

Respondents by Local Authority area

A total of 4,920 respondents provided a postcode, of which all but 59 could be plotted. Of these, the vast majority of respondents are within Greater London and its environs. Altogether, 3,630 responses were received from postcodes within London Boroughs (see table below), while 1,231 were received from postcodes outside of London.

Number of respondents by London Borough

Borough	No. of Respondents
City of Westminster	270
Kensington and Chelsea	214
Southwark	207
Camden	199
Wandsworth	190
Barnet	177
Lambeth	176
Islington	173
Tower Hamlets	141
Hackney	133
Ealing	129
Hammersmith and Fulham	126
Waltham Forest	100
Croydon	96
Lewisham	95
Richmond upon Thames	91
Bromley	90
Greenwich	89
Brent	88
Haringey	83
Newham	78
Redbridge	76
Hounslow	71
Hillingdon	68
Merton	66
Enfield	63

Harrow	59
Havering	55
Barking and Dagenham	51
Bexley	49
Kingston upon Thames	47
Sutton	45
City of London	35
Total	3630

Summaries of responses from stakeholders

Local authorities

London Councils – has flagged concerns that the proposal would lead to inconsistencies between the value of Borough road PCNs and those issued on the TLRN. London Councils has made no comment on the proposal to increase the Congestion Charge PCN.

London Borough of Camden – is not supportive of the proposal without TfL providing more detailed analysis of the data. LB Camden is also concerned re: the inconsistencies between the value of Borough road PCNs and those issued on the TLRN.

London Borough of Merton – made no specific comments regarding support or opposition to the proposal.

Westminster City Council – opposes an increase in the value of PCNs on the TLRN and in the Congestion Charging zone because raising the value could cause hardship to residents and businesses.

Transport groups

Friends of Capital Transport Campaign – Recommended ‘a new system of road charging’ but was strongly supportive of the proposal.

Alliance of British Drivers – Suggested that it is wrong to assume that an increase in the cost of PCNs would improve compliance. Requests research on collection rates vs repeat offending rates.

Campaign for Better Transport – Raised no concerns with the proposals.

Confederation of Passenger Transport – Recommended ‘wider and more comprehensive’ driver education as an alternative, and was critical of the administrative processes followed in issuing PCNs.

RAC Foundation - Opposed to the proposals on the basis of several points, including that non-compliance with Congestion Charge and Red Route traffic controls is a symptom of poor signage or road layout, amongst other issues. Generally argued that there was a lack of evidence to justify the proposed increase.

Businesses/business groups

RAC - supports TfL’s proposal to increase compliance with the TLRN and the Congestion Charge. However the RAC has raised concerns with the size of the proposed increase.

Automobile Association – suggested that TfL and London Boroughs should not collect revenue from PCNs, and instead should have high-contravention ‘hot-spots’ independently inspected to determine if an engineering solution might improve

compliance. Suggested that only repeat offenders should receive PCNs (first time offenders should be sent a warning letter only).

UPS – wrote to support/endorse the response from FTA (see above)

John Lewis – Recommended a ‘light touch’ approach to enforcement against freight vehicles. Concerned that the proposals would increase delivery costs and highlighted a perceived lack of loading facilities across London.

DHL - wrote to support/endorse the response from FTA (see above)

Heart of London Business Alliance – Broadly agreed with the proposals and suggested that TfL explore new road charging regimes, including an emissions-based regime. Did not think that the proposals would unfairly burden businesses in the West End.

Freight Transport Association - opposes the TLRN PCN increase, unless TfL also implements a package of measures to support operators comply with TLRN traffic rules. The proposal to increase the Congestion Charge PCN value is supported by the FTA.

British Vehicle Rental and Leasing Association – Could not support the proposals ‘as the true offender is not held to account for leased vehicles’, and suggested that TfL should lobby for legislative change to ensure that vehicle leasers can be held to account for PCNs issued for contraventions they commit.

Community organisations

Hackney Living Streets – is supportive of the proposal.

The Soho Society – requested that TfL take enforcement action against vehicle noise (sounding of horns specifically) at night in the Soho area.

Living Streets/Hackney Living Streets – strongly supportive of the proposals and highlighted the benefits from effective enforcement.

Greenwich African Caribbean Organisation – suggested banning driving in high-contravention hotspot areas and improving public transport. Also recommended encouragement of walking, cycling, car sharing, etc.