sub-regional Transport Plans could be an effective way to achieve a better local bus network. It supports the

Mayor's agenda on Climate Change and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions but states that the CO<sub>2</sub> target would benefit from interim targets. It supports the proposal to promote a lane rental system. It notes the importance of sub-regional planning to address cross-borough and shared transport challenges and objectives and would like to see further details and full consultation in defining the roles and responsibilities of the sub-regions. It supports electric vehicle charging point proposals in principle but suggests that investment in infrastructure is carefully balanced with current and future demand. It supports the opening up of bus lanes to coaches, minibuses and motorcycles.

## **London Borough of Southwark**

The London Borough of Southwark states that while the MTS recognises the important link between transport improvement and land-use growth, it lacks ambition. It states that there should be further funding committed to the improvement of key transport interchanges in Southwark, and at Elephant & Castle and Peckham Rye in particular. It asserts that in the absence of firm proposals for a Cross River Tram (CRT), a deliverable alternative must be developed to improve accessibility for the Aylesbury and north Peckham areas connecting with Elephant & Castle and through to central London. Southwark welcomes the possible extension of the Bakerloo line and in view of the cancelled CRT scheme wishes early engagement over the options for the extension, where provision for Camberwell can also be considered. It suggests that the future of the South London Line, when known, should be included in the MTS and also notes its uncertainty over the East London line phase 2 with regard to the proposed Surrey Canal Road station and Brixton High Level. Southwark considers that there is a need for a more fundamental analysis of bus provision across London, rather than incremental review, and states that there is a need for bus timetabling to take account of school children. It supports the improved coordination of works on the highway network but encourages a more rigid, detailed and longer term programme to support the overall reduction of traffic. It welcomes the positive approach taken to encourage greater use of the Thames. Southwark states that road safety should have a greater weighting within the strategy's policies and is disappointed that the strategy does not set out a coherent speed reduction programme that would support Southwark's own 20mph strategy or acknowledge the wider benefits of reduced speed limits. It welcomes the focus on enforcement but notes that no new resources are identified for this purpose. Southwark suggests that the strategy does not set out a convincing approach for encouraging walking. It states that while the strategy acknowledges that there is a potential conflict between the focus on smoothing traffic flow and improving the public realm, there is no indication of a clear strategy to resolve this. It welcomes cross-borough initiatives to promote cycling but is disappointed that there is no clear programme or additional funding identified to deliver the concept of 'Biking Boroughs'. It notes that the document lacks a coherent strategy to achieve the challenging CO<sub>2</sub> targets and that local air quality factors are also not considered sufficiently. It suggests that more may have to be done to manage demand on the road network in order to reach the challenging targets for CO<sub>2</sub>.

## **London Borough of Sutton**

The London Borough of Sutton supports the six overarching goals of the MTS which it considers builds on the success of previous approaches, and is pleased to see the greater emphasis on outer London. Although it recognises their importance to London as a whole, it notes that Sutton will not directly benefit from Crossrail, the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games or Tube upgrades, and states that outer London boroughs must continue to receive funding for smaller scale local improvements, for example Smarter Travel. It notes the success of this programme locally and, in this context, calls for a more ambitious target for cycling mode share. It would like further enhancements to orbital bus services; a commitment to improving connectivity across the GLA boundary; and for all bus stops to be fully accessible. It supports proposals for smoothing traffic flow as long as these are not at the expense of pedestrians and cyclists, and it welcomes measures for better streets, including shared spaces. It welcomes the call for greater Mayoral powers over National Rail, and the requirement for London Overground style standards on the network, but notes gaps in the rail

services from Sutton; it would also like an extension of Tramlink to Sutton Town Centre. It states there is a need to reduce road traffic and is supportive of measures to improve road safety, including 20mph zones, safer driving and improved street lighting. It considers that there needs to be a greater emphasis on demand management of aviation and further consideration given to public transport access to airports. It suggests a number of measures which could improve air quality, such as enforcement of regulations on engine idling and further uptake of electric and low emission vehicles; it is also keen to reduce noise from aircraft and vehicles locally. Finally it states that there is a case for a review of the concessionary travel scheme and that consideration should be given to more flexible ticketing.

## **London Borough of Tower Hamlets**

The London Borough of Tower Hamlets identifies its four main priorities for the transport system as follows: providing better access; connecting communities and places (including Hackney Wick and Bromley-by-Bow interchanges); promoting sustainable travel (including opposition to further expansion at London City Airport); and delivering new strategic transport infrastructure, including cycle hire scheme, pedestrian and cyclist river crossings, electric vehicle charging infrastructure. It supports Crossrail 2 and would like High Speed 2 to connect with High Speed 1 at Stratford; it identifies a number of stations in the borough for step-free access and it would like consideration of a Central line or other link to Hackney Wick. With regard to buses, it welcomes measures to make the fleet more attractive, such as Countdown, but is concerned about capacity issues on crowded routes following withdrawal of articulated buses and also calls for more investment in physical accessibility on the network. Traffic smoothing should not compromise pedestrian and cyclist safety, TfL should promote the take-up of low emission taxis and, while welcoming greater use of the Thames, it states that fare levels are currently prohibitive. It opposes expansion of runway capacity in London, indicating that High Speed 2 offers the opportunity to switch some flights to rail. It is concerned about noise and air quality impacts of road river crossings and would like TfL to commit to reducing road accidents on the TLRN in every borough. It describes its own Clear Zone plans and welcomes the proposal to encourage electric vehicles and improve the public realm. Finally it welcomes the CO<sub>2</sub> reduction target and states that demand management tools like road user charging are required to achieve this and could also provide funding for future transport infrastructure.

## **London Borough of Waltham Forest**

The London Borough of Waltham Forest states its support for the Cycle Superhighways and cycle hire scheme and its potential future extension to outer London. It states that a road user hierarchy is still useful and supports 20mph speed limits on residential streets, but is concerned that smoothing traffic flow could disadvantage pedestrians. Waltham Forest proposes several specific rail recommendations such as improved connectivity between Waltham Forest and the Stratford / Lower Lea Valley area, and states support for Crossrail, the Chelsea-Hackney line and the electrification of the Gospel Oak to Barking line. It states opposition for continued increases to bus fares and states that fare increases should not reduce the attractiveness of the bus relative to the private car. It states support for the forthcoming Countdown bus signs and the Mayor's intention to develop London river services, but states that river services should be better integrated into the overall transport network. It states that more emphasis should be placed on improving orbital transport links as well as enhancing capacity on radial routes; it also states its concern that rephasing traffic lights may increase traffic speeds. Waltham Forest states that a 5 per cent mode share for cycling by 2031 is insufficiently ambitious and underrepresented groups such as women, children and older people should be encouraged to cycle. It states that in order to improve air quality a reduction in road traffic by cutting unnecessary vehicle journeys is needed, as well as targets to reduce traffic. It states that travel plans need to be simplified and linked to environmental and health objectives and also states that road pricing would help reduce congestion and emissions as well as improve air quality. It also states that it seeks to improve access to all its Overground and Underground stations and unsure that all stations

are refurbished to meet current access standards as well as seeking an improvement in east-west bus linkages or routes in the borough.

## **London Borough of Wandsworth**

The London Borough of Wandsworth states the importance of ensuring that existing transport networks operate as effectively and efficiently as possible and of delivering large scale infrastructure improvements, particularly on the public transport network. It stresses the need to enable transport choice by providing infrastructure, facilities and information to support all modes of transport and to ensure that adequate funds are reserved for transport projects, both pan-London and at borough level. It commends proposals to increase rail capacity on routes in south west London and potentially to deliver Crossrail 2. It welcomes proposals to deliver capacity enhancements at Clapham Junction and Balham stations and improvements to orbital rail services on London Overground via Clapham Junction. It would like more explicit support for cross-river tram services. It welcomes improvements to the Underground but would like greater clarity on which schemes have been deferred or cancelled. It stresses the importance of maintaining an affordable and efficient bus service network. It supports proposals for taxis, private hire, coaches, community transport and the Blue Ribbon Network. It supports proposals for managing the road network provided that they lead to a balanced outcome and no particular user groups are adversely affected. It opposes expansion of Heathrow and supports Airtrack. It stresses that discrepancies in the Oyster pay as you go fares need to be eliminated. It supports proposals to increase cycling mode share and establish 'Biking Boroughs' but states that the detail of individual initiatives should be decided in partnership with borough councils. It states that walking should be considered as an integral part of any transport intervention or scheme. It supports measures for improving public transport safety and urges for improvements to bus driver training. It states that improving road safety should remain a high priority and stresses that casualty hotspots should be targeted. It states that staff presence at stations and creating exemplar urban realm schemes will help to reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour. It supports 'better streets' and improved noise impacts. It broadly supports the proposals for improving air quality and tentatively supports electric vehicles but with a caveat that there must not be too much money spent on infrastructure that will quickly become obsolete. It states that in order to improve Air Quality, modal shift must be a priority, particularly to walking and cycling and states that there is need for a climate change adaption strategy. It supports better journey planning and information but states that there is potential for new technologies alongside paper-based information. It states that Smarter Travel interventions should be well targeted. It opposes any park and ride scheme in outer London if there were to add to overcrowding on key public transport corridors. It supports road user charging as an option should congestion levels dictate that further action is required, although states that any new scheme should be based on congestion levels and be fair. It supports the removal of the Western Extension Zone provided that it will not lead to an unacceptable increase in traffic congestion and delay in Wandsworth. It states that in the absence of a road user hierarchy, more guidance on prioritising interventions is needed as areas of the strategy seem to be in conflict.

## **London Chamber of Commerce and Industry (LCCI)**

LCCI welcomes and supports the Mayor's continued commitment to both Crossrail and the Underground upgrade and notes that consideration of future extensions would also be welcome. It is disappointed that the MTS does not contain any proposals for a strategic review of bus services, though welcomes the proposals for buses overall. It is pleased that the MTS recognises the importance of taxis and supports the measures outlined, but urges for the issue of the shortage of taxis plying for hire at night to be addressed. It welcomes proposals to make better use of the river but cautions that significant investment is needed to ensure the provision of sufficient infrastructure, capacity and connectivity. It also states that ferry services are a poor substitute for tunnels or bridges. LCCI is pleased to see that the Mayor recognises the need for additional airport capacity in the South East but is disappointed that the proposal for a third runway at Heathrow has been rejected without

any suitable alternatives provided. It welcomes the proposals to remove the Western Extension Zone and to defer Phase 3 of the Low Emission Zone but urges for a clear timetable to be provided for the former. It does not support proposals regarding road user charging.

## **London City Airport**

London City Airport requests further information on the integration of Crossrail with London City Airport at Poplar and Custom House and calls for further development of the DLR in East London as well as longer operating hours for DLR so that its staff could use it for work journeys. It states that it does not support the safeguarding of wharves for waterborne freight as it could prejudice development opportunities and cause heavy road traffic on local roads. It does not support enhancements to the Woolwich Ferry or the potential for an additional ferry at Gallions Reach as this would contradict objectives for sustainable regeneration and would provide slow and inefficient crossings. It states support for new river crossings in east London and the proposals to encourage the development and use of quieter aircraft and to seek coordination of flight paths to minimise impact on London. It states that the MTS should be updated to expand the number of flights from London City Airport from 80,000 to 120,000 and states that the MTS should plan for accommodating these journeys to the airport.

## **London Civic Forum**

The London Civic Forum supports the promotion of walking and cycling as travel options, improving the accessibility of the transport system for all, recognition of the potential for the Blue Ribbon Network for both leisure and freight, opposition to Heathrow expansion, 'better streets' principles, the notion of the whole journey approach to transport planning, the integration of transport and land use planning, reducing the need to travel, improving transport connectivity, improving the public realm, supporting regeneration and tackling deprivation and would like to see these elements strengthened in the strategy. It supports Crossrail, Tube modernisation, the modernisation and expansion of London Overground to form an orbital rail service and the expansion of the DLR. It states that the strategy should develop specific proposals for planning the expansion of the public transport network after the completion of the current TfL investment programme. It opposes the deferment of the step-free programme and supports the exploration of new possible revenue sources such as road user charging and parking levies to fund the programme. It states that any work on 'better streets' should be done in conjunction with local communities and disability groups in order to ensure their safety. It states that there needs to be better and more consistent eligibility criteria for the Dial-a-Ride service. It welcomes work to encourage walking and cycling but is concerned that targets are not ambitious enough. It supports changing travel behaviour to encourage use of more sustainable modes but states that this is countered by proposals which will result in increased traffic. It states that lower speed limits should be introduced to encourage walking and cycling, reduce short car journeys and increase road safety. It states that a number of policies and proposals aimed to meet the challenges of climate change and poor air quality will not have sufficient impact. It states that the strategy does not have clear policies, proposals and goals aimed at reduction in car traffic levels. It is concerned that methods to smooth traffic flow will counteract many of strategy's aims for reducing carbon emissions and improving air quality. It supports reducing road space and allocating it in favour of sustainable modes. It opposes the removal of the Western Extension Zone.

## **London Civic Forum and Youth Campaign for Better Transport**

The London Civic Forum and Youth Campaign for Better Transport welcomes the MTS and is keen to ensure that young people's views are heard. It would like to see the Mayor extend eligibility for 18+ concessions to all young people between the ages of 18 and 24, not just those currently in full or part-time education. It is pleased to see commitment to promoting clean public spaces and better streets but also stresses the importance of ensuring that public transport remains clean and that any waste

collected is recycled appropriately. It welcomes the emphasis on the importance of reducing crime and anti-social behaviour and is keen to ensure that this is addressed fairly, and in a way which doesn't discriminate against young people. In addition it would like to see an increase in the number of staff available at stations at night, improved communication regarding night services using 'youth-friendly' technology, improved lighting at stations and increased night services. It is pleased to see the Mayor's commitment to tackling climate change but urges for the Mayor to prioritise spending on the advancement of 'green' technologies in order for all London's buses to exceed EU targets for emissions. It opposes the proposed removal of the Western Extension Zone and calls for further public consultation on this.

## **London Councils**

London Councils welcomes many aspects of the MTS, including the Implementation Plan; the commitment to walking and cycling and an increased mode share for these and public transport; proposals to reduce carbon emissions and improve interchange and integration; and the opposition to Heathrow expansion. It also supports the intention to improve connectivity into existing town centres; and it is pleased that the requirements for LIPs will be kept to a minimum and that the Mayor will seek greater influence over National Rail. It highlights a number of areas where it would like to see changes made to the MTS. These include better integration of the MTS with the EDS and London Plan, so that, for example, priority areas for investment can be identified; it would also like to see more integration of these strategies with non-London strategies. It would like the MTS to set out how local and long-distance services will be balanced, and more clarity about what is achievable in the timetable given (for example, a date for review of the Chelsea-Hackney line). London Councils continues to call for an explicit road user hierarchy and, while it welcomes the measures for cycling and walking, would like more emphasis on target-setting and the achievement of this shift. Similarly it supports the polycentric approach but firstly is concerned that there is little said about radial links into central London (which remain important) and secondly, that much of the approach for outer London depends on improved information and integration rather than on new infrastructure or services. Related to this, it would like to see a full review of bus routes and services, including noise impacts and ticketing flexibility, and would like to be involved in this. London Councils states that the Mayor should make his position on further road user charging clear, particularly in the light of boroughs' powers to implement this. It states that there needs to be interim targets for CO<sub>2</sub> reduction, and specific targets for bus and taxi emissions; and a statement on the contingency plan if the EU refuses the request for an extension for achieving NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> targets. It advocates the development of a low emission taxi but, in regard to incentivising other low emission vehicles, states that parking charges must be decided by individual boroughs. It is concerned about the affordability of public transport, particularly with regard to bus fares, and recommends the introduction of concessionary travel for apprentices. Finally, London Councils calls for increased Mayoral control over National Rail services, including franchise specification, and states its concern that there are requirements for boroughs in the MTS (for example, electric vehicle parking, road works permits) that have not been funded.

## **London Cycling Campaign (LCC)**

LCC states that the pace of change for the implementation of cycle-friendly policies need to be increased and states that creating the right conditions for cyclists will address environmental, health and congestion issues. For this reason it believes that there should be a preference for reallocating street space to walking, cycling and public transport. It is concerned that any planned pedestrian crossing time proposals would be detrimental to pedestrians. It states that the MTS does not fully engage with managing demand across the modes of transport and that the targets for cycling in the MTS should be reviewed with interim targets set, and a long-term goal of 20 per cent modal share of trips under five miles. LCC states that cycle journeys should be counted to demonstrate the extent of cycling and that greater emphasis should be given to improving off-peak on-train cycle carriage

provision. It states that there should be a commitment to the Road Danger Reduction Charter and a commitment to funding Borough public realm design guidance. LCC states that planning requirements and incentives to the employer must be included in the MTS to facilitate workplace and educational establishments' cycling facilities and states the MTS should set sub-targets for increasing cycling among particular target groups as well as targets for private motor traffic reduction. LCC states that 20mph speed limits are required on all residential streets; river crossings should support active travel; and Biking Boroughs should be encouraged with the provision of dedicated funding and central coordination.

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

LDA is satisfied, with the policy levers outlined in the draft Strategy. It states that the strategy should make a stronger proposition to support Opportunity Areas through the spatial investment offer of the LDA. It would welcome a reference to the LDA Crossrail Regeneration Benefits and Investment Plan within the strategy. It suggests that, in order to support the outer London economy, thought needs to be given to the local variety, distinctiveness and capability of places. It states that outer London often has more in common with the Outer Metropolitan Area and that there is a need to address the many key transport issues of common concern on both sides of the Greater London boundary, including congestion and strategic transport routes.

## **London Disability Cycling Forum**

The London Disability Cycling Forum states that more provision needs to be made for cycling equipment used by disabled cyclists, not only on the road but also in development sites and at public transport locations. It would like more emphasis on accessibility issues for disabled cyclists and the inclusion of a wide range of cycles in cycle schemes, as well as the inclusion of trikes in the London Cycle Hire Scheme.

## **London First**

London First welcomes the following in the MTS: the planned increases in capacity; the need for additional airport capacity and river crossings; the intention to develop demand management measures; and the upgrade of Overground rail. It would also like to see a proposal to develop new funding mechanisms to get projects started, noting the current constraints on revenue; and lists further actions which are needed to reduce congestion; it also states that there is more scope to develop real-time information for transport users. With regard to aviation capacity, it does not support the Mayor's position on Heathrow and also calls for a heliport in east London. On the proposal to remove the Western Extension, it prefers that it is suspended for six months, so that an evaluation of the impacts and complementary measures can be made, with a further option to reinstate with reduced operational hours in future. It supports road user charging to reduce congestion and pollution on the most affected roads during peak periods and would like details on how schemes will be developed with stakeholders.

## **London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies**

The London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies identified four developments which must shape the MTS: meeting CO<sub>2</sub> reduction targets; improving air quality; greater use of demand management; and recognition of growing financial constraints. It opposes the proposal to defer implementation of Phase 3 of the Low Emission Zone; it supports the development of road user charging for economic and environmental aims and opposes the proposed removal of the Western Extension. It supports proposals to develop outer London based on a 'hub-and-spoke' approach, the promotion of walkable neighbourhoods, an improved public realm and step-free access. It states concern that the strategy relies too much on the need to travel especially by car for long distances. It supports break-bulk or



consolidation centres as well as the concept of a 'London lorry' and more rail freight terminals. It states that the current reduction in current bus transport capacity is unacceptable but supports access improvements to town centres, higher capacity orbital railway, changing travel behaviour and encouraging the use of more sustainable modes. It also states that there should be better coordination between rail and Underground networks with regard to closures for maintenance, supports the program of station refurbishment, but is concerned that there is insufficient commitment to improving transport interchanges. It states further concern over smoothing traffic flow if this advantages vehicular traffic at the expense of pedestrians. It supports maximising use of the Blue Ribbon Network for passengers and freight as well as support for enhancing information provision and making traffic lights more pedestrian friendly. It supports proposals to encourage cycling and states that the same priority should be given to walking. It welcomes measures to: improve road safety, reduce noise impacts, provide better walking routes, encourage the use of Delivery Service Plans and encourage more carbon efficient travel behaviour. Finally it hopes that there will be further work to integrate the MTS and the draft London Plan, particularly with regard to identifying preferred locations for high trip-generating uses, for consolidation and break-bulk centres and aligning new public transport provision with new development areas.

### **London Gatwick Airport**

London Gatwick Airport states that good rail links between the airport and central London are vital and supports the objective of improving accessibility to central London as well as stating that improved connectivity to Gatwick from south London should be considered as part of the corridor approach. It is disappointed that the MTS does not promote improved rail connectivity between key south London locations and West London line to Gatwick

### **London Liberal Democrats (The London Assembly Liberal Democrat group and Liberal Democrat London spokesperson Tom Brake MP)**

The London Liberal Democrats states that there are contradictions in the MTS and that it lacks interim measures of success, and in particular lacks detail on the Mayor's priorities for schemes in a difficult financial climate. It is concerned about the funding for the Tube upgrade and questions whether there is funding for the potential Northern and Bakerloo line extensions, although it welcomes these in principle. It is critical of bus fare increases and plans to reduce bus services, stating that this is unfair for passengers with lower incomes and calls for changes to bus contracts so that there is an incentive for bus companies to carry more passengers. It urges the inclusion of policies to help reduce the need to travel, including joining-up spatial and transport planning so that, for example, people live closer to key services. It welcomes proposals to encourage walking and advocates the pedestrianisation of Oxford Street; it also supports cycling proposals but also states that there needs to be more effective enforcement of legislation in regard to cycling. It notes that even with capacity increases on public transport, there is still a 14 per cent increase in road congestion forecast by 2031 and urges TfL to investigate road-pricing schemes, accompanied by a further roll-out of Smarter Travel schemes. London Liberal Democrats are concerned about air quality and would like to see a proposal for an inner London Low Emission Zone; there should also be more done on bus fleet emissions and enhanced electric vehicle charging infrastructure. It would like priority given to step-free access, a review of Dial-a-Ride and for the Mayor to have direct oversight of all regional rail routes in the London area.

### **London Primary Care Trusts**

London Primary Care Trusts states that the hard evidence on the health effects of transport is not made clear or qualified in the strategy. It states that the health impacts of the decision to defer Phase 3 of the Low Emission Zone are not quantified and that it is not clear that progress in reducing poor air quality at the worst sites is adequate or will be maintained. It welcomes the acknowledgement of the

annoyance factor of noise and its effects on mental health but notes that these effects are not mapped or quantified in order to judge how unacceptable or damaging noise levels are. It notes that the downside of more cycling may be more casualties and states that the NHS may wish to be involved in local policy and implementation to avoid these burdens on services and to maximise the benefits through safe physical activity. It is unsure to what extent the overall road safety policy will lead to real and substantive progress on the ground. It suggests that a strategic review of accessibility to health services may be warranted. It states that it is unclear how the aim of prioritising transport improvements in regeneration areas will be effectively delivered. It is disappointed that despite the repeated reference to health and the assertion that the monitoring will be outcome-based, the monitoring indicators do not include specific health indicators.

### **London Sustainable Development Commission (LSDC)**

LSDC welcomes the commitment to CO<sub>2</sub> reduction targets and making improvements to air quality; it also welcomes the approach taken to the Integrated Impact Assessment of the MTS. It would like greater emphasis on reducing the need to travel and on improving access to services rather than access to transport itself. It would like more policies on raising money for public transport improvements and guidance for supporting communities to choose lower carbon transport options, and while it welcomes electric vehicles, notes the need to reduce emissions overall. The Commission would like the Mayor to state how air quality targets will be met; a clearer direction on addressing road accidents and more on how TfL policies will help the most vulnerable. It also calls on TfL to accelerate the take-up of sustainable technologies, for example by using its procurement programme. It notes that there will need to be closer examination of any airport expansion plans.

### **London Thames Gateway Development Corporation**

London Thames Gateway Development Corporation states that the MTS could say more about how specific proposals will be funded and delivered, in order to help delivery agencies fulfil their targets for housing and employment. While it supports the principle of integrating transport and land use planning, regeneration areas may need improvements to capacity beyond public transport and demand management, for example via additional highway capacity. It welcomes the inclusion of the following schemes: Barking station, Dagenham Dock DLR extension (but would like more detail on future extensions), and the commitment to High Speed Rail, and advocates Stratford as a suitable interchange for High Speed 1 and 2. It notes a number of apparent discrepancies between the MTS and the London Plan, for example the former does not mention Beam Park station. It strongly supports a new river crossing and is keen to see more details about the review being undertaken and potential timescales for a project; it would also like more information on the Blackwall Tunnel refurbishment and how this fits in with the current A12 study; and also calls for TfL to state its views on the possible Thames Estuary Airport.

### **London TravelWatch**

London TravelWatch identifies a number of priorities for transport in the short term, particularly with regard to securing further bus priority measures across the range of borough and authority boundaries, an extension of the network and its operating hours, and timely delivery of the bus stop accessibility programme. It calls for further work to be done on the costs and benefits of further road user charging so that it can be better understood; progression of the Better Streets initiative and delivery of both the Underground PPP and the National Rail HLOS projects. It is keen that more efficient, mass transit modes like buses are given more road space and priority and is wary about reallocation of road space for uses including loading and motorcycles and PHVs in bus lanes. It welcomes the promotion of walking and cycling, measures to improve safety and security and advocates much greater use of Smarter Travel and the adoption of travel plans in hospitals, schools and workplaces. While it is positive about smoothing traffic flow and Smarter Travel, it states that

there is a need to 'lock in' the benefits through the use of complementary measures, otherwise there is a danger that there will just be increased demand for this released road space. It would like greater value given to health-related trips, for example a consideration of how bus stops can be moved closer to hospitals. London TravelWatch welcomes the proposals for new infrastructure such as Crossrail 2, increases to capacity on National Rail and further DLR extensions but calls for more detail on how these will be funded; it also would like to see further proposals for tram schemes. It also states that there must be targets and monitoring for key objectives such as reducing congestion and crowding. Finally, it sets out a number of specific improvements on the rail network that it would like to see, and a list of locations on the road network where it would like the Mayor to explore options for reducing peak time delays.

## **London Visual Impairment Forum**

The London Visual Impairment Forum is concerned that the rephrasing of traffic signals may result in blind and partially sighted people having less time to cross the road, and notes that safety must be a factor in the design of streetscape and shared spaces. It stated that attention should be given to the design of streets so that buses are able to pull up to stops and deploy the wheelchair ramp effectively. It expresses concern over cycle greenways where they include shared use, any curtailment of step-free access and any reduction in concessionary fares. It supports the introduction of Countdown 2, effective pavement maintenance and the commitment to work with utility companies to reduce road congestion. It states that taxi and private hire drivers and Dial-a-Ride staff should have adequate disability equality training; and that cycle training should include disability awareness. It welcomes measures to improve signage including Legible London, the introduction of ISA technology to limit the speed of vehicles and the introduction of 20mph speed limits however it does not support allowing cyclists to cycle both ways down one way streets.

## **National Express East Anglia and c2c**

National Express East Anglia and c2c welcome the MTS and fully supports the aspiration to achieve a transport system 'which can excel among those of world cities'. It agrees with the desire outlined in the MTS to achieve improvements in key areas such as station interchange, orbital journeys, better station facilities, enhanced pedestrian and cycle access to stations, and other modal improvements which would complement rail transport and share the ATOC view that there should be a greater focus in the strategy on tackling capacity constraints, enhanced light rail and bus links with National Rail services, better accessibility and additional prioritisation of schemes (to help direct investment according to the funding environment - especially if, as seems likely, funding is constrained). It reiterates the importance of both extra capacity and new trains on the West Anglia route and considers that 'four tracking' of the Lea Valley is essential but consider there is also a vital need for major upgrade to infrastructure and services on the Great Eastern Main Line with faster journey times, new trains (especially on the intercity services to Norwich) and increased capacity and line speed, and the need to compliment Crossrail. It also considers that priority should be accorded to the crucial multi-modal interchanges at Liverpool Street, Stratford, Walthamstow Central, Tottenham Hale and Seven Sisters, where the flows are substantial, growing and beyond the levels they were originally expected to easily accommodate and that more work is required on ticket inter-availability and information provision. Finally, collaborative working between the train operating companies, British Transport Police and TfL on safety and security should be a priority.

## **National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG)**

NJUG welcomes the Mayor's emphasis on securing a reliable road network and supports initiatives to minimise disruption from unplanned events, use intelligent traffic control and develop a workable Permit scheme for roadworks. However, it states that new initiatives such as lane rental and permit schemes need to be properly trialled and evaluated in terms of their benefits to road users and their

cost to utility companies and consumers. It notes that there are already a number of regulations in place to manage the impact of street works, and some of these are relatively new, including overstay charges, Fixed Penalty Notices and permit schemes applied by local authorities. It urges that these be properly evaluated to ascertain whether further measures would add benefits. NJUG notes that it has, at the Mayor's request, been implementing the Clearway 2012 project to minimise disruption during the 2012 Games and that, generally, utilities only ever excavate roads for essential reasons of safety, security of supply, connection / upgrade or to divert apparatus for major transport or regeneration projects. It welcomes TfL's commitment to coordinate roadworks but states that TfL and all the boroughs should also upload their planned works to the database and that there is more scope to organise 'workathons' when different agencies undertake work simultaneously to minimise disruption. Finally, NJUG questions whether utility works are responsible for significant levels of congestion, citing research that only 10 per cent of congestion is caused by road works, half of which are undertaken by local authorities.

## **Natural England**

Natural England welcomes the prominence given to walking and cycling, as these modes of active travel have major health benefits, as does access to green space. Therefore it welcomes plans to plant trees, improve the street scene and create safe walking routes in London. However, it would like parks to be included in these walking routes and notes that these could also bring biodiversity benefits.

## **Network Rail**

Network Rail supports the Mayor's goals as set out in the MTS, and welcomes its status as a key delivery partner for the proposals in the document, noting the central importance of the passenger and freight railway in supporting economic growth in the Capital. It welcomes the integration of the three Mayoral strategies, particularly for ensuring that development makes use of existing and planned transport links. It also calls on the Mayor to invest revenue from the planning system and road charging to improve London's railway. Network Rail notes that it is working with TfL on the London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS) and states that this should be referred to in the MTS. It welcomes Mayoral involvement in planning National Rail services and standards and calls for the Mayor to be a champion of the case for sustained investment in rail infrastructure in London.

## **NHS Lambeth**

NHS Lambeth states that resources should be invested in areas of economic deprivation to encourage use of public transport by those from more disadvantaged groups and states TfL should engage with stakeholders to facilitate access to new health developments. It states that there should be improved signage from stations and bus stops as well as more information on maps to help people find their way to public services, and also states there should also be a specific option on journey planner for routes to public services. It calls for preventive measures to minimise the potential risks associated with increased cycling.

## **NHS London**

NHS London is broadly supportive of the MTS and welcomes the emphasis on different organisations within London working together. It makes a number of suggestions for further additions and clarifications: greater embedding of health and health inequalities, including the monitoring of these, within the MTS and a modification so that Journey Planner should make walking its first recommendation for trips, which would help NHS and TfL to promote this mode and its attendant health benefits. It is disappointed that the removal of the Western Extension is proposed, given the high air pollution levels in London and the high levels of respiratory disease. It notes that while there has been good progress in improving communication between public services and TfL, the process of

reconfiguring transport remains slow. Finally it states that the principle of working in partnership could be expanded to include, for example, co-funding of developments such as lifts and signage.

## **NHS Tower Hamlets**

NHS Tower Hamlets PCT broadly welcomes the MTS and commends the Mayor's office for the vision and ambition of the document. It applauds the prominence given to the further development of promoting active healthy travel and notes that the strategy moves a considerable way towards addressing the interlinked issues of travel, climate change and public health. However, it states that an opportunity has been missed to support NHS policy since it has a major role with regard to carbon reduction, given the size and travel patterns of its work force and the volume of its procurement activity. It notes that the focus within the strategy upon road safety and work-related road safety is to be applauded but states that it is not clear to what extent the overall policy will lead to real and substantive reductions in accidents on the ground. It regrets that it is proposed that Phase 3 of the Low Emission Zone be deferred, given the acknowledgement in the strategy that London's overall air quality remains the poorest of any region in the UK, with transport emissions as a major contributory factor.

## **North London Strategic Alliance**

NLSA acknowledges the progress that has been made in improving London's transport network and welcomes the level of investment in TfL's Business Plan. It is pleased with TfL's work on sub-regional transport analysis and welcomes many of the policies and projects outlined in the MTS. It considers that, while these improvements will go some of the way towards meeting the challenges facing North London, additional measures are essential in the longer term if the sub-region is to play its full role in supporting growth of London as a world class city. It is concerned that: funding is concentrated on Crossrail and the Underground upgrades with little provision for the development and implementation of other medium and large scale schemes; by 2025 the additional capacity from the PPP improvements will not be enough to mitigate congestion on the Victoria, Piccadilly and Northern lines; the suitability of the existing bus network and the range of services on offer and that there are not enough specific plans to address ongoing congestion on key arterial road routes, including the North Circular Road. It states that, if adequate airport capacity is to be provided in the longer term, then growth at Luton and Stansted could play an important part in the renewal of two corridors of coordination and growth. NLSA supports the Chelsea-Hackney line as a strategic rail link between South-West and North London, providing new capacity and congestion relief, particularly on the Victoria line and the identification and promotion of a viable proposal securing maximum benefits for North London should remain a priority. It considers work is needed to continue to relieve existing crowding on the Northern and Piccadilly lines, including interchange improvements at Camden Town station, and to maximise the benefit of the Thameslink Programme for North London and the wider London-Luton Growth Corridor including ensuring that inner suburban services are enhanced and improving key stations at Mill Hill Broadway and Cricklewood and the interchange at West Hampstead to cope with growth. It considers that increased capacity is required on the West Anglia routes to mitigate over-crowding and support sustainable growth along the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough corridor and at Stansted, and welcomes TfL's support for four-tracking, and considers that enhanced Stratford services, including to Chingford, should be long-term priorities. It considers that longer trains and full electrification of the North London and Gospel Oak to Barking lines are required to support growth and upgrades to the Gospel Oak to Barking and Felixstowe to Nuneaton lines are required to encourage the sustainable distribution of freight. It considers that a top priority is for a review of the bus network to tackle issues including poor orbital links, and suggests that solutions for North London could include bus-based transit schemes. Finally, it considers that bespoke packages of investment to deal with congestion are required to reduce delays, achieve a mix of priorities for different road-users and achieve an environmental balance.

## **North West London Hospitals NHS Trust**

The North West London Hospitals NHS Trust is concerned that transport services, particularly bus services do not adequately serve London's hospitals and that the consultation process to consider such requests are inadequate. It suggests specific bus route changes and would like to see the Countdown 2 project be provided as a real time system located in the cafe / lounge areas of hospitals and expanded to include Underground and Overground information. It suggests Northwick Park station should be a priority for step-free access and states that provision of secure cycle parking is a high priority. It states that the Cycle Superhighways concept should be extended to popular cycle routes in outer London.

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

The ODA welcomes the following in the MTS: the commitment to Crossrail; the 60 per cent target for a reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions; the commitment to having London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games transport infrastructure in place for the Games; and the proposal for international services to stop at Stratford. While it welcomes the proposed DLR extension from Stratford it would like to be consulted on the detail. The ODA supports initiatives to increase walking and cycling and would like to see reference made to the 'Chingford Link Project' in the MTS. Finally, it states that the approach of raising developer contributions for Crossrail should be balanced with the need to fund the delivery of local schemes in key regeneration areas, and these may need to take precedence over Crossrail.

## **Park Royal Partnership (PRP)**

PRP states that, as a major stakeholder in the economic prosperity of west London, it should have a direct and funded role in helping to develop and implement the strategy's policies. PRP suggests that TfL operating departments should be set targets to increase mode share by making public transport services, including park and ride schemes, more attractive to motorists. It encourages low emission and electric vehicles, as well as the reduction of the number of commuters accessing Park Royal by car but states that Park Royal's urban realm and security around public transport must be improved in order to encourage modal shift. PRP seeks to reduce congestion by encouraging parking at integrated transport hubs. It welcomes the continuing attention to smarter travel in the strategy and states that the restoration of PRP's smarter travel funding is necessary. It notes that the establishment of a freight forum will improve the efficiency of freight distribution, and would like to see more use of the Grand Union canal, where viable, to distribute freight. It also suggests that Network Rail should be encouraged to improve utilisation of some of the major rail freight facilities in London. In order to further improve accessibility, PRP wishes to see real time running information at all bus stops in the Park Royal area, better signposting and easier access to tickets. It welcomes the policy to support regeneration in Opportunity areas and seeks the transport investment necessary to deliver it in Park Royal. It states that the removal of the articulated bus is unnecessary and that significant re-design of the bus service is required in order to provide a better orbital bus service. Additionally it requires an explanation within the strategy of what the 'development of the bus network' will involve. It wishes to see information on the Mayor's manifesto commitment to introduce a network of express bus services linking rail stations in outer London, and would like this to include Fastbus. It states that the potential for enlarging North Acton station ticket hall and providing step-free access to its platforms as well as construction of the proposed First Central interchange should be investigated. Additionally it states that there is a need for rail interchange between the west / north London lines and Crossrail.

## **Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety**

The Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety states its support for the introduction of voluntary Intelligent Speed Adaptation due to safety improvements and also supports proposals to improve cycle safety in the vicinity of HGVs. It also states that there may be interesting cross-modal

approaches which can be taken to risk manage London's rail networks more effectively. It states that the Mayor should not only commit to reducing casualties and injury but also to encourage all agencies to work together and narrow any data 'gap' between them as well as encourage the GLA and TfL to implement driving-for-work policies.

### **Port of London Authority**

The Port of London Authority is pleased to see that the movement of people and goods by river has been comprehensively integrated into the MTS and suggests some further clarifications and additions to the proposals and policies relating to this. Firstly it asks for consistency of terms when the Thames, Blue Ribbon Network and other waterways are referenced, and a full inclusion of river transport in the definition of public transport. It states that the MTS should include the Port of London in addition to the other ports listed in the draft. It supports proposals to seek financial support for new piers, retain safeguarded wharves and the identification of further wharves. It notes that there must be early consultation on any future river crossings.

### **Private Hire Board**

The Private Hire Board states that private hire vehicles should be able to use bus lanes, noting that lifting the restrictions may help improve air quality through reduced engine idling. It states that any shortages in official Olympic transport provision could be met by private hire vehicles.

### **RAC Foundation**

The RAC Foundation states that the approach of the MTS to maintaining an efficient road network is unrealistic in the context of growth, competing demands for road space, road space reallocation and constrained funding. It states that the MTS appears to deal with rail congestion but not increasing road congestion as well as stating the MTS lacks a clear indication of priorities and only refers to funding in general terms. It states initiatives such as cycling and walking are welcome but will not entirely solve the problems of congestion as well as stating that dealing with road congestion is important as it affects prosperity, competitiveness and bus performance. While it supports smoothing traffic flow it states that there is no evidence to suggest that this approach will make more than a small difference to the problem of deteriorating road network performance. It states that differential pricing could be used to control future demand for road space and states that firm proposals are needed for demand management. It states the MTS should include the importance of the road network, car travel, road freight and identification of 'quick win' junction improvements as well as a strategic assessment of road space requirements linked to a pricing mechanism. It states that the MTS's focus on accessible transport should not only be on public transport, but also include car travel. It states it is hard to see how commitments on carbon reduction and reducing congestion can be met without road user charging, and advocates a 'second generation' scheme possibly covering a much wider area of London than the current scheme. It states that roads should be widened where possible, that there is a need for another river crossing and bus lanes should be re appraised periodically to ensure they are working correctly. In particular, it calls for a better recognition of the importance of the car in outer London; and notes that virtually all freight and services to and within London is done by road. Finally, it would like to see clearer prioritisation of the Mayor's schemes and proposals and a better indication of where funding will be focused.

### **Railfuture**

Railfuture states that more frequent trains, better service reliability, to both inner and outer London and the quality and cleanliness of rail services are important. It states that improving and redesigning stations will help to improve capacity, access and passenger flow and states its support for demand management and disagreement with the proposed removal of the Western Extension Zone. It states

that secure parking is important at stations and there should be further promotion of the transfer of road freight to rail, including the provision of freight transfer depots.

## **Ramblers**

The Ramblers notes that praise is undoubtedly due for the enlightened approach of several proposals in the MTS but it is not certain that the proposals will go so far as to create a demand for walking across London and raise the pedestrian in the highway hierarchy. It feels that the strategy should further promote walking through the expedients of social inclusion and targeting. It is delighted that there is a commitment to roll out Legible London in other areas but would like to see a greater commitment to better integrate it with other modes. It is pleased to note the strategy's proposals for promoting physically active modes of transport but feels there needs to be better communication and coordination between the various agencies delivering such projects. It praises the proposals regarding better policing and designing out crime but stresses that measures to reduce crime should interfere as little as possible with a citizen's freedom to move around unimpeded. It welcomes proposals for safety improvements and promoting balanced streets but feels that while road safety campaigns for young people are essential, they must not deter them from walking. It suggests that cycling should be encouraged provided that work done to improve routes for cyclists does not make those routes less attractive and safe for walkers.

## **Richard Tracey - London Assembly Conservative Group**

The Conservative Group in the London Assembly states that the MTS is an excellent document. It states that both the Tube upgrades and construction of Crossrail will be of great benefit to London as a whole but notes that these will not be of direct benefit to South London. It would like to see a clear breakdown of the costs of desirable projects as well as more clarity over the order of priority of such projects. While it understands that a number of excellent schemes are currently unaffordable, it suggests that the MTS should make clear that specific improvements to South London's transport are at the very top of the Mayor's future priorities as soon as funding becomes available. It suggests that there is further scope for the strategy to consider bringing back into use unused or little used railway lines, particularly in South London. It does not support the option of road user charging. It notes that when discussing forecast increases in public transport trips and road congestion the strategy does not take into account the extent to which measures such as flexible working and working from home will help to reduce demand.

## **Road Haulage Association (RHA)**

The RHA endorses many of the aims and aspirations of the MTS. It welcomes the efforts already underway to adopt more business-friendly enforcement of traffic regulations on TfL roads and the commitment to take this approach to boroughs it considers have been unreasonably using fixed penalty notices. It supports the encouragement of cycling in London and offers support in highlighting the dangers and responsibilities involved to both cyclists and truck drivers. It agrees with promotion of alternatively-fuelled freight vehicles, is keen to seek reasonable incentives for operators, and encourages the publication of testing of the technology so that operators and financial institutions fully understand the operational and cost risks involved. It highlights the efforts that the industry and its suppliers have made over the past three decades to innovate, to improve efficiency and to reduce the environmental impact of freight. While it supports TfL's continued commitment to Delivery Service Plans, Construction Logistics Plans, the freight portal, and the overall aim of FORS, it does not agree with the segmentation of the freight industry under FORS. It recognises the challenges posed by NO<sub>x</sub> levels but is concerned about the benefit / cost of imposing a NO<sub>x</sub> requirement in 2015 on trucks that do little mileage in London and the impact on small businesses.



## **Roadpeace**

Roadpeace supports proposals to encourage cycling but states that the Mayor should encourage TfL, council and justice sector staff to cycle in order to encourage public uptake. It states that campaigns promoting compliance among cyclists should include other road users, that there should be a wider implementation of cycle superhighways and that in addition to making the Highway Code more cyclist friendly, there should be reform of the civil compensation system. It supports proposals to promote walking but states that it is necessary to adopt a sustainable road user hierarchy with pedestrians at the top. It states that the road casualty reduction targets are disappointing and that greater publicity should be given to the number of road casualties and the location of collision hotspots. It stresses the need for a Road Danger Reduction Plan and supports the continued investment in road safety research publications. It supports proposals for HGV and freight safety but stresses that even more needs to be done in these areas. It states that 20mph default speed limits should be implemented in London. It suggests that tackling crime and fear of crime should also include motoring offences and that all police consultations should include motoring offences. It welcomes proposals for designing out crime and states that a key priority should be designing out blind spots on Lorries and promoting mandatory Intelligent Speed Adaptation. It welcomes proposals for smarter travel and supports the wider use of safety cameras and Automatic Number Plate Recognition systems. It states that aspirations for modal shift should be higher but raises concerns that electric vehicles would eliminate the warning of oncoming vehicles provided by engine noise. It states that support for biofuels should be qualified. It suggests that intermediate targets should be defined for the development and uptake of CO<sub>2</sub> efficient road vehicles and to secure modal shift and that failure to meet these targets should trigger the use of stronger incentivisation.

## **Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea (RBKC)**

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea states that the MTS must aim to manage the consequences of population growth without compromising sustainability. It believes that the delivery of Crossrail by 2017 should be the main priority but is disappointed that there is no proposal to turn the provision of a turnback facility into a working station. It supports the development of a national high-speed rail network and welcomes the inclusion of the Chelsea-Hackney line in the strategy. It strongly supports improvements to orbital rail capacity and interchange but stresses that interchange stations should be accessible to all and that direct links provided by existing orbital rail travel should be preserved. It would like to see the removal of the capacity constraints at Clapham Junction station and further integration in the timetabling of Southern train and London Overground train services on the West London line. It supports the proposals to relieve London of freight without an origin or destination in the Capital. It supports the planned upgrade of the Underground service. It is disappointed that there is no commitment in the strategy to carry out a large area-wide review of the bus network, such as on a sub-regional basis, or a review of London's taxi provision. It welcomes the proposed measures to smooth traffic flows and supports investment in intelligent traffic control systems. It opposes capacity increases at Heathrow and supports proposals to improve public transport access to London's airports but stresses the need for the West London line services to Gatwick to be reinstated. It supports initiatives to create a more accessible transport system. It supports efforts to make the road network more permeable for cyclists, increase provision of cycle parking and training and introduce the Cycle Hire Scheme but is sceptical about the benefits of Cycle Superhighways. It would like to see a greater focus on the implementation of smarter travel initiatives. It notes the importance of balancing improved information provision and the reduction of street clutter. It welcomes efforts to improve road safety, especially with regard to technology and side-guard protection on HGVs. It suggests a programme of education and enforcement to promote road safety and considerate behaviour towards other modes. It supports the Mayor's Share the Road Campaign and believes that this should be included explicitly within the strategy. It supports proposals to reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour. It commends the principles of 'better streets'. It strongly supports the provision of noise reduction measures but suggests that more can be done to tackle

vehicle noise. It supports the principle of Low Emission Zones but notes that the current zone has not delivered large benefits in air quality. It states that the strategy should go further to address air quality issues, including taking a more proactive role in addressing the problem and setting explicit targets for reducing bus and taxi emissions. It supports proposals for car clubs, promoting behavioural change and the development and use of hybrid vehicles but has reservations about encouraging electric vehicles. It welcomes the introduction of Oyster pay as you go on Thames Clipper and National Rail services in London and supports the rationalisation of TfL and National Rail fares. It does not support consistent parking and loading regulations across London. It states that there may be a case for road pricing across London but stresses that any scheme would need to take into account local conditions and have fair and flexible charges. It states that the Western Extension Zone is inflexible and that if the proposals to remove the zone go ahead, the Mayor should ensure that traffic levels do not return to their pre-Western Extension levels.

### **Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames**

The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames states that there needs to be a stronger link between the MTS policies and proposals. It states that despite metropolitan town centres being identified as key growth areas, the proposals do not prioritise them or provide certainty that the transport infrastructure will be delivered to support these areas as growth nodes. It opposes the Mayor's intentions to continue to increase bus fares and reduce the total kilometres of the bus network. It is concerned that appropriate funding has not been provided for the implementation of the new proposals and initiatives for the boroughs set out in the MTS. It states that proposals throughout the strategy do not provide confidence that reducing the high mode share of private motor vehicle use in outer London is a priority for the Mayor. It states that transport infrastructure in south London is not supported in a way that would allow all parts of London to contribute to economic growth and that focusing investment in transport infrastructure and economic growth in central London is contrary to the aim of creating a low carbon economy. It is concerned that the measures outlined in the strategy fail to achieve the Mayor's own CO<sub>2</sub> reduction targets for London and states that reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions should be a priority for the MTS. It states that the strategy needs to set interim targets to assess the Mayor's performance and track the progress towards the strategy's 2025 and 2031 targets. It calls for greater consideration of transportation links to key population centres outside London. It suggests that Travelcard rezoning of metropolitan town centres should be considered as a means to reduce travel costs and promote the economic development of these areas. It requests that Kingston and Surbiton stations be reclassified to Zone 4. It calls for strong consideration to be given to increasing train frequencies, and improving the connectivity of the rail network in southwest London as key means of increasing capacity; as opposed to just considering longer trains. It supports the increased emphasis on Smarter Travel initiatives and the promotion of walking and cycling. It requests that Cycle Superhighways are expanded further into outer London and that orbital highways are considered and calls for a commitment to installing cycle storage on trains. It supports road user charging and demand management but stresses the need to ensure that such measures do not provide incentives for modal shift away from public transport, walking and cycling and would prefer to see incentives for using electric vehicles rather than penalising motorists. It has concerns regarding the Mayor's proposal to remove the Western Extension of the Congestion Charging Zone and opposes the deferment of Phase 3 of the Low Emission Zone.

### **Royal Free Hampstead NHS Trust**

The Royal Free Hampstead NHS Trust states its support for air conditioning on the Underground and would like the programme extended to the Northern line; for capacity increases on the London Overground; upgrades to the Northern line; and 'Making Walking Count'. It also states the targets to improve cycle parking at stations could be achieved in one year rather than the proposed two.

## **Royal National Institute for Deaf people (RNID)**

RNID states that it welcomes plans to make transport more accessible for people with hearing impairments and wants the same accessibility standards across all public transport networks. It also welcomes plans to improve staff training and would like to see commitments to improve public address systems and improve taxi drivers' awareness in relation to people who are deaf. RNID states that it wants more information available in a variety of formats that people with hearing impairments can use. It states concern over shared spaces but welcomes the fact that the MTS states that it will take into account disabled and deaf peoples needs, and notes that it has previously raised concerns on this issue. It also states that the needs of disabled people need to be taken into account when encouraging walking and cycling. It states that deaf people's needs must be incorporated into planning of transport and infrastructure.

## **Royal National Institute of Blind people (RNIB)**

RNIB requests that bus drivers are trained to pull up close to the stop and notes that taxi drivers must be aware of their obligations under the Disability Discrimination Act. It states that all pedestrian crossings should have audible signals, welcomes plans to improve coordination with community transport, and requests that information related to transport, including LondonWorks and Dial-a-Ride is available in suitable formats, including online. It welcomes travel mentoring initiatives and the provision of real time information for bus services. While it supports the removal of street clutter, it states that there must be a delineation between the pavement and the kerb and opposes the removal of controlled crossings; it is also concerned the introduction of quiet electric vehicles as these would not always be perceived by other people, and calls for measures to address the potential safety risk.

## **Royal Parks**

The Royal Parks supports the balanced vision for improving transport combined with enhancing quality of life through better place making and urges the Mayor to give rigorous protection to existing valued places such as the Royal Parks. It states that parks should be recognised in the strategy as landscape heritage. It supports and will work with the Mayor on the promotion of healthy travel options and increasing the number of trees and vegetation in London. It supports aspirations to encourage walking through improved streets and facilities and a greater provision of information, and to reduce the impact of noise and improve air quality in order to ensure the tranquillity of parks is maintained

## **Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders Limited (SMMT)**

SMMT is committed to working with the Mayor in order to improve road safety and engage in the forthcoming Road Safety Plan for London. It suggests that changes to the London Low Emission Zone and policies on air quality must take into account the complete Euro standard regime and supports the Mayor's initiatives in reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions through traffic management policies, conventional vehicle improvements and investment in a variety of new technologies. It is pleased to see the commitment to incentivising low carbon, electric; hybrid, hydrogen and other alternatively fuelled vehicles as early markets develop, including initiatives that can be implemented straight away. The SMMT urges the Mayor to ensure national collaboration in low carbon vehicle development and supporting infrastructure.

## **South & West London Transport Conference (SWELTRAC)**

SWELTRAC welcomes the increased focus on transport issues in outer London but states that there should be stronger emphasis still and that the findings of the Outer London Commission should be given greater weight within the MTS. It welcomes the move towards a 'hub and spoke' approach. It supports the emphasis on boroughs to identify and implement proposals in their own areas but notes that they will need extra support and funding in order to achieve this. It welcomes emphasis on the

integration of services with National Rail as well as all proposals to help increase capacity on rail routes. It suggests that even more can be done to improve capacity at outer London interchanges, including East Croydon station. It is disappointed at the lack of commitment to large-scale orbital transport. It welcomes Crossrail and stresses the need for Crossrail 2. It urges that the strategy should include support for improved public transport access to all the airports serving London, rather than just Heathrow and opposes expansion at Heathrow, but feels that the strategy could be bolder in addressing issues of airport capacity. It would like to see Tramlink extended to locations such as Crystal Palace, Tooting and Sutton. It welcomes proposals to extend the Northern line and would like to see improvements to the District line. It supports proposals to keep the bus network under regular review and all means to improve information for bus passengers but would like to see more emphasis on the role of the bus in improving orbital travel. It is concerned that bus priority measures will lose much of their impact due to a change in LIP funding. It states that the potential for ferry services along the Thames and new crossing points should be investigated. It supports aspirations for a 'Cycling Revolution' and initiatives such as 'Biking Boroughs', Cycle Hire and Cycle Superhighways but notes there should be better consultation with the boroughs on the latter. It supports the Legible London initiative but does not feel enough emphasis has been given to how walking can reduce overcrowding and benefit health. It notes that the introduction of shared space in many areas would be welcome but requires a better definition of what constitutes a 'Better Street'. It supports the use of electric vehicles and proposals to get the infrastructure in place first in order to encourage a significant uptake. It welcomes any plans to promote car clubs and the use of other low carbon vehicles and carbon efficient technologies. It encourages a greater emphasis on Smarter Travel measures currently in place. It is concerned that proposals to smooth the flow of traffic could cause conflict with pedestrian use of the highway and requires greater clarity on the prioritisation of interventions. It supports consideration of use of bus lanes by coaches, minibuses and possibly HGVs where this is not already permitted.

### **South East England Development Agency (SEEDA)**

SEEDA disagrees with the Mayor's position in opposing the expansion of the capacity of Heathrow but states support for improving public transport access to Heathrow as it will help address air quality considerations and help to mitigate climate change impacts. It also states support for the principle of high-speed rail links to Heathrow.

### **South East England Regional Transport Board**

The South East England Regional Transport Board focuses its response on matters of strategic cross-boundary interest. It notes that many of the proposals, including many regarding National Rail, have a cross-boundary dimension relevant to South East England and that the final document should recognise this. It states that the document should recognise the role of London as an interchange point for trips across the Greater South East as well as consider local trips across the Greater London boundary to outer London town centres. It also notes that the significance of the M25 for route choices for London-bound traffic should be acknowledged.

### **South London Partnership (SLP)**

SLP welcomes the coordinated publication of the strategies and the commitment to developing outer London, but states that inconsistencies between the plans must be resolved and that there is no vision or shape for south London emerging from the strategies. It states that small scale tram extensions need to be part of the strategy's investment programme. It stresses that new routes and infrastructure are required as well as better promotion in order to achieve the enhanced orbital travel objective. It welcomes the Sub-Regional Transport Plans but states that the emphasis on these means that strategy is light on detailed analysis, which makes it difficult for boroughs and businesses to establish their own development plans. It states that beyond committed schemes, there is little

prospect of major investment in SLP's identified transport priorities in the near future and therefore urges the Mayor to work with SLP to prioritise projects. It would like to see greater policy support and investment in Smarter Choices initiatives, and stronger commitment to investment in managing essential highways networks beyond the support given to traffic smoothing. It welcomes the more flexible approach to town centre parking in outer London and the support for Park and Ride schemes.

### **Steve O'Connell - Assembly Member**

Steve O'Connell, Assembly Member for Croydon and Sutton, states that the MTS is an excellent document. He states that both the Tube upgrades and the construction of Crossrail will be of great benefit to London as a whole but notes that these will not be of direct benefit to South London. He would like to see a clear breakdown of the costs of desirable projects as well as more clarity over the order of priority of such projects. While he understands that a number of excellent schemes are currently unaffordable, he suggests that the strategy should make clear that specific improvements to South London's transport are at the top of the Mayor's future priorities as soon as funding becomes available. In particular he feels that the extension of the Croydon Tramlink to Crystal Palace as well as extensions from Purley to Brixton and a Sutton extension via Morden would be of huge benefit to South London.

### **Sustrans**

Sustrans states that overall it supports the direction that the MTS sets out, as well as the six goals for transport in London. Sustrans also makes several recommendations for inclusion in the MTS such as interim targets for cycling growth and carbon dioxide emissions reduction. Sustrans recommends that there should be a focus on under-represented groups such as women and children in delivering the cycling revolution. Sustrans states that the MTS should set out a London-wide road traffic reduction target and that the scope and structure of expanded road user charging is established under the current mayoralty. Sustrans also recommends that the MTS should promote the reduction of traffic speeds and expansion of 20mph speed limits and should seek to smooth traffic flow by increasing the uptake of space efficient modes such as cycling. Sustrans also states its support for new pedestrian and cycle Thames crossings in east London, however it opposes proposals for additional Thames crossings for motor vehicles; Sustrans also opposes additional airport runway capacity provision in the south east.

### **Tandridge District Council**

Tandridge District Council stresses the need to deal with growth impacts across GLA borders. It states that the cross boundary implications of rail in Croydon and Bromley should be taken into account and that it would like to see Thameslink completed, including the East Grinstead Railway line. It opposes expansion of Heathrow. It states that the cross boundary impact of any park and ride scheme in Bromley and Croydon should be taken into account in the strategy. It calls for the strategy to look at the potential of extending the Tramlink network to Selsdon and Purley / Streatham. It states that the strategy should take the cross boundary implications of bus routes into account and that there is scope to provide real time information on such bus routes. It states that cycle parking and hire facilities should be made available at London Terminal stations.

### **Thames Gateway London Partnership (TGLP)**

TGLP states that the Thames Gateway is the area of the greatest expansion in the capital yet the Mayor's transport proposals are not consistent with this level of growth and states that there should be a commitment to early implementation of the Hall Farm Curve due to the enhanced access to jobs and services that it may bring. It states concern that some critical schemes to the sub region remain unfunded and schemes that are funded would not be delivered on a timescale consistent with the delivery of new homes in the London Plan. It is also concerned that no funding is in place for the

implementation of further river crossings and states that consideration should be given to renegotiation of the PFI credits that were available as part of the potential funding package for the Thames Gateway Bridge.

### **The Confederation of Passenger Transport (CPT)**

The CPT states that the MTS has insufficient focus on coach travel and the benefits that this can bring to London. It identifies three areas where it would like to see further detail: coach parking facilities; traffic enforcement; and school transport. With regard to coach parking, it calls for better provision of safe and secure facilities both day and night, while coach operators are willing to pay for these, it requires local government to provide them. On enforcement, it would like a review of standards across London with a view to developing a more consistent system and more flexibility about where coaches can pick up and set down passengers. Finally it calls for the Mayor to encourage London boroughs to make dedicated coach parking bays outside schools.

### **The Crown Estate**

The Crown Estate is pleased that proposals for central London will focus on tackling congestion, increasing the capacity of the rail network, encouraging walking and cycling and managing demand. It applauds the emphasis on the environment and stresses the importance of improvements to the urban realm, especially in the West End. It supports proposals for better streets and a better allocation of surface space between pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. It also supports initiatives to improve transport's contribution to the built environment welcomes measures to smooth traffic flow. It notes that work to review the bus network should include reviewing optimum provision and routes in the West End; balancing provision with that of other forms of transport and the impact on the public realm. It states that the delivery of Crossrail and upgrade of the Tube are essential and suggests the use of consolidation centres to ease congestion while work takes place. It supports initiatives to improve delivery and servicing and proposals to transfer freight to smaller low emission vehicles. It notes that since the Mayor has a legal obligation to comply with European targets for air quality, this must be given greater emphasis. It states that poor air quality should be approached in a more comprehensive way and suggests substantial reductions in high-emitting vehicles including buses.

### **Trade Union Congress (TUC)**

The TUC welcomes an increased focus on the needs of businesses and organisations in the MTS, the Mayor's commitment to increasing capacity and investment in public transport and the integration of different modes, as well as welcoming the recognition that demand management may be necessary on some parts of the road network. It is concerned that targets for modal shift have been reduced, and the potential impacts of financial cuts on the provision of services, where it calls for more public ownership of projects. It states that it is wrong that so few Tube stations are accessible to wheelchair users and calls for consideration of the needs of the visually-impaired in making changes to street crossings and layout. It supports the Low Emission Zone, the transfer of freight from road onto rail and water (but calls for more investment in the relevant infrastructure) and supports schemes to reduce road congestion, including road charging for delivery and service vehicles.

### **Transport for All (TfA)**

TfA states it welcomes the commitment to improve the physical accessibility of the transport system but is concerned that accessibility plans such as the step-free Tube programme have undergone funding cuts. However it welcomes the step-free transport opportunities that Crossrail will bring. TfA states that there should be regular engagement with disabled Londoners on Crossrail and the New Bus for London to ensure the service will meet their needs and states that clarification is needed on the level of accessibility on Thameslink services. It states support for the proposal for a '7 day railway', common service standards, staffing at stations and plans to make part of the new orbital

railway for London step-free however it would like to see plans expanded and is concerned that funding for step-free access on the Overground is not ring-fenced. It welcomes proposals to upgrade the Tube, station refurbishments and accessibility, increasing capacity and air conditioning on the Tube. It states that TfL should publish the response times to repair broken lifts and escalators as well as take more robust action against companies that allow buses to leave depots with faulty ramps as well as more rigorous training for bus drivers, and it states support for iBus and the 'Countdown' display at bus stops. TfA states its support for enhancing river boat provision but would like more detail on how accessibility will be factored into the proposals such as portable ramps. TfA states strong opposition for shared surfaces and states that the removal of the curb is dangerous. It states that TfL should ensure Blue Badge Holder in London have up to date and clear information as to where they can park, and is concerned about the enforcement of the priority seating on buses. It states its support for travel mentoring and states there should be more money for Dial-a-Ride and the Freedom Pass should be honoured on Door to Door transport.

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

TfL Board notes the development of the MTS in tandem with the development of the London Plan and the Economic Development Strategy, and is fully supportive of the policies and proposals within it. It states that the TfL Business Plan has been structured around the six goals contained within the MTS to set out how TfL will deliver its contribution to the strategy to 2018. Beyond 2018, it notes that the rate of implementation of the MTS will depend on the financial environment and funding available. It reiterates its commitment to working with the Mayor, the GLA, the boroughs and other agencies in order to implement the Mayor's vision for London

### **Transport Planning Society (TPS)**

The TPS welcomes the MTS's recognition of the need for a balance between enhancing capacity and managing demand; it also welcomes the proposals for improving customer service on the National Rail network. However it would like to see more details on how buses will be used, particularly to support suburban centres. It states that the MTS could aim to enable wheelchair users to travel spontaneously rather than booking in advance but states that the MTS is right to recognise that accessibility is not just about step-free access. It welcomes the proposals to improve safety and security, better streets and cycling infrastructure, although it notes that secure cycle parking will be vital. It states that street design that encourages slower driving should be used rather than time-distance cameras and states smoothing traffic flow should not mean allowing more or faster traffic flow. It welcomes the recognition that additional road user charging or other demand measures may be needed and supports the use of pricing differentials based on vehicle emissions; it also states that a fully-integrated fare system is an important goal.

### **Transport Salaried Staffs' Association (TSSA)**

TSSA notes that the policies and proposals in the MTS require a multi-agency approach and prefers that staff are permanent and in-house, and is critical of recent private sector involvement in Tube maintenance contracts. It is concerned about reductions to the step-free access programme; is cautious about water transport; and states that the removal of the Western Extension will reduce revenues further and have negative air quality and congestion effects. It is also concerned about reductions in funding of the Commercial Vehicle Education Unit and increases to bus fares, stating that fares can be an important factor in encouraging travel behavioural change. It would like flexible working included in the Strategy and for TfL to explore new ways of raising funds; it also states that the goals of the MTS will not be met without road user charging.

## **UKLPG (UK Liquefied Petroleum Gas)**

UKLPG supports measures to increase the use of Liquid Petroleum Gas (LPG) as a low carbon alternative to conventional fuels. The 100 per cent discount on the Congestion Charge for LPG vehicles to continue; and it states that there should be parking discounts for LPG vehicles.

## **Unite the Union**

Unite the Union calls on the Mayor to adopt a higher target for increased public transport mode share, stating that achieving this shift is important for a range of reasons including London's position as a world city and to meet climate change objectives. It states that there has been a reduction in planned bus kilometres and calls for a reversal of fare increases, retention of the bus subsidy at previously planned levels and an expansion of the network, particularly in outer London. On fares generally, it is concerned that these will continue to rise over the life of the Strategy, with negative impacts on the lowest-paid and on achieving modal shift. It supports the third runway at Heathrow but believes there must be reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with Heathrow, for example by high-speed rail links and local congestion charging. It is concerned about constraints on the transport budget and notes that the removal of the Western Extension will further constrain revenue; instead of the New Bus for London, it calls for the development and introduction of a zero emission bus fleet by 2015.

## **University of East London (UEL)**

UEL states its general support for the three Mayoral strategies and particularly welcomes the principle of convergence, whereby the host boroughs for the 2012 Games achieve parity with the London average across a range of socio-economic indicators. It notes the range of agencies which will deliver this in London and states that these, including the GLA group, need to work together effectively and across strategic service boundaries. It states that transport planning should seek to address the uneven spread of services and institutions across London, and in this context welcomes a Thames Gateway crossing, eastwards extension of the DLR and the use of the Hall Farm Curve.

## **Valerie Shawcross - Assembly Member**

Valerie Shawcross states that the priorities for the MTS should be investment in sustainable transport, increasing the capacity of public transport, reducing car use, encouraging more people to make their journeys on foot or by bike; and tackling congestion on public transport. Ms Shawcross also states that the MTS fails to plan for London's long-term transport challenges and states that the MTS serves to deliver identified and ongoing schemes but not future and unfunded schemes. Ms Shawcross states that the MTS fails to plan for the predicted population and employment growth in the capital. Ms Shawcross states that there is a gap between the desired outcomes and the ability of proposed policies to achieve the goals, and states that there is no clear strategy to progress possible projects. Ms Shawcross agrees that achieving CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction targets, yet questions whether proposals such as bus fare increases, Low Emission Zone Phase 3 deferral and the proposed removal of the Western Extension Zone will help to achieve a shift to public and sustainable transport. Ms Shawcross states that decisions to cancel projects related to accessibility should be taken in consultation with disability groups and states her concern over cuts to projects that improve physical accessibility. Ms Shawcross is concerned that the cancellation of plans for the Thames Gateway Bridge and Cross River Tram will have negative effects on regeneration in, for example, Elephant & Castle and states that it is unclear in the MTS if the Thames Estuary airport is to be pursued, and suggests it is not developed further. Ms Shawcross states that London's economic growth must not be limited to central London, and that the MTS must contain serious proposals for high capacity public transport improvements for outer London such as bus services. Finally Ms Shawcross identifies several risks in the delivery of projects including: the deferring or scaling back of station upgrades on



former Metronet lines, upgrades being behind schedule on the Jubilee line, disputes regarding the second period of the Tubelines upgrade contract and plans to reduce TfL's budget by £5bn.

## **Walk England**

Walk England welcomes the Mayor's proposals to encourage walking and advocates the following: that the Mayor should embrace an overarching vision for a walkable city; a clearer statement of the wider benefits of walking and the publication of the Physical Activity Strategy for London. With regard to the Strategic Walk Network, it urges that this is maintained and promoted beyond 2012 and suggests a number of locations for its extension.

## **West London Partnership**

West London Partnership supports the overall aims and objectives of the MTS but it has concerns that there are several west London issues that are not dealt with satisfactorily in the MTS and that there is no hook for the Sub-regional Transport Plan to deal with these issues while remaining compliant with MTS. It considers there is also no clear statement on the mechanism for achieving cross-boundary coordination, which should include sub-regional partnerships and boroughs. It considers that it would be better if less was said in the MTS about the needs of and proposals for the sub-regions so that there would be more scope for the Sub-regional Transport Plan for West London to respond to the real issues the sub-region faces. It also considers there should be a more consistent read across between the MTS and the London Plan, particularly that growth and development opportunities set out in the London Plan will be frustrated by lack of transport investment. It also considers the MTS should note the importance of car parking policy and standards as a demand management tool and a means of enabling access to developments. It considers there is a need to monitor congestion levels on key hub and spoke routes in West London and that the hub and spoke network in West London should be mentioned. It is concerned there is no MTS ambition to reduce journey times or support for removing bottlenecks on West London's highway system except through smarter travel initiatives. It is concerned there is no detail on how town centres, opportunity areas and major developments are to be served with transport infrastructure and public transport services to support development; that investment in orbital public transport is completely focussed on the North and West London lines with no attempt to connect this orbital transport provision with Crossrail at Old Oak Common; and that there are no proposals to improve orbital public transport elsewhere in West London with no mention of West London Orbital Rail, Wembley to Park Royal Fastbus or other bus-based orbital services, for example the proposed extension of the North London line to serve Hounslow, or to improved rail access to Uxbridge. It disagrees that London has a comprehensive orbital bus network and considers the role of freight quality partnerships has been ignored; that there is a lack of plans for improving accessibility at West London stations; that aviation plans are not satisfactorily detailed; and that smarter travel initiatives should focus on the most carbon intensive movements, such as long-distance commuter travel, business travel, visitor travel and fleet and goods movements.

## **Westminster City Council**

Westminster City Council supports the overarching vision and goals set out in the MTS, and notes that it aligns with its own policies and programmes. It identifies a number of areas where particular attention is needed; calling for policies to increase capacity to be met by expansion of surface and Underground rail and Crossrail. It states that there is a case for reviewing the operation of the bus network in central London and that while it welcomes the proposed removal of Western Extension Zone there is no proposal to remove the original central zone, which it continues to oppose. It states support for the promotion of smoothing traffic flows and lane rental scheme as well as stating support for the Cycle Hire scheme. It states that Legible London should be further developed and states that more reference should be made to car clubs due to their potential to reduce air pollution. Westminster

City Council states that the following schemes should be set out in a realistic implementation programme and that boroughs' responsibilities for their delivery should be defined: Thameslink, Crossrail, London Underground line upgrades, station congestion relief, Victoria and Paddington upgrades, Western Extension Zone removal, bus network improvements and cycling and walking initiatives. It states that the following schemes should be safeguarded in the MTS: Crossrail 2, DLR extension west of Bank, High Speed 2 and the Northern line extension. It supports proposals to encourage walking and states that smoothing traffic flows must not be at the expense of reduced road crossing times; it would also like the greater integration of modes; and urges the Mayor to strengthen cycle parking standards across London. It states that there should be a review of the bus network, so that it can serve London appropriately. It questions whether there are adequate standards in place to ensure river services use less polluting engines and supports the encouragement of freight consolidation schemes. Westminster City Council supports the inclusion of a policy to enhance connectivity, reduce severance and improve access to employment, and identifies areas in the borough that might benefit from such a policy. It welcomes proposals for TfL to work with the boroughs on Air Quality 'hotspots'; it supports the proposal to include NO<sub>x</sub> in the Low Emission Zone (LEZ) and calls for clarification of the proposed changes to the LEZ implementation timetable, as well as suggesting modification to the scheme; and it prefers that TfL operate Low Emission Zones rather than have several boroughs run zones. It states that the requirement for all buses in London to meet the Euro IV standard for NO<sub>x</sub> by 2015 is insufficiently ambitious and calls for the electrification of the rail network across London. Westminster City Council recognises that road user charging has the potential to improve air quality and that further schemes may be needed across London, but this must be considered in consultation with the boroughs, and take account of economic severance in deprived areas. Westminster City Council urges the Mayor to consider a limit on future fare increases and certain concessionary fares for the most vulnerable.

## Annex C - TfL's consideration of late responses to the consultation

This annex is Transport for London's consideration of late responses to the Mayor's Transport Strategy

All responses until the 31<sup>st</sup> March are considered here, copies of these responses and any further late responses were forwarded to the Mayor.

This annex considers responses in the following order

1. Open Responses (11)
2. Questionnaire responses (26)

### Section 1: Open Responses

#### List of late stakeholder respondents received

##### Organisations (3)

Councillor Paul Webbewood – (London Borough of Greenwich)  
Ibero-American Community Group  
The Westminster Society

##### Businesses (4)

DB Schenker Rail (UK) Ltd  
Muswell Hill Metro Group  
Quintain Estates and Development PLC  
Real Estate Opportunities Limited

##### Public (4)

Comments included in open responses have been coded to the codeframe. The table below shows the issues raised and how many respondents raised them, sorted in descending order of number of comments made.

Code	Comment made on:	Number of Respondents making a comment
A6	Other (Tube)	4
T4	London Plan comment (planning issues)	3
A4	Tube line extensions	2
B2	Increased rail capacity	2
B8	Crossrail 1 & 2 (inc Chelsea-Hackney line)	2
B11	Other (Rail)	2
C5	Other (Interchange)	2
F1	Bus Service / route issues	2
F3	Bus design inc New Bus, Bendy Bus	2
H2	Smoothing traffic flow	2
I6	Other (Freight)	2

<b>Code</b>	<b>Comment made on:</b>	<b>Number of Respondents making a comment</b>
N10	Other environment / climate change comment	2
P2	Physical accessibility improvements, eg step-free tube, bus ramps	2
S6	Regeneration / Economic downturn (general)	2
S8	Olympic Games 2012	2
T1	Working with Boroughs / LIPs process / Sub-regional plans	2
T2	Financing transport schemes	2
T3	Fares and ticketing	2
T7	Positive General Comment on MTS	2
A1	More reliable / longer hours tube service	1
A2	Improvements to tube stations / staffing	1
A5	Air con on tube	1
B1	Improved service levels (staffing, clean, secure)	1
B4	High Speed 1 / rail links to Europe	1
B5	TfL Overground rail (inc East London Line, North LL)	1
B6	Integration of TfL / NR services eg Oyster PAYG on all rail (and Mayoral control / influence of NR)	1
B7	Improved services inner + outer London	1
B9	DLR comment	1
M2	Surface access to airports and High Speed 2 rail	1
D4	Cycle Superhighways	1
D7	Other (Cycling)	1
E2	Pedestrian access to PT and safety	1
E4	Development of key walking routes	1
E5	Other (Walking)	1
H1	Parking	1
H7	Other (Better Streets / Roads)	1
I2	Freight consolidation / distribution	1
I3	Environment / noise impacts of freight	1
I5	Rail freight	1
J2	Integrating Thames with other transport (including Oyster)	1
J4	River crossings	1
J5	Other Thames / waterways / River Crossing comment	1
N1	Noise Pollution (General)	1
N7	Electric vehicles	1
N8	Adapting to / Risk Mgt of Climate Change	1
N9	Transport impact on natural environment	1
N11	Targets for CO2	1
N12	Targets for Air Quality (incl. EU targets on NO2 and PM)	1
O7	Against for Deferment / Suspension of Phase 3 of LEZ	1
P1	Public transport and access to services - eg health, education, jobs	1

<b>Code</b>	<b>Comment made on:</b>	<b>Number of Respondents making a comment</b>
Q2	Public Transport Safety (general)	1
R3	Smarter Travel (inc workplace and school travel plans)	1
R5	Other demand mgt / road user charging / traffic reduction	1
S1	Orbital Connectivity	1
S3	Outer London comment	1
S5	Comment on local issue	1
S7	Cancelled Schemes (eg Cross River Tram, Thames Gateway Bridge)	1
S10	Modal Shift / sustainable choices	1
T8	Negative General Comment on MTS	1
T9	Other re Mayor or TfL	1
T11	Other Strategies / UK Agencies	1

## **Section 2: Questionnaire Responses**

### **Late public questionnaires received**

26 paper Questionnaires were delivered to TfL on 1 March 2010. The analysis of the responses is below:

#### **Q1: Questions about you**

Note: Due to the small number of late respondents, some percentage totals may be greater than 100% due to rounding.

<b>Do you live in London?</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Yes	73%
No	23%
Not Stated	4%
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>26</b>

<b>Do you work in London?</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Yes	65%
No	31%
Not Stated	4%
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>26</b>

<b>In what capacity are you responding to this consultation?</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
As an individual	96%
As a representative of a business or organisation	4%
Not Stated	0%
Total Responses	26

<b>Are you:</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Male	73%
Female	23%
Not Stated	4%
Total Responses	26

<b>What is your ethnic background?</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Asian / Asian British	4%
Chinese	0%
White	81%
Black / Black British	0%
Mixed ethnic background	0%
Other ethnic group	15%
Total Responses	26

<b>What is your age group?</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Under 16	0%
16-24	4%
25-44	31%
45-64	54%
65+	12%
Total Responses	26

**Q2: Transport for London is proposing a range of measures to improve travelling in London; for each category listed below please tick those that you consider would bring most benefit:**

Note: As respondents could select as many options as they wish within each sub-question, the percentages for the respondents change with each question and usually total more than 100%.

<b>Tube</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
No response	12%
Providing air conditioning on trains	38%
Expanding step free access	35%
Building more Tube lines	38%
Providing more frequent trains	19%
Delivering a more reliable service	42%
Other (Please Specify)	31%
Base	26

<b>Rail</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
No Response	12%
Enabling passengers to use Oyster pay as you go across all rail in London	54%
Providing more capacity on the DLR and Tramlink	23%
Building more rail lines	27%
Improving the cleanliness, security and quality of suburban rail stations	38%
Creating an improved service for Inner and Outer London	42%
Other (Please Specify)	27%
Base	26

<b>Interchange</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
No Response	15%
Reducing the need to come in to central London to interchange for journeys to other places	58%
Improving the design and quality of areas around stations and termini	31%
Redesigning stations to provide more capacity	27%
Providing more facilities to drop off car passengers so they can continue their journey by public transport	27%
Other (Please Specify)	12%
Base	26

<b>Cycling</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
No Response	31%
Providing more secure cycle parking	46%
Introducing specially designated Cycle Superhighways	27%
Introducing Cycle Hire Schemes	15%
Providing more cycle training	23%
Other (Please Specify)	23%
Base	26

<b>Walking</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
No Response	23%
Providing more information about journeys that could be undertaken by foot	19%
Improving the quality and design of streets	31%
Improving signs and other information to help people find their way better	31%
Tackling crime and fear of crime	46%
Improving pedestrian access to stations and improving safety in surrounding areas	35%
Other (Please Specify)	12%
Base	26

<b>Buses</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
No Response	15%
Providing more information at bus stops	58%
Developing a New Bus for London	19%
Phasing out the bendy bus	27%
Ensuring all new buses from 2012 have environmentally friendly engines	50%
Other (Please Specify)	27%
Base	26



<b>Information</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
No Response	15%
Providing travel planning and guidance to assist people in deciding how to travel	35%
Enhancing the provision of up to minute information, for instance online and by text message	42%
Improving the travel information assistance provided at stations	31%
Introducing journey planning tools which are focused on specific areas, eg town centres	19%
Building consistent signage and information for cyclists and pedestrians	23%
Other (Please Specify)	19%
Base	26

<b>Better Streets</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
No Response	4%
Encouraging the uptake of low emission vehicles	50%
Removing unnecessary signage and clutter	46%
Introducing shared space schemes to improve the look and feel of streets and make them safer	15%
Using high quality and attractive materials for pavements and streets	46%
Other (Please Specify)	23%
Base	26

<b>Freight</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
No Response	19%
Promoting the use of the Thames and other waterways for freight	69%
Encouraging out-of-hours delivery	38%
Building more centres to transfer freight to cleaner vehicles for local deliveries	46%
Other (Please Specify)	0%
Base	26

<b>The Thames</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
No Response	23%
Introducing Oyster on passenger services	62%
Raising service standards and making them consistent with other public transport	23%
Introducing more stops	31%
Providing more environmentally friendly boats	35%
Other (Please Specify)	12%
Base	26

**Question 3: Additionally, there are some particular issues we would like your opinion on; please consider the following two questions**

Note: Some respondent's selected more than one option as such percentages may add up to more than 100%

**Demand Management**

To what extent do you agree or disagree that a fair system of managing demand for road use should be used if necessary?

<b>Demand Management</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Strongly agree	35%
Agree	12%
Neither agree nor disagree	8%
Disagree	12%
Strongly disagree	15%
Don't know	4%
No Response	19%
Base	26

**Western Extension of the Congestion Charging Scheme**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to remove the Western Extension?

<b>Western Extension</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Strongly agree	27%
Agree	12%
Neither agree nor disagree	4%
Disagree	8%
Strongly disagree	27%
Don't know	18%
No Response	12%
Base	26