Appendix 1

LONDONASSEMBLY

Transport Committee

The Future of Road Congestion in London

June 2011

LONDONASSEMBLY

Transport Committee

The Future of Road Congestion in London

June 2011

Copyright

Greater London Authority
June 2011

Published by
Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA
www.london.gov.uk

enquiries 020 7983 4100
minicom 020 7983 4458

ISBN

This publication is printed on recycled paper

Transport Committee Members

Caroline Pidgeon (Chair)	Liberal Democrat
Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair)	Labour
Victoria Borwick	Conservative
Roger Evans	Conservative
Jenny Jones	Green
Joanne McCartney	Labour
Murad Qureshi	Labour
Steve O'Connell	Conservative
Richard Tracey	Conservative

The Transport Committee agreed the following terms of reference for its investigation on 12 January 2011:

- What are the implications for the capacity of the road network of the projected growth of population and economic activity; and
- What policies should be explored to reduce and manage future road congestion?

The Committee welcomes feedback on this report. For further information, contact Ian O' Sullivan on 020 7983 6540 or ian.osullivan@london.gov.uk. For press enquiries contact Dana Gavin on 020 7983 4603 or dana.gavin@london.gov.uk

Contents

Foreword	**7**
Executive Summary	**9**
Introduction	**12**
Congestion now and in the future	**14**
Congestion and the Mayor's Transport Strategy	**19**
Capacity on the road network	**23**
Managing Demand I – Road works and maintenance	**27**
Managing Demand II – Reducing the need to drive	**32**
Conclusion	**37**
Appendix 1 - Conclusions and Recommendations	**38**
Appendix 2 - Conservative Group dissenting paragraphs	**42**
Appendix 3 – Orders and Translations	**44**

Foreword

Road congestion is one of the most difficult transport challenges facing the Mayor and TfL. London is already the most congested city in the UK. With London's population expected to rise by over one million and around 750,000 new jobs due to be created in the next two decades, the situation is set to get worse.

There are significant obstacles to controlling rising levels of congestion in London. The capital has a hugely diverse road network: from medieval streets to busy motorways. The availability of alternative forms of transport to the car varies: there are many more public transport options in central than in outer London. The sites of major regeneration projects to create homes and offices in the capital are often areas already suffering from high levels of road congestion.

This report explores the extent of road congestion now and in the future, and examines the impact of the Mayor's policy of 'smoothing the traffic flow' on congestion levels. While there has been some success to date in reducing road congestion by cutting the number of road works through the current permit scheme, and in achieving small reductions in delays at junctions through the use of smarter traffic management technology, the scale of the future problem may require calling on a wider range of practical policies.

In the past providing public transport alternatives and prioritising sustainable transport, supported by the Central London Congestion Charge scheme, has had some considerable success in shifting commuters away from cars and towards public transport and cycling. The Transport Committee's varied attitudes on such policies may reflect Londoners' own mixed feelings on these issues.

However, the whole committee were enthusiastic to see a new generation of approaches and ideas properly explored, such as the potential for car clubs to reduce private car ownership and use, and schemes to better manage road works. There was also consensus that any new road schemes which might be considered, such as river crossings, or as part of regeneration projects, should be looked at alongside measures to reduce local environmental impact and limit the generation of new and additional car traffic on London's roads. The management of car congestion should be a primary consideration in the future planning of any major developments in London.

Roads are essential to the economic and social cohesion of London, and this will not change in the next 20 years. It is vital that the Mayor has a policy on road congestion which enhances the economic effectiveness of London whilst also improving the quality of life for all Londoners.

Valerie Shawcross AM, Deputy Chair Transport Committee

Executive Summary

Congestion is the result of demand for road space outstripping the available infrastructure. While a certain level of congestion can be a sign of a healthy, growing economy as the volume of people and goods moving across the region multiplies, it is also increasingly affecting London's transport infrastructure, environment and quality of life. Each year, delays and disruption on London's roads cost our economy approximately £2 billion, while an associated rise in toxic air particles has the potential to contribute to thousands of deaths.

The situation will get worse as the city's economy and population grows in the next two decades. 20 per cent of the UK's congestion is concentrated on just five per cent of the road network in London. These economically and strategically important areas will continue to face pressure as billions of pounds in regeneration funds are concentrated on areas where the opportunity to add new infrastructure is severely limited. According to the Mayor's Transport Strategy, congestion could rise by as much as 14 per cent, even with the Strategy's proposals implemented in full.

The Mayor and Transport for London (TfL) suggest that the 14 per cent figure, which was included in the Transport Strategy published in May 2010, is already out of date. Improvements to data gathering techniques should provide an opportunity for TfL and the Mayor to update their projections so the full impact of traffic management interventions can be accurately assessed. This should also include rigorous benchmarking of figures, including journey time reliability, journey speed and delay, disruption caused by planned and unplanned events and volume of road works.

The Mayor has a two-pronged approach to managing the expected rise in congestion. The first is to enhance the capacity of the current network. TfL is rolling out the use of sophisticated traffic management technology to increase the capacity of junctions and smooth traffic flow. We question how accurately these technologies are at measuring all road users: for example, SCOOT, which uses sensors buried in the road to re-sequence traffic lights in response to fluctuations in traffic demand, does not, as yet, measure pedestrians. As traffic volumes recover and increase after the previous recession, the Mayor and TfL will have to make difficult choices about what transport modes to prioritise, and therefore accurate measurements of all road users is vital.

While increasing the capacity of the current network is a priority for the Mayor, the Transport Strategy does leave the option of new road building open. River crossings in East London are seen as essential to the continued development of the region. However, the Mayor will need to be clearer about how new road infrastructure is assessed against the potential impact on the environment and public health, and how negative effects will be mitigated by other measures.

The second option pursued by the Mayor and TfL is to reduce the demand for road space, ie, through the reduction of delay and disruption caused by road works, and helping to shift Londoners towards using sustainable and public transport. Improved information sharing and administration of road works through the current road works permit scheme has shown some success in reducing disruption, with a 21 per cent fall on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) during the scheme's first year of implementation. The Mayor and TfL argue that a lane rental scheme, targeted at key strategic and economically important areas on the TLRN, would help to reduce the disruption caused by road works, while incentivising companies to invest in more efficient technology. Some concerns were raised about the effectiveness of a lane rental scheme in light of the relative success of the permit scheme, as well as how the cost of the lane rental will be passed on to consumers. We welcome further clarification of these issues once a detailed plan is prepared later in the year.

The Committee also examined other schemes which could help to ease congestion. Smarter travel programmes have shown some success at borough level in shifting travel patterns, but more ambitious schemes to fundamentally change behaviour may be affected by cuts to transport projects over the next few years. Improvements to public transport infrastructure, such as Crossrail, Thameslink and the tube upgrades will have a significant impact on London's transport network. However, these schemes are still some way from completion, and in the case of some tube upgrades, are not funded. The Committee also argues that continued development of car club schemes could help to reduce the number of private vehicles on the road, as well as encourage a more mixed transport matrix for users.

There were two issues of principle on which the Committee was unable to reach an agreement and the Conservative group dissented from the positions set out in the main body of this report. First, a majority of

the Committee concluded that a road user hierarchy, enshrined in the Mayor's London Plan, and prioritising walking, cycling and public transport over private car use, would help to ensure the Mayor's modal shift targets are met. Secondly, a majority of the Committee argues that the Mayor should set out the conditions, such as the increase in congestion mentioned in his Transport Strategy, under which road user charging should be examined as an option. The Conservative Group's position on these two issues is set out in Appendix 2.

Managing the growth of congestion represents one of the most complex transport issues for the Mayor and TfL over the coming two decades. If London's growth and dynamism is to be supported, and an essential shift towards more sustainable and public transport modes achieved, then tough decisions based on a realistic appraisal of the problems will need to be made.

Introduction

What is Congestion?

Roads are vital to London's transport network. Over 10 million journeys, representing 42 per cent of all trips in London each day, are undertaken by private motor vehicles. In addition, 3.5 million daily bus journeys, and over six million walking and cycling trips, use roads for at least part of their journey.[1] Roads are also essential to the economic health of London: 88 per cent of London's freight is transported by road.[2]

This level of demand becomes a problem when it creates unwelcome consequences and these are often described, if not clearly defined, as congestion. At a strategic level, congestion occurs when the level of demand for road space exceeds the available space to the extent that it inhibits the free movement of traffic. In practice, congestion manifests itself at a local level in the build-up of traffic on certain roads and junctions.

A certain level of congestion is inevitable and can be an indicator of more positive long-term changes. First, it is usually a product of a vibrant economy. Congestion is caused by large numbers of people travelling around to get to work or transport goods and services for others. Secondly, a certain level of congestion can serve to control and slow down the flow of traffic, potentially improving road safety.

Defining congestion and the level at which it warrants policy interventions is therefore complex. Congestion can mean different things to different people and can even vary for different road users at the same time. For example, a set of intelligent traffic signals which can give priority to a bus in a bus lane will facilitate a more reliable bus journey but potentially cause traffic build-up for other vehicles using the same road. The bus passenger will not see a problem; the car driver, or pedestrian delayed while the bus gets priority, may have a different view.

The traditional measure of congestion, traffic speed, is problematic when used in isolation. This is because it fails to take into account the way road space is allocated or that average speed can mask unpredictable changes in the flow of traffic. Increasingly, TfL is placing an emphasis on journey time reliability as an important measure of congestion. This is implicit in the Mayor's headline policy

[1] *Travel in London 3*, Transport for London, December 2010, page 38
[2] *Travel in London 3*, Transport for London, December 2010, page 72

for tackling congestion, 'smoothing the traffic flow'. The emphasis is not purely on increasing the speed of traffic on London's roads; it is about ensuring journeys run more smoothly and that the driver or passenger can more reliably estimate the time the journey will take. It can be difficult to separate these issues: for example, building new road space may increase speed temporarily, but eventually lead to poor reliability as traffic volumes increase to fill the new space.

Similarly, the aim of this report is not to promote measures which will simply increase the speed of traffic. It is to examine the policies in place to manage London's roads and assess the extent to which the needs of different road users are balanced. We aim to raise questions which will ensure there is a rigorous assessment of these needs when policy decisions are made and implemented. Managing congestion is not just about technocratic solutions; it is about ensuring that policy prioritises different types of road users and transport modes to create a more vibrant, liveable and environmentally sustainable city.

We recognise that there are no easy solutions. The views presented to this Committee from those representing car users, the freight industry, cyclists and pedestrians demonstrate the extent to which solutions for one group of road users are perceived as detrimental to another group. However, this is a problem that is not going to go away and if London's economy and population grows as expected over the next 20 years, it risks becoming a problem that will force the Mayor into some difficult decisions. This Committee can play an important role in ensuring that these decisions are carefully considered and form part of the long-term planning for London's road network.

Congestion now and in the future

The effect of congestion on London

London is the most congested city in the UK. Five of the country's top ten congestion hotspots are in London[3] and drivers on London's roads experience 20 per cent of all congestion nationally, even though only five per cent of UK road space is within the M25.[4]

This congestion has direct economic and social costs. These costs can damage the competitiveness of London in the global market and the attractiveness of the city as both a tourist destination and a place to live. Its effects on air quality could even be a factor in the deaths of thousands of Londoners each year.

The capital loses billions of pounds worth of economic activity every year due to congestion. TfL estimates that up to £17 is lost for every hour a vehicle is stuck in traffic,[5] and calculates that the total cost of congestion to London's economy is approximately £2 billion per year.[6] These figures do not account for indirect disincentives to economic activity caused by congestion, including the effects on tourism of clogged roads, the difficulty for businesses in making deliveries on time, and the reputational harm caused to the city for potential new investors.

Congestion, and the heavy traffic volumes this generally entails, also has serious adverse effects on the city's environment and public health. London has some of the worst air quality in the UK.[7] Parts of the city exceeded agreed European levels for poisonous airborne particles dozens of times during 2010.[8] Emissions of these particles are closely related to congestion and heavy traffic: up to 67 per cent come from road transport[9] and maps show their concentrations

---

[3] 'Traffic Congestion in Europe: INRIX U.K. Traffic Scorecard Provides Revealing Look at Traffic Congestion in Cities Across the Country', Press Release from Inrix http://www.inrix.com/pressrelease.asp?ID=107 – as measured by average speed through GPS enabled vehicle sampling
[4] *Travel in London Report 3*, Transport for London, December 2010, page 86
[5] *Road Works Count*, Colin Buchanan and Partners Ltd, March 2010, page 19
[6] *Transport Strategy*, Mayor of London, May 2010, page 151
[7] *Every Breath You Take*, London Assembly Environment Committee, May 2009, page 9
[8] 'London air pollution "worst in Europe"', *The Guardian*, 25 June 2010
[9] *Every Breath You Take*, London Assembly Environment Committee, May 2009, page 15

correlate with London's most congested areas.[10] Estimates suggest that up to 4,000 deaths in London each year could be attributable, at least in part, to poor air quality.[11]

Congestion in the past

The traditional measurement of congestion has been journey speed. This has seen a steady decrease in the last two decades, as the rise in traffic volumes has outpaced the development of road network capacity. Since 1992, the number of daily journeys using at least part of the London's road network has grown by 1.8 million, while the number of annual vehicle kilometres travelled has increased from 30.7 to 31.4 billion kilometres.[12] As a result, between 1980 and 2006, average journey speeds decreased by approximately 14 per cent while average speeds during the morning rush hour fell by 18 per cent.[13]

Since 2000, new demands have been placed on our road network, in an effort to control the rise in car traffic and encourage alternative transport usage. Sustainable and public transport modes have been increasingly promoted through the re-allocation of road space away from private motor vehicles. Bus lanes, servicing up to 700 routes throughout London, are the most visible signs of this policy. They have been an important factor in improving bus frequency and reliability: as a result, since 1992 the number of daily trips on buses has grown by over 60 per cent.[14]

Also contributing to congestion levels is the geographical spread of traffic across London. Congestion is particularly severe on London's main roads and in areas already served with a dense transport network. At present 30 per cent of traffic is confined to just five per cent of the road network.[15] According to TfL, 85 per cent of congestion on the TLRN occurs on around 50 per cent of its roads, which is less than three per cent of London's total road network.

Responsibility for London's roads

TfL directly manages five per cent, or about 580 kilometres of the road network. This section, the Transport for London Road Network,

---

[10] *Air Quality Strategy,* The Mayor of London, December 2010, page 29
[11] *Report on estimation of mortality impacts of particulate air pollution in London,* Institute for Occupational Medicine, June 2010, page 7
[12] *Travel in London Report 3*, Transport for London, December 2010, page ?
[13] *Travel in London Report 3*, Transport for London, December 2010, page ?
[14] *Travel in London 3*, Transport for London, December 2010, page 38
[15] *Transport Strategy*, Mayor of London, May 2010

is estimated to carry up to 40 per cent of the gross economic weight of London's traffic. Within this network, TfL has identified 23 individual traffic corridors as being particularly important to the smooth running of London's road network.[16] The majority of the rest of the network is under borough control, except for the M25, M1, M11, M3 and M4 motorways which fall within the remit of the Highways Agency. TfL also directly manages traffic signals and control systems on all roads.

The Mayor outlined his broad objectives for managing the road network in his Transport Strategy, published in May 2010. These include:

- Maximising the efficient and reliable operation of the road network
- Minimising the impact of planned and unplanned interventions
- Maintaining and building new road assets
- Managing demand on the road network

TfL published a Network Operating Strategy in May 2011 which outlined in detail the schemes it will undertake to deliver on the Mayor's objectives. The draft strategy is currently under public consultation until July 2011.

Managing congestion in the future

Levels of demand and available capacity can change both on a daily basis (ie in response to emergency road works or seasonal travel patterns), and as a result of long-term planning designed to change London's transport patterns. Dealing with this fluctuating picture requires operating a flexible and responsive network that supports the city's broader strategic vision.

Traffic volumes may rise significantly in the next two decades. The GLA estimates that the population will grow by almost 1.3 million by 2031. The transport infrastructure will have to support the development of approximately 750,000 jobs in the same period. Overall, if present work patterns are maintained, this growth will result in more than 27 million daily trips, a rise of over three million from 2007.

The growth in population is expected to be particularly intense in central and inner London; these areas are already developed and the possibility of adding extra road capacity is very limited. For example,

[16] *Network Operating Strategy*, Transport for London, May 2011, page 11

according to TfL's Streets Chief Operating Officer, growth in the Lea Valley region will result in increased pressure on the Blackwall Tunnel and other busy areas. He expressed concern about the lack of resilience in this particular area to absorb any delays caused by planned or unplanned events.

Our report will examine the Mayor's policies as outlined in both his Transport Strategy and TfL's Network Operating Strategy. Their priorities can be broadly broken down into two key areas:

- Increasing capacity of the road network through the use of new traffic management technologies and exploring the possibility of building new road infrastructure.
- Managing demand on road space by improving road work efficiency, improving the infrastructure for public and sustainable transport, and encouraging people to shift from private car use to other forms of transport, where possible.

The Transport Strategy also presents long-term projections for future congestion levels. These projections show that if nothing is done congestion will increase by 20 per cent by 2031. Taking into account the measures proposed in the Strategy, there could still be an increase of up to 14 per cent if work and behaviour patterns remain consistent.

Long-term projections are always subject to change. The Transport Strategy acknowledges that the level and distribution of congestion by 2031 will be "dependent upon future investment and travel patterns, neither of which are precisely known". It also points to new technological and social changes in the next two decades which may improve the outlook for congestion, but which are currently beyond the power of the Mayor to significantly affect (such as changing work patterns reducing the need to travel during traditional peak periods). At our meeting on 9 March, TfL said that the figures given in the Transport Strategy were already seen as out of date and are subject to revision based on improvements to data gathering.

Clearly, projections into the future are speculative and we would expect them to change over time. That said, the purpose of the Mayor's Transport Strategy is to set the long-term policy framework and should provide a broad measure for how various transport modes will be affected by social and economic changes. To assess this potential shift, we would like

to see the revised projections for congestion levels, which will inform policy decisions over the coming years.

Recommendation 1

By September 2011, TfL should provide figures for future congestion projections based on its best current understanding of the situation. It should give revised estimates of congestion levels if nothing is done to alleviate it by 2031 and the figure assuming the implementation of the measures in the Mayor's Transport Strategy. TfL should also explain in more detail the reasons for any adjustments.

Congestion and the Mayor's Transport Strategy

Measuring success

The way that congestion in London is measured is changing as a result of improved technology and data analysis. As noted previously, average speeds and 'excess delay' (extra time taken compared to a journey in uncongested conditions) have been the traditional methods of quantifying congestion.

TfL is now examining additional metrics which it says better align with the Mayor's 'smoothing traffic' approach and research indicating what matters most to motorists. As outlined in the Network Operating Strategy, the metrics are;

- Journey time reliability
- Average speed and delay
- Levels of disruption
- Volume of road works.

TfL's 'key measure' of the success of smoothing traffic flow policies is to be journey time reliability.[17]

On the evidence of our meeting on congestion, moving to a focus on reliability would meet with the approval of the freight industry. The Road Haulage Association told us that most freight operators would "tolerate a level of congestion" as long as they had journey time reliability.[18] TfL's Streets Chief Operating Officer went further, saying, "whether it is business, private individuals or whoever is using the road network, it is managing that reliability and giving you reliable journey times that is the most effective thing you can do".[19] Research undertaken by TfL in 2009 found that almost 75 per cent of all drivers in London wanted more reliable journey times and freer flowing traffic prioritised.[20] The Director of the RAC Foundation said journey time speeds should also continue to be an important metric. [21]

Clear figures have been set out by TfL against each of the four chosen metrics. There is some recent improvement across the board, although the time period over which comparable data is available is often very short. This is because of the recent availability of new technology such

[17] Travel in London 3, TfL, December 2010, pages 86, 91 and 92
[18] John Howells, RHA, speaking at the Transport Committee, 9 March 2011, transcript page 3
[19] Garrett Emmerson, TfL, speaking at the Transport Committee, 9 March 2011, transcript page 5
[20] *Network Operating Strategy*, Transport for London, May 2011, page 11
[21] Prof Stephen Glaister, RAC Foundation, speaking at the Transport Committee, 9 March 2011, transcript p. 5

as Automated Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) and Global Positioning Systems (GPS), which give a more detailed picture of traffic delay and congestion.

The results of recent monitoring are as follows:[22]

- Traffic speeds and average delay – average speeds have remained largely static since 2007, while average vehicle delay has fallen slightly in inner and outer London.
- Journey time reliability – data is available from April 2009 and shows 80-90 per cent reliability across the network. This means that up to 90 per cent of journeys are completed within an 'allowable' excess of five minutes for a standard 30 minute journey. It is anticipated that a target will eventually be introduced for improvements in journey time reliability.
- Disruption caused by planned and unplanned events – there has been a reduction of nine per cent for planned events, such as road works, and 13 per cent for unplanned events across the road network compared with 2009/10.
- Volume of road works – figures are only available for the TLRN but early indications show a month by month reduction in road works since the introduction of the permit scheme in 2009. The total number of road works undertaken on the TLRN in 2009/10 was 48,247 and TfL is aiming to achieve a five per cent reduction against this figure.

As this data is collected, TfL will be able to construct a clear picture of trends in delays and journey time reliability in different areas and across the day. It will also be able to monitor the disruption caused by planned and unplanned events and road works. The draft Network Operating Strategy states that the information described above will be published on a quarterly basis, which will help to build a detailed comparative picture over the next few years.

We also note at this point that the metrics do not make any mention of the variety of road users. For example, in a system based on ANPR and GPS technology, the impacts on other road users such as cyclists and pedestrians are not recorded. New advances in traffic management technology, such as the SCOOT system described below, could be made to provide regular measures of all road users, but at present data is only collected on vehicle traffic.

[22] *Travel in London Report 3*, Transport for London, December 2010, pages 87-101

Benchmarking

Appropriate benchmarks for each of these metrics would allow an assessment of the effectiveness of the Mayor's approach to tackling congestion and the performance of the road network over the coming years. At this stage, only the figure for the volume of road works currently appears to provide such a benchmark; as set out above, TfL's aim is to reduce road works on its network by five per cent in 2010/11.

To establish long-term benchmarks in the other areas (speed, delay, reliability and disruption), TfL will need to disaggregate the effects of unusual traffic levels as a result of the recession in recent years. According to TfL's figures, Greater London road traffic fell by about 0.2 per cent each year between 2000 and 2007 and 2.5 per cent in both 2008 and 2009.[23] As economic activity increases and traffic levels pick up, congestion will increase. Long-term benchmarks should be based on more typical congestion levels.

Additionally, it is unclear how a decision would be made to employ the more radical measures retained as a future possibility in the Transport Strategy. These measures include road user charging and building new road infrastructure. At some point, depending on the level of success of current policies, there may need to be a trigger point established for the exploration of interventions like these to limit rises in congestion and satisfy economic and environmental objectives.

To better scrutinise the performance of TfL, benchmarks, adjusting for the effects of the recession and time of day, should be established for each of the four metrics: journey speed and delay, journey time reliability, disruption caused by planned and unplanned events and volume of road works. These should be adjusted for the effects of the recession and for the peak periods and locations within London. We would also like a more detailed breakdown of how TfL can ensure that it is capturing the entire range of traffic, including pedestrians and cyclists.

[23] *Travel in London Report 3*, Transport for London, December 2010, pages 142

Recommendation 2

In the Network Operating Strategy's quarterly assessments, TfL should establish benchmarks for each of the four main congestion metrics: journey speed and delay, journey time reliability, disruption caused by planned and unplanned events and volume of road works. To provide a detailed picture of congestion, the assessments should include data for central, inner and outer London, as well as for the AM peak, the inter-peak period and the PM peak, on weekdays and at weekends. TfL should also outline in its response to this report how it will ensure measurements of all traffic, both vehicle and pedestrian.

Capacity on the road network

The Mayor's Transport Strategy ruled out large-scale road building as a cure for the expected rise in congestion. Instead, it looks to increase the capacity of the current network through: greater use of traffic management technology; improvements to road work coordination and efficiency; and reducing the need to travel by car using smarter travel and public transport upgrades.

Developments in traffic management technology are allowing greater control of traffic flows and, in some cases, helping to increase capacity at key junctions. TfL is implementing the following measures relating to traffic control systems:[24]

- Installing and commissioning new traffic signal infrastructure at thousands of sites across London to enable them to operate 'SCOOT'[25], SVD[26] and SASS control systems;[27]
- A target to annually review 1,000 traffic signal timings. As of February 2010, 783 signals had been reviewed;[28]
- Removing traffic signals where "it can be proved" there will not be a detrimental effect to pedestrians;[29] and
- After a successful trial at eight sites around London of Pedestrian Countdown at Traffic Signals (PCaTS), TfL is examining how it can be rolled out to other areas of the road network.[30]

It is likely in most cases that road users may not notice any significant difference due to improved technology or reviews of traffic signals. In research carried out amongst road users, TfL found that improvements of up to 20 to 30 per cent were needed before road users noticed any

[24] Figures taken from the TfL Commissioner's Report, February 2011
[25] Split Cycle Optimisation Technique (SCOOT) uses sensors buried in the road to re-sequence traffic lights in response to fluctuations in traffic demand. The introduction of this type of infrastructure can reduce delays by up to 12 per cent. (Source: TfL)
[26] SVD (Selective Vehicle Detection) operates in conjunction with iBus technology to prioritise buses at traffic lights by extending the green signal or reducing the amount of wait time. Since May 2008, this has been installed at more than 1,500 sites (Source: TfL Network Operating Strategy)
[27] SASS (System Activated Strategy Selection) uses other systems such as iBus and SCOOT to automatically switch between a pre-programmed set of traffic directions to help during planned events, for example, a bridge lift at Tower Bridge (Source: TfL Network Operating Strategy)
[28] The reviews aim to ensure that signal timings are maintained at their optimum level on London's strategic road network. Reviews from 2010 have achieved an average eight per cent reduction in stop/start delay. (Source: TfL)
[29] TfL drew up an initial list of 145 sites, 12 of which have been agreed with boroughs for removal and 36 will be left in place. A further 20 were identified for possible removal during the consultation process. (Source: TfL)
[30] Initial results from the trials showed that 83 per cent of all surveyed pedestrians liked the technology, rising to 94 per cent for those with mobility impairments.

major improvements to traffic light signalling.[31] Overall, TfL believes that SCOOT can deliver an average 12 per cent reduction in delay; some areas will see greater reductions while others will see minimal change.[32]

Improvements to the network as a whole may also not track with the daily experience of road users, as they move around a network which receives variable levels of new technology and investment. Those who regularly use TfL's 23 highest priority corridors may see effective congestion interventions which are then nullified by lack of investment along less prioritised borough roads. Future programmes such as the lane rental scheme and the Congestion Management Areas, discussed below, could be an opportunity for further discussion between TfL and stakeholders on the rationale behind road prioritisation and how this could affect the wider network.

The Committee also requested further information from TfL on the effect of new traffic management technology on pedestrian movements. TfL's subsequent submission showed a slight increase of 0.67 per cent in the number of occasions when all pedestrians waiting to cross the road will have cleared the kerb during the first green man period compared to 2009/10. This is based on end of year data from over 1,700 signal time reviews.[33]

A win/win situation?

At our 9 March meeting, TfL's Streets Chief Operating Officer assured us that changes to traffic signals were a "win/win benefit". However, there is disagreement about the extent to which these technologies can continue to deliver improvements in the future. In a response to the Mayor's Transport Strategy, the RAC Foundation said that TfL had been working on policies relating to better control of traffic for "years" and while new technology may bring some improvements, "the contribution this can make to the long term problems is small."

Living Streets has also criticised pedestrian countdown systems. They claim that Londoners with mobility issues in particular feel less safe

[31] Garrett Emmerson, TfL, speaking at the Transport Committee, 9 March 2011, transcript page ?
[32] Garrett Emmerson, TfL, speaking at the Transport Committee, 9 March 2011, transcript page 21
[33] Written submission from TfL, April 2011

when crossing the road. The Chief Executive of Living Streets said that "our streets are places as well as traffic corridors, and should be designed with people in mind first, not just motor traffic."[34]

SCOOT and related technologies have been operating during periods when traffic volumes have fluctuated and fallen as a result of the recent recession. It is not clear at this stage how TfL and the Mayor will balance the competing priorities of road users if traffic volumes begin to grow once again as a result of improved economic conditions and population growth. These priorities include: facilitating the Mayor's planned modal shift in walking, cycling and public transport; supporting the economic growth of London; and making it a better place to live for Londoners. The Network Operating Strategy notes that projects which are in conflict between varying priorities are referred to TfL's Network Management Group (NMG) for discussion before a recommendation is reached. Guidance for how the NMG balances priorities is not currently available.[35]

The Mayor's draft replacement London Plan removed the road user hierarchy which had been a feature of the previous Plan. This hierarchy directed transport planners to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport over private motor vehicles when devising transport schemes. The Mayor claimed that removing the hierarchy would give transport planners more freedom to respond to local issues.

However, the Panel Report on the draft London Plan's Examination in Public reported that virtually every organisation which responded to the consultation, including London Councils and London TravelWatch, criticised the removal of the road user hierarchy. The report concluded that "there should be a place for explicitly recognising a hierarchy of road users in the over-arching transport policy in order to guide formulation of public realm as well as transport schemes."[36] The Transport Committee, in its response to the Mayor's draft Transport Strategy also called for a framework to provide a clear indication of where the Mayor's priorities lie in the event of conflicting road user demands.[37]

[34] Submission to the London Assembly, July 2010
[35] *Network Operating Strategy*, Transport for London, May 2011, Appendix 4
[36] *Panel Report on draft replacement London Plan*, May 2011, page 213
[37] *Response to the Mayor's draft Transport Strategy*, London Assembly Transport Committee, January 2010, page 4

As traffic volumes rise in response to greater economic activity, difficult choices will have to be made about road user prioritisation, particularly at London's most congested junctions. Including a road user hierarchy in the London Plan, which prioritises sustainable and public transport, as well as economically essential services and important economic traffic such as freight, over private car use would ensure that these forms of transport are given precedence by transport planners.[38]

Recommendation 3

In the final draft London Plan the Mayor should reinstate a hierarchy of road users, which would ensure that future schemes would support economic development and encourage more people to use sustainable and public transport.

[38] The Conservative group dissented from this paragraph and do not support recommendation 3. Please see Appendix 2 for more information.

Managing Demand I – Road works and maintenance

While changes to managing traffic flow using more sophisticated technology has demonstrated some success, accommodating longer-term growth will require more radical changes to how London's roads and journeys are managed. This will include controlling access for space on London's roads to road works, and reducing the need for people to travel by private motor vehicles.

Planned and unplanned events

The Mayor has made reducing the level of disruption caused by road works a major part of his Transport Strategy.[39] There are around 500,000 road works across the entire road network in London every year. Over 49,000 of those are located on the TLRN. They are a major source of congestion. The Mayor's figures indicate that up to 30 per cent of congestion is caused by planned works, such as utility upgrades, and local authority works.[40] As well as their effect on congestion, the cost of road works is also rising. According to the Annual Local Authority Road Maintenance (ALARM) Survey, boroughs saw a 30 per cent rise in potholes in 2010/11 over the previous year, with the cost also rising from £68 per pothole to £71.[41]

Measures already established to reduce delays caused by road works include: the provision of better information through the LondonWorks web portal; establishing a Code of Conduct for Road Works to encourage best practice amongst utility companies; more power for road authorities to control when works take place; and encouraging greater collaboration between those undertaking works.[42] The Mayor has also recently announced a £1 million fund to invest in technologies which would make road works more efficient.[43]

To give authorities more control over when roads are dug up, in January 2010 TfL established a permit scheme for road works. By April 2010, 18 of the London boroughs had signed up to the scheme, while a further nine are expected to sign up by the end of 2011. 82 per cent of roads in London will then be covered by the scheme.[44] Between April and December 2010 TfL granted 31,652 permits and

[39] London First, *Road Sense,* May 2010, page 3
[40] *Transport Strategy*, Mayor of London, June 2010, page 153
[41] http://www.alarm-survey.co.uk/images/library/files/Alarm_2011_web.pdf - pages 14 and 15
[42] *Transport Strategy*, Mayor of London, June 2010, page 156
[43] '£1 million development fund for technology to cut road works disruption', *Fleet News*, 11 May 2011
[44] *Network Operating Strategy,* Transport for London, May 2011, page 41

refused 5,143 permit applications. TfL says there was a 21 per cent reduction in the hours of serious and severe disruption caused by road works compared with the previous year.[45] TfL also said that the permit scheme has improved coordination and enforcement. For example, Thames Water was recently fined a record £110,000 for breaching the conditions set out by Enfield Council for mains pipe replacement work in 2010.[46]

Lane rental

The Mayor and TfL have been lobbying the Secretary of State for permission to establish a 'lane rental' scheme for major works on the TLRN. TfL anticipates further discussions soon with a view to establishing a scheme by spring 2012. TfL's Streets Chief Operating Officer explained that a rental scheme would help both to incentivise companies to invest in quicker and more efficient technology and, where possible, schedule works to avoid peak hours.[47]

We sought further information on the rationale for a lane rental scheme. TfL provided further information on the principles underlying the lane rental scheme as well as the estimated effect on road works and costs. The scheme, as currently envisaged, would be based on two principles:[48]

- A Targeted Scheme: TfL plans to focus the scheme on Congestion Management Areas (CMAs), which are specific sites already experiencing serious or severe disruption due to congestion. As disruption at junctions and pinch points is significantly higher, lane rental charges will be weighted to reflect this. It is unclear from the plan submitted if TfL's own road works which take place within the CMAs would be subject to lane rental charges, and if not, what that would mean to efforts to reduce overall levels of road works.
- Avoidability: Where lane rental charges do apply, TfL's aim is to develop a scheme that gives utilities adequate time to carry out works without being charged. A schedule will be produced for each section of road identified in the lane rental scheme, showing when and where road works may be carried out without incurring a charge, and when lane rental will apply.

---

[45] TfL Commissioner's Report, February 2011
[46] 'Thames Water hit with huge fine for roadworks that caused gridlock', *Evening Standard*, 6 May 2011
[47] Garrett Emmerson, TfL, speaking at the Transport Committee, 9 March 2011, transcript page 21
[48] Description of scheme and estimated figures in the subsequent paragraph provided by TfL in written submission to the Committee, April 2011

Initially, TfL estimates that approximately 1,600 works could be moved to non-chargeable times, delivering an eight per cent reduction in the hours of serious and severe congestion caused by road works on the TLRN, and saving London's economy around £16 million a year. Future projections for improvements to the speed of road works could also deliver a further 14 per cent reduction in serious and severe congestion. In the longer term, it is hoped that up to 70 per cent of road works undertaken by utilities will be transferred to non-chargeable times (a similar number achieved by highway authorities at present).

TfL estimates that the charging scheme could initially cost companies £8 million a year. Net income from the scheme could be invested back into research, development and funding of new technologies to help improve the speed and efficiency of road works.

The City of London Corporation, though broadly supportive of a lane rental scheme, raised questions about how the scheme would be implemented and the financial and social cost. In a written submission to the Committee, the Corporation said the costs could simply be passed on to customers, reducing the incentive for companies to innovate, and leading to higher bills. It also raised the issue of more disruption for residents at night as companies move the work period to avoid 'chargeable' periods.[49]

In evidence to the House of Commons Transport Select Committee in May 2011, both National Grid and the National Join Utilities Group (NJUG) also questioned how effective a lane rental scheme would be. The representative from the NJUG said that there would be a "law of diminishing returns" as road works were already tightly regulated through various schemes. National Grid also believes that a lane rental scheme would unfairly penalise work which has to take place to upgrade services, and said that efforts would be better spent developing and improving the current permit scheme.

The Committee recognises the potential benefits to managing road works from a lane rental scheme. There are some significant, detailed questions which will need to be answered when the scheme is worked up, such as: the extent to which the regulator allows utility companies to pass the cost on to

[49] City of London Corporation, written submission to the Committee, March 2011

customers; the level of disruption caused by off-peak working to residents; the extent to which works in less economically vital areas might suffer a reduction in quality and efficiency; and the effect of a lane rental scheme on TfL's own works. This will also be relevant to the future work on fuel poverty by the Health and Public Services Committee.

Recommendation 4

By September 2011, TfL should publish a plan outlining how a pilot lane rental scheme would operate in London. This should include details of the confirmed list of Congestion Management Areas, the type of charges which utility companies would have to pay, more detailed targets for how it would ease congestion, and how TfL's own works could be affected by the scheme.

Building new roads

Road building in the capital is hugely constrained, not least by the built-up nature of much of central and inner London. Nonetheless, one particular need identified at our meeting was for additional river crossings in east London. The Mayor's transport adviser said the issue was being looked at with the aim of "providing a set of crossings that are acceptable to both the local population and also in terms of handling the level of demand and congestion that we think there will be there".

Currently, the London Plan and Transport Strategy envisage a new road crossing at Silvertown in the form of a tunnel and a new vehicle ferry at Gallions Reach, replacing the existing Woolwich Ferry. TfL is working on the design and planning of these options, as well as examining possible funding streams. At present, only the planned cable car between Greenwich Peninsula and the Royal Docks has secured funding and is being progressed through to construction.[50]

Sustainable transport groups have challenged the idea that adding additional road capacity, such as river crossings in east London, is the answer. In submissions to the Committee, the Campaign for Better Transport and Friends of the Earth said that any additional roads were likely to increase congestion in those areas, and lead to poorer air

[50] Kulveer Ranger, then Mayoral Advisor on Transport, speaking at the Transport Committee, 9 March 2011, transcript page 10

quality in affected neighbourhoods, as well as negatively affect attempts to shift road users to more sustainable forms of transport.

The Transport Strategy emphasises that any new road building scheme would have to meet a series of transport, environmental, economic and public health tests. However, the relative importance of each of these priorities, and thus, how a new scheme is evaluated, is not immediately clear from the Strategy or the London Plan. The Campaign for Better Transport said that this has led to confusion in the past when major road infrastructure schemes were approved by TfL despite reporting likely negative impacts on congestion and pollution.

We note at this stage that, beyond the scheme for installing a cable car between Greenwich Peninsula and the Royal Docks, there is no funding for additional river crossings. In working up further options, the Mayor and TfL should be clearer about how they intend to balance the concerns of improving traffic flow, with the environmental and public health impacts that new roads can bring to a region. If there is a strong economic case for building new roads, as might be the case with additional river crossings, then any strategy should also include specific mitigation measures, such as traffic calming, local traffic control schemes, demand management and/or additional local public transport services, to deal with negative effects on road users and local communities.

Recommendation 5

The Mayor and TfL should use the publication of any future plan on river crossings to outline in detail how any projected benefits in road capacity or congestion relief are measured against potential negative impacts on public health, sustainable transport and the environment. It should also examine various mitigation measures which might be established to manage potential negative impacts.

Managing Demand II – Reducing the need to drive

Adding to the difficulty in forecasting congestion levels is uncertainty surrounding future travel patterns and behaviour. TfL and the boroughs have a role in helping to reduce the need to travel by car, by: improving public and sustainable transport infrastructure; funding smarter travel schemes; promoting alternative demand management strategies such as car clubs; and examining alternative ways to deliver goods.

Improving sustainable transport

TfL and Network Rail have a programme of new schemes which are designed to significantly increase the capacity of London's public and sustainable transport network. These include:

- Crossrail, which will run up to 24 trains per hour from Maidenhead and Heathrow in the west to Shenfield and Abbey Wood in the east. It is claimed that this will bring an additional 1.5 million people within 45 minutes of central London;
- The north/south Thameslink line, which will run up to 18 trains per hour through London Bridge, linking suburban areas and town centres in south London with central London;
- The tube upgrade programme, which TfL had claimed will add an extra 30 per cent capacity by 2020; and
- Expanding the Cycle Superhighways and Hire Scheme.

In its previous work, the Committee identified areas of concern in each of these projects. Though supportive of the aims of each, these projects either will not be available for several years (Crossrail and Thameslink), have already slipped their scheduled completion dates (various tube line upgrades such as the Jubilee, Northern and Piccadilly) or will need continuing commitment and funding in light of difficult economic times (the Mayor's cycle programme). In addition, the construction phase of the largest schemes will in themselves cause significant road disruption in vital areas of London.

Long term behaviour change through smarter travel

Smarter travel involves a range of different interventions designed to encourage the shift towards walking, cycling and public transport. Research from two borough-wide initiatives has shown positive results. In Sutton, relative car use was reduced by 16 per cent and the modal share of cycling increased by 83 per cent. In Richmond, over 8,000 employees were included in a workplace travel-plan scheme,

1,350 cycle stands installed in public places, and over 4,000 residents enrolled in car club schemes.[51]

While these results are encouraging, traffic levels in Sutton declined at about the same rate as levels throughout London. As noted previously, traffic levels between 2006 and 2009 in London declined by roughly three per cent: in Sutton in the same period, they declined by 3.2 per cent.[52] This would imply that while Sutton residents' behaviour might have changed, this was not sufficient in itself to dramatically change traffic volumes. Clearly, smarter travel is part of the solution, but must be one element of a wider package of measures.

Smart travel programmes are necessarily long-term in nature and require investment now in order to realise benefits in the future. Friends of the Earth raised concerns that these programmes remain an easy target for budget cuts. For example, Smarter Travel Richmond was concluded six months early due to budget cuts.[53]

Funding for smarter travel programmes will now be even more dependent on transport planners' decisions at borough level, principally based on Local Implementation Plans (LIPs). The next round of LIPs is currently being finalised between boroughs and TfL. With the pressure on transport budgets across the capital, it will be worth noting what areas of London see funding for smarter travel maintained or increased.

The Committee will continue to examine public transport improvements and LIP funding as part of its work programme in 2011/12.

Other measures to help manage demand

Road user charging

The Director of the RAC Foundation made it clear at our 9 March meeting that he believed road user charging should be looked at "very

[51] Outcomes on Sutton and Richmond schemes provided by TfL in additional submission to the Committee, April 2011
[52] *Learning Lessons from Smarter Choices*, MVA Consultancy (Katie Hall), October 2010 - http://www.mvaconsultancy.com/publications/Learning%20lessons%20from%20smarter%20choices.pdf
[53] Additional TfL submission to the Committee, April 2011, page 3

aggressively". He said "the only way of meeting overall targets on carbon reduction…is by having an intelligent pricing mechanism across the whole city". This mechanism would take into account varying rates of congestion and traffic volumes in different parts of the city at different times.[54] A recent report from the RAC Foundation found that while these schemes were often controversial before being implemented, public opinion changed as long as the scheme was designed fairly and the benefits used to improve infrastructure.[55]

The Mayor's Transport Strategy does retain the possibility of implementing further road user charging beyond the central congestion zone. This would be examined "if congestion becomes an increasing problem or if other objectives…cannot otherwise be met".[56] Our guest representing Islington Council highlighted that, this does not indicate the threshold increase in congestion at which further road user charging would be considered if other measures had failed to limit increases in congestion.[57] The Committee made a similar point in our response to the Mayor's Draft Transport Strategy and Statement of Intent, in which we sought clarification from the Mayor about this threshold. While the Mayor's transport representative acknowledged at our 9 March meeting that it may be a necessary tool in the future, it was the policy of the Mayor to exhaust all other options for dealing with congestion first.[58]

Car clubs

Car clubs could help to slow the growth of car usage in the capital by giving Londoners the option of using a car without the costs of ownership. The Committee heard that car club members not only delay the purchase of a new vehicle, but tend to use public and other forms of sustainable transport at higher levels.

TfL has supported the growth of car club membership in the capital. Up to £480,000 is provided annually to install car club parking bays across London. As of October 2010, there were nearly 2,600 car club parking bays in London, and over 133,000 car club members. At

[54] Prof Stephen Glaister, RAC Foundation, speaking at the Transport Committee, 9 March 2011, page 16
[55] *The Acceptability of Road Pricing*, RAC Foundation, May 2011, page ix
[56] *Transport Strategy*, Mayor of London, May 2010, page 271
[57] Eric Manners, speaking at the Transport Committee, 9 March 2011, transcript page 33
[58] Kulveer Ranger, speaking at the Transport Committee, 9 March 2011, transcript page 32

present, boroughs have largely pursued their own car club schemes based on the particular needs and priorities of their own borough. For example, Islington has contracted a single car club company for their entire borough, while Camden and Kensington and Chelsea allow multiple companies to operate. The representative from Islington Council indicated that the future of car clubs may require greater cooperation between boroughs to realise its full potential.

Case Study – Car Clubs in Islington

Islington began implementing a single provider, borough wide car club scheme in 2003. It was supported through borough and TfL funding for car club bays, and through the planning process and Section 106 funding. Since 2003, membership of the scheme has risen to over 12,000, with growth ranging between 40 and 50 per cent a year. There are now roughly 55 members for each of the scheme's 215 on and off road vehicles.[59] The effect of this growth on car ownership in the borough has been significant;

> "These figures are so incredible that sometimes we scale it back because we want people to believe the potential benefits of car clubs. It comes down to something like 12 of those 55 members get rid of an existing car and another 13 decide they are not going to buy a car that they suggest that they would have bought. We are talking at least 12 fewer cars. Let's say 2,000 to 5,000 fewer cars on the streets of Islington."[60]

Freight transport

The London Lorry Ban may contribute to congestion during busy daytime periods, according to evidence from the freight industry. The Ban, administered by London Councils, controls the movement of heavy goods vehicles at night and at weekends on a network of 'excluded roads'. A relaxation of the scheme could result in more deliveries at night and reduced congestion at the peak times. The RHA told the Committee that new technology and practices mean that lorries are now quieter, both on the road and during offloading, which could facilitate the removal of some of the restrictions.[61]

[59] Figures provided by LB Islington
[60] Eric Manners, LB Islington, speaking at the Transport Committee, 9 March 2011, transcript page 36
[61] John Howells, Road Haulage Association, speaking at the Transport Committee, 9 Mar 11, page 6

We raised these arguments with London Councils, who argued that many of the restrictions placed on night-time delivery are actually planning restrictions and would not be changed by removing the Ban. London Councils also claim that new technology is only effective when lorries are well maintained and driven correctly, which is not always the case. Finally, many businesses are simply not equipped to handle night-time deliveries.[62]

Due to the complex nature of congestion, the Mayor will need to take an expanded role in identifying and encouraging schemes that help to reduce demand on the road network, particularly if congestion increases at a faster rate than anticipated. This role will include setting the terms at which more controversial programmes included in his Transport Strategy, such as road user charging, will be considered, as well as helping to facilitate and promote more innovative ways of reducing vehicle ownership and managing increasing levels of freight transport.[63]

Recommendation 6

By September 2011, the Mayor should outline in more detail how road user demand can be reduced. This should include:

- **The level of increase in congestion necessary to trigger a consideration of further road user charging;**
- **The broad principles to which any scheme would have to conform;**
- **How the Mayor will protect smarter travel funding in future LIP rounds;**
- **Any work undertaken by TfL to examine the potential market for car clubs in London and how it might develop support in the future; and**
- **Any work undertaken to look at changing freight delivery practices.**

[62] London Councils submission to the Transport Committee, April 2011

[63] The Conservative group dissented from this paragraph and do not support the road user charging element of recommendation 6. Please see Appendix 2 for more information.

Conclusion

We ask our roads to do much more than simply get us from A to B. In future, they will have to support substantial economic expansion and record population growth, as well as helping to sustain major changes to transport behaviour. Londoners already spend a disproportionate amount of time locked in their cars in comparison to other cities in England and across Europe. The effects of current levels of congestion on the region's economy, on the environment and on its public health are unacceptable.

Managing rising congestion in the face of conflicting demands on road space requires the Mayor to establish a framework for how these claims will be examined. A road user hierarchy would offer clear guidance to transport planners, as well as ensure that the need to keep vehicles moving does not undermine the wider strategic movement towards increasing the number of Londoners using sustainable and public transport.

The Mayor and TfL will also need to ensure that their current efficiency programme will not disadvantage schemes that help to change long-term travel behaviour. Smarter travel is seen as an essential component to helping people realise the benefits of switching to sustainable and public transport and require investment and planning now, to realise benefits in the future.

Finally, establishing benchmarks for how congestion should be monitored is vital to ensuring transparency and flexibility in dealing with a future in which congestion levels are still speculative. Managing congestion involves making hard decisions which could prove unpopular in the short term. Benchmarks would also provide an agreed and fair way of establishing when more controversial proposals should be examined.

The causes of congestion are complex. While the Mayor will never have complete control over congestion growth, its management will require realism and creativity in directing transport and land-use planning to help manage future growth. Billions of pounds are being spent to regenerate London and prepare it for the challenges of this century. Creating traffic and pollution clogged arteries around new housing and retail developments is unlikely to create the type of dynamic and appealing world city which will continue to attract investment and improve the quality of life for Londoners.

Appendix 1 - Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusion 1 – Predicting future congestion levels to inform policy interventions

Clearly, projections into the future are speculative and we would expect them to change over time. That said, the purpose of the Mayor's Transport Strategy is to set the long-term policy framework and should provide a broad measure for how various transport modes will be affected by social and economic changes. To assess this potential shift, we would like to see the revised projections for congestion levels, which will inform policy decisions over the coming years.

Recommendation 1

By September 2011, TfL should provide figures for future congestion projections based on its best current understanding of the situation. It should give revised estimates of congestion levels if nothing is done to alleviate it by 2031 and the figure assuming the implementation of the measures in the Mayor's Transport Strategy. TfL should also explain in more detail the reasons for any adjustments.

Conclusion 2 – Providing benchmarks to assess the success of the Mayor's Transport Strategy

To better scrutinise the performance of TfL, benchmarks, adjusting for the effects of the recession and time of day, should be established for each of the four metrics: journey speed and delay, journey time reliability, disruption caused by planned and unplanned events and volume of road works. These should be adjusted for the effects of the recession and for the peak periods and locations within London. We would also like a more detailed breakdown of how TfL can ensure that it is capturing the entire range of traffic, including pedestrians and cyclists.

Recommendation 2

In the Network Operating Strategy's quarterly assessments, TfL should establish benchmarks for each of the four main congestion metrics: journey speed and delay, journey time reliability, disruption caused by planned and unplanned events and volume of road works. To provide a detailed picture of congestion, the assessments should include data for central, inner and outer London, as well as for the AM peak, the inter-peak period and the PM peak, on weekdays and at weekends. TfL should also outline in its response to this report how it will

ensure measurements of all traffic, both vehicle and pedestrian.

Conclusion 3 – Prioritising road users[64]

As traffic volumes rise in response to greater economic activity, difficult choices will have to be made about road user prioritisation, particularly at London's most congested junctions. Including a road user hierarchy in the London Plan, which prioritises sustainable and public transport, as well as economically essential services and important economic traffic such as freight, over private car use would ensure that these forms of transport are given precedence by transport planners

Recommendation 3

In the final draft London Plan the Mayor should reinstate a hierarchy of road users, which would ensure that future schemes would support economic development and encourage more people to use sustainable and public transport.

Conclusion 4 – Reducing road works through a lane rental scheme

The Committee recognises the potential benefits to managing road works from a lane rental scheme. There are some significant, detailed questions which will need to be answered when the scheme is worked up, such as: the extent to which the regulator allows utility companies to pass the cost on to customers; the level of disruption caused by off-peak working to residents; the extent to which works in less economically vital areas might suffer a reduction in quality and efficiency; and the effect of a lane rental scheme on TfL's own works. This will also be relevant to the future work on fuel poverty by the Health and Public Services Committee.

Recommendation 4

By September 2011, TfL should publish a plan outlining how a pilot lane rental scheme would operate in London. This should include details of the confirmed list of Congestion Management Areas, the type of charges which utility companies would have to pay, more detailed targets for how it

[64] This conclusion and the associated recommendation 3 is not supported by the Conservative Group – see appendix 2

would ease congestion, and how TfL's own works could be affected by the scheme.

Conclusion 5 – Building new roads

We note at this stage that, beyond the scheme for installing a cable car between Greenwich Peninsula and the Royal Docks, there is no funding for additional river crossings. In working up further options, the Mayor and TfL should be clearer about how they intend to balance the concerns of improving traffic flow, with the environmental and public health impacts that new roads can bring to a region. If there is a strong economic case for building new roads, as might be the case with additional river crossings, then any strategy should also include specific mitigation measures, such as traffic calming, local traffic control schemes, demand management and/or additional local public transport services, to deal with negative effects on road users and local communities.

Recommendation 5

The Mayor and TfL should use the publication of any future plan on river crossings to outline in detail how any projected benefits in road capacity or congestion relief are measured against potential negative impacts on public health, sustainable transport and the environment. It should also examine various mitigation measures which might be established to manage potential negative impacts.

Conclusion 6 – Reducing road user demand[65]

Due to the complex nature of congestion, the Mayor will need to take an expanded role in identifying and encouraging schemes that help to reduce demand on the road network, particularly if congestion increases at a faster rate than anticipated. This role will include setting the terms at which more controversial programmes included in his Transport Strategy, such as road user charging, will be considered, as well as helping to facilitate and promote more innovative ways of reducing vehicle ownership and managing increasing levels of freight transport.

[65] This conclusion and the associated recommendation 6 is not supported by the Conservative Group – see appendix 2

Recommendation 6

By September 2011, the Mayor should outline in more detail how road user demand can be reduced. This should include:

- **The level of increase in congestion necessary to trigger a consideration of further road user charging;**
- **The broad principles to which any scheme would have to conform;**
- **How the Mayor will protect smarter travel funding in future LIP rounds;**
- **Any work undertaken by TfL to examine the potential market for car clubs in London and how it might develop support in the future; and**
- **Any work undertaken to look at changing freight delivery practices.**

Appendix 2 - Conservative Group dissenting paragraphs

Road user hierarchy

Roads should be thoroughfares which enable all users, whether they are cyclists, motorists, pedestrians, bus passengers, van drivers, taxi passengers or motorcyclists to get from A to B as swiftly and as safely as possible. Neither the Mayor nor the Government should impose an artificial road user hierarchy as this inevitably has the effect of deliberately slowing down some users. Further to this, the Mayor should encourage cycling by emphasising that it is cheap, healthy and quick, not by worsening conditions for other road users.

Road user charging

There is no occasion when a large London-wide road user charging scheme should be introduced. Any introduction of a road user charging system should be limited to small, local schemes which have the support of local people. Past experience has shown that the results of consultations can be ignored.

Road user charging risks penalising poorer Londoners who may not have any option but to use a car to travel. It has also been shown to negatively affect small businesses in any congestion charging zone.

Appendix 3 – Orders and Translations

How to order

For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact Ian O' Sullivan, Assistant Scrutiny Manager, on 020 7983 6540 or email: ian.osullivan@london.gov.uk

See it for free on our website

You can also view a copy of the report on the GLA website: http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/publications

Large print, braille or translations

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print or braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call us on: 020 7983 4100 or email: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Chinese

如您需要这份文件的简介的翻译本，
请电话联系我们或按上面所提供的邮寄地址或 Email 与我们联系。

Hindi

यदि आपको इस दस्तावेज का सारांश अपनी भाषा में चाहिए तो उपर दिये हुए नंबर पर फोन करें या उपर दिये गये डाक पते या ई मेल पते पर हम से संपर्क करें।

Vietnamese

Nếu ông (bà) muốn nội dung văn bản này được dịch sang tiếng Việt, xin vui lòng liên hệ với chúng tôi bằng điện thoại, thư hoặc thư điện tử theo địa chỉ ở trên.

Bengali

আপনি যদি এই দলিলের একটা সারাংশ নিজের ভাষায় পেতে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে ফো করবেন অথবা উল্লেখিত ডাক ঠিকানায় বা ই-মেইল ঠিকানায় আমাদের সাথে যোগাযোগ করবেন।

Greek

Εάν επιθυμείτε περίληψη αυτού του κειμένου στην γλώσσα σας, παρακαλώ καλέστε τον αριθμό ή επικοινωνήστε μαζί μας στην ανωτέρω ταχυδρομική ή την ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση.

Urdu

اگر آپ کو اس دستاویز کا خلاصہ اپنی زبان میں درکار ہو تو، براہ کرم نمبر پر فون کریں
یا مذکورہ بالا ڈاک کے پتے یا ای میل
پتے پر ہم سے رابطہ کریں۔

Turkish

Bu belgenin kendi dilinize çevrilmiş bir özetini okumak isterseniz, lütfen yukarıdaki telefon numarasını arayın, veya posta ya da e-posta adresi aracılığıyla bizimle temasa geçin.

Arabic

الحصول على ملخص لهذا المستند بلغتك،
فرجاء الاتصال برقم الهاتف أو الاتصال على
العنوان البريدي العادي أو عنوان البريد
الإلكتروني أعلاه.

Punjabi

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਇਸ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਦਾ ਸੰਖੇਪ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਲੈਣਾ ਚਾਹੋ, ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਸ ਨੰਬਰ 'ਤੇ ਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਉਪਰ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਡਾਕ ਜਾਂ ਈਮੇਲ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ।

Gujarati

જો તમારે આ દસ્તાવેજનો સાર તમારી ભાષામાં જોઈતો હોય તો ઉપર આપેલ નંબર પર ફોન કરો અથવા ઉપર આપેલ ટપાલ અથવા ઈ-મેઈલ સરનામા પર અમારો સંપર્ક કરો.