

Appendix 1 - Summaries of Stakeholder responses

Contents

Aviation Authorities (1).....	6
British Airports Authority (BAA)	6
Business Representative Groups (6).....	6
Association of International Courier and Express Services (AICES).....	6
Evolution Quarter Group (Peckham)	6
Freight on Rail.....	6
London First	7
London Taxis International (LTI).....	7
The Motorcycle Industry Association (MCI).....	7
New West End Company (NWEC).....	7
South Bank Employers Group (SBEG)	7
West London Business	8
Disability and Mobility Groups (5)	8
Kent Association for the Blind	8
London Visual Impairment Forum	8
Royal National Institute for Deaf People (RNID).....	9
Scope.....	9
Transport for All.....	9
Economic/Regeneration Partnerships (8)	9
Central London Freight Quality Partnership.....	9
Cross River Partnership.....	10
North London Strategic Alliance (NLSA).....	10
Park Royal Partnership (PRP).....	10
South London Partnership	10
Thames Gateway Development Corporation	11

Thames Gateway London Partnership (TGLP)	11
West London Partnership.....	11
Education (1).....	12
University of East London	12
Emergency Services Providers (1)	12
Port of London Authority.....	12
English Local Authorities Contiguous to London (2)	12
Hertfordshire County Council	12
Tandridge District Council	12
Freight/Haulage Representative Organisations (1).....	13
Freight Transport Association	13
GLA Functional Bodies and Commissions (3)	13
London Development Agency (LDA)	13
London Sustainable Development Commission (LSDC)	13
London TravelWatch	14
Health Organisations (1)	14
National Heart Forum.....	14
London Boroughs (31)	15
The City of London	15
The City of Westminster.....	15
The London Borough of Barking & Dagenham (LBBD).....	15
The London Borough of Barnet	16
The London Borough of Bexley.....	16
The London Borough of Brent	16
The London Borough of Bromley.....	17
The London Borough of Camden.....	17
The London Borough of Croydon	18

The London Borough of Ealing	18
The London Borough of Enfield	18
The London Borough of Hackney	19
The London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham	19
The London Borough of Haringey	19
The London Borough of Havering	20
The London Borough of Hillingdon.....	20
The London Borough of Hounslow.....	20
The London Borough of Islington.....	21
The London Borough of Lambeth.....	21
The London Borough of Lewisham	21
London Councils	22
The London Borough of Merton	22
The London Borough of Newham.....	22
The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames	23
The London Borough of Southwark	23
The London Borough of Sutton.....	24
The London Borough of Tower Hamlets.....	24
The London Borough of Waltham Forest	24
The London Borough of Wandsworth.....	25
The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames	25
The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea (RBKC).....	25
London Political Representatives (3)	26
The London Assembly Labour Group.....	26
The London Assembly Liberal Democrat Group	26
The London Assembly Transport Committee	27
London Assembly Members (1)	27

Jenny Jones AM.....	27
Motoring Organisations (3)	27
The Association of British Drivers (ABD).....	28
The British Motorcyclists Federation	28
Hillingdon Motorists Forum.....	28
Non-departmental Public Bodies (3)	28
English Heritage.....	28
The Environment Agency	28
Natural England	28
NHS Greater London (2).....	29
North West London Hospitals NHS Trust	29
The Regional Public Health Group London.....	29
Political Organisations (3)	29
Croydon Labour Party Retired Group.....	29
Liberal Youth	29
Southwark Labour Group	29
Professional Organisations (1).....	30
The Association for Consulting and Engineering.....	30
Public Transport Operators (2)	30
London Taxi Network.....	30
Network Rail.....	30
Residents' Associations (2).....	31
Eastcote Residents' Association	31
The Knightsbridge Association.....	31
Transport and Environment Representative Organisations (17).....	31
The Campaign against Climate Change, Transition Town Kingston and Kingston Cycling Campaign.....	31

The Campaign for Better Transport (CBT)	31
The Campaign for Clean Air in London	32
The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)	32
Ealing Cycling Campaign.....	32
Energy Saving Trust	32
Friends of Capital Transport	33
Friends of the Earth.....	33
Green Chain.....	33
Greener Harrow	33
Hackney Living Streets.....	34
London Cycling Campaign.....	34
London Living Streets.....	34
Railfuture	35
Sustrans	35
Walk England.....	35
The Westminster Cycling Campaign.....	35
Trades Unions (2)	36
The Trades Union Congress (TUC)	36
Unite	36
Transport Partnerships (1)	36
SWELTRAC	36
Utilities (2)	37
National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG).....	37
Thames Water	37
Voluntary & Community Groups (2)	37
The Community Transport Association.....	38
The London Forum of Civic and Amenity Societies.....	38

Aviation Authorities (1)

British Airports Authority (BAA)

British Airports Authority (BAA) is broadly in agreement with the principles in the document, particularly the modally agnostic approach and improving information to travellers. It considers that the effective management of PPP is important. It would like to see greater coverage of airports in the strategy, and a reflection of the importance to the economy of surface links to airports during the recession and the Olympics and plans to enhance these links. It opposes the focus on alternatives to Heathrow as being out of step with the London Plan's economic aspirations and with national policy as set out in The Future of Air Transport, and is disappointed that the Mayor is opposed to Heathrow expansion. It states that Heathrow is important to London's economy and the third runway at Heathrow would undergo an Environmental Assessment. Also, Stansted should be acknowledged as Europe's fastest growing airport which will assist with numerous mayoral priorities. It considers the Thames Estuary airport review to be contrary to previous studies which concluded that it is an inappropriate site for an airport and to the Air Transport White Paper. BAA say it would also benefit other European hubs by disaggregating the location of services rather than concentrating them in London. It would like more reference to London's engagement with the development of transport links in the East of England. Finally it advocates a strategic approach to the development of coach travel in the Capital.

Business Representative Groups (6)

Association of International Courier and Express Services (AICES)

AICES agrees with the principles set out, particularly with protecting the environment. It agrees that congestion is a key issue and should be improved by smoothing traffic flows and connecting planning and transport policies. AICES is concerned that the principles contain no explicit reference to express services and hope this will be rectified in MTS. It considers that references to freight are generally negative and do not reflect the important role freight plays in London's success. AICES identifies a need for improved access for loading and unloading, and better administrative procedures in respect of penalty charges to minimise operational cost. It also has concerns that new cycle routes would make access for loading and unloading more difficult, and allowing cyclists to turn left on red lights would encourage them to drive up the inside of freight vehicles which is dangerous for the cyclist.

Evolution Quarter Group (Peckham)

Evolution Quarter group is very concerned that the discontinuation of the Cross River Tram project will have adverse impacts on some of London's most deprived communities. The tram would have been environmentally-friendly, and had a broad cross-section of support. It says the Mayor consulted on the Western extension of the Congestion Charging Zone and should have consulted on the future of Cross River Tram.

Freight on Rail

Freight on Rail supports plans to improve London's environment and tackle climate change but is disappointed that there is no reference to rail freight in Way to Go. It states the

Transport Strategy should reflect the TfL Rail Freight Strategy published in 2007. It states that rail freight produces lower CO₂ emissions than road freight, is much safer and also has the advantage of not adding to road congestion. It says that the GLA should produce supplementary planning guidance for road freight and direct the boroughs to safeguard land for future use by rail freight. It would like to see an upgrade of the North London Line and more terminal capacity for freight at interchanges. Finally it notes that rail freight has a key role in meeting the Olympics target of moving 50% of materials by non-road haulage.

London First

London First states that the Transport Strategy should focus on the issues which support economic prosperity: Tube capacity and cooling; Crossrail delivery and cost; reduce road congestion; orbital rail and commuter and airport rail links; public transport integration. It says that there is a need to balance delivery and strategic planning: various upgrades are planned for the next 10 years, but growth will continue after that so there is a need to look post-2017 as well. It would like to see increased national and international connectivity: High Speed Rail 2, links to airports, review airports and heliport provision, integration of MTS with national and international strategies. It makes a number of suggestions for reducing road congestion and states that there should be better integration of public transport to provide an 'end to end' service.

London Taxis International (LTI)

London Taxis International suggests ways to improve the taxi fleet. These include shortening the knowledge examination, imposing a 10 year age policy on cabs and ensuring sustainable renewal of the fleet.

The Motorcycle Industry Association (MCI)

The Motorcycle Industry Association (MCI) focuses on issues pertinent to users of powered two wheelers (PTW). It welcomes the introduction of PTW access to bus lanes and agrees that car users should not be vilified. The MCI considers that PTW should be promoted as an alternative mode in London that would contribute to reduced congestion and CO₂. The MCI would like to see further measures for rider safety and thinks there is a need for a London-wide motorcycle strategy.

New West End Company (NVEC)

The New West End Company wants to maintain and enhance the position of the West End. It says that demands on London's transport will continue to grow and the public transport system must be able to cope. It would like to see a 33% reduction in bus movements along Oxford St. It supports expansion of Legible London and says pavements may need to be widened and decluttered in some cases. NVEC fully supports the principles in the document. It adds that the fumes from buses and taxis are unpleasant in Oxford St and it would like to create more 'green oasis' areas. Although it supports development in outer London, it should be in addition to radial routes which are vital to the West End. There is support for connecting transport and planning, increasing accessibility and working with the boroughs. The NVEC is also supportive of Crossrail although it has concerns that increased demand at gateway stations of Bond St and Tottenham Court Road is managed. There is support for the coordination of roadworks. Promotion of walking and cycling is welcomed but progress should be rapid as London is falling behind other cities in this regard.

South Bank Employers Group (SBEG)

South Bank Employers Group is leading the Waterloo City Square project and is very keen to see further improvements to public realm, especially in this part of London. It welcomes Crossrail, tube upgrades, river transport and improvements related to the Olympics. With regard to the modal hierarchy, it believes that there needs to be priority for pedestrians and public transport around Waterloo. It supports measures to limit the impact of utilities roadworks on the movement of traffic. It would like to see more Legible London. It would also like to see more attention paid to TfL's relationships with stakeholders other than boroughs, such as business networks. There is insufficient emphasis on interchange and it is concerned that the focus on Crossrail will result in there being very little s106 money available for other schemes such as improving the public realm. It recommends that the model used by SBEG to develop a neighbourhood approach to improvements as a useful way of making scarce resources go further.

West London Business

West London Business states that without improvements to the structure of public transport in London, the intention to move people away from cars will not succeed. While it welcomes Crossrail, it is not sufficient and, in West London, will not connect to London Overground. It would like a new West London Orbital rail link to connect the 20 radial railways in the area.

Disability and Mobility Groups (5)

Kent Association for the Blind

Kent Association for the Blind generally support the principles but would like to ensure that accessibility for all users extends beyond wheelchair users and considers blind and partially sighted people. It supports iBus technology and would like full audible information on all routes. There are also concerns that the Routemaster would not stop long enough or close enough to the curb for blind or partially sighted people. It is strongly opposed to shared space schemes as blind and partially sighted people use curbs and textures surfaces in order to safely navigate their way. Removing these signals would severely restrict mobility. Allowing cyclists to turn left at red traffic lights would also be dangerous for sight impaired people. Promotion of walking and cycling is welcomed, but routes must be clearly demarcated.

London Visual Impairment Forum

London Visual Impairment Forum calls for more provision of pedestrian crossings and for these to be improved; it is concerned about any shortening of the pedestrian green man phase and it says that there should be more residential 20 mph zones. It has safety concerns about the quietness of hybrid and hydrogen vehicles and also about shared space schemes, noting that kerbs are important for safety. It welcomes moves to reduce street clutter, which is a safety risk, and also points out other hazards including cars parked on the pavement, A-boards and overhanging trees, which also make for an unsafe environment. It would like changes to Congestion Charge exemptions, further enhancements to iBus, a 24-hour Freedom Pass and a review of door-to-door transport, noting its concerns about the funding for Dial-a-Ride. It welcomes Safer Transport Teams and makes a number of suggestions for improving the accessibility of bus stops, Underground and Overground stations. It is concerned about a reduction in the target for step-free stations.

Royal National Institute for Deaf People (RNID)

Royal National Institute for Deaf People (RNID) generally agrees with the principles for developing policy, including keeping people informed as this is a particular problem for deaf and hard of hearing people. It considers that all pre travel information should be available in a variety of forms. During travel, real-time visual displays need to convey the same information as audible messages. Emphasis on accessibility should not be restricted to wheelchair accessibility but should also consider other requirements. Similarly it believes that these needs should be considered when planning for shared road space and walking and cycling measures. It would like to see training for frontline staff in how to communicate with deaf and hard of hearing people.

Scope

Scope offers a guarded welcome to the strategy outlined in Way to Go, but is concerned that the new Mayor is not fully committed to accessibility after improvements to Kensington and Chelsea tube station were postponed last year. The document only includes one paragraph on accessibility and Scope thinks it may appear as though commitment is wavering. Scope is concerned about the proposals for shared road space as this makes it very difficult for disabled people to safely use the street. It is also concerned that attitudinal barriers, as well as physical barriers are addressed, with full access audits carried out by disabled professionals underpinning all transport strategies.

Transport for All

Transport for All notes that access to transport enables people to live independently and restricted access can lead to ill-health and isolation. It recommends that there is a publicity campaign highlighting disabled peoples' right to travel on public transport; it would also like to see involvement and consultation of disabled people in designing transport services, with mobility forums established across the capital. It welcomes improvements to bus services such as iBus but there are still problems with use of ramps and the wheelchair space: it calls for electric mobility scooters to be allowed on buses and for ramps to be more widely used. The cycle hire scheme should include adapted cycles and trykes. It says that the review of door to door transport has gone on too long; there should be a consolidated service of Dial-a-Ride, Taxicard, Capital Call and local community transport providers, and is concerned about budget freezes in this area. It is concerned about a reduction in the target for step-free stations.

Economic/Regeneration Partnerships (8)

Central London Freight Quality Partnership

Central London Freight Quality Partnership welcomes the rejection of a road user hierarchy, stating that there needs to be a consideration of local circumstances. It says that the lack of a statement on freight policy in Way to Go is a major omission, and there should be recognition of the important role that freight and servicing plays in London's success. It would like to see a link to the ODA's Transport Plan. While it supports walking and cycling, it is concerned about the safety implications of allowing cyclists a left turn on red and the potential loss of road space incurred in providing road cycle lanes. Finally it lists a number of issues which it says should be covered by the freight policy. These are: loading and

unloading on TLRN; congestion and congestion charging; the development of urban commercial vehicles; and the provision of gas and electric refuelling points.

Cross River Partnership

Cross River Partnership generally supports the principles in Way to Go, particularly the promotion of walking and cycling, improving the public realm, station access and the Olympics. It welcomes the approach of working with boroughs but states that there is also a benefit in sub-regional partnership working - this helps in, for example, dealing with cross-boundary issues. It states that it would like to see more attention paid to transport's role in regeneration.

North London Strategic Alliance (NLSA)

The NLSA welcomes many of the policies outlined including rail improvements, reform of the Congestion Charge, airport provision and getting London moving. It welcomes the commitment to work collaboratively with boroughs and sub-regional partnerships but seeks greater flexibility in the funding relationship. However, it believes these are insufficient on their own to address North London's current and forecast growth and aspirations, suggesting a package of additional measures including rail capacity increases and service improvements, bus network improvements, interchange upgrades, reduction in road traffic delays and promotion of sustainable transport. The NLSA's concerns include the concentration of funding on Crossrail and Underground and the need to maximise capacity for passengers and freight through additional projects. It would also support improvements to the existing freight infrastructure, a review of the bus network and focus on Stansted for additional airport capacity.

Park Royal Partnership (PRP)

The Park Royal Partnership supports the principles set out in the document, as well as the additional principle of improving customer care. Issues of funding, and measures to tackle climate change however, have not been addressed and this must be changed. The PRP agree with promoting walking and cycling where it offers a genuine alternative to car use, but this must be facilitated with improvements to the public realm, proper signage and routes (a particular problem in Park Royal). PRP has already been working on voluntary travel plans and believe that Travel Demand Management measures have a significant role to play in reducing congestion. They see the introduction of express buses, particularly Fastbus as a priority, and suggest that bendy buses could be used for this purpose. It is also vital to reduce congestion while protecting the role of HGVs and vans in distributing goods and services.

South London Partnership

The South London Partnership is pleased to see the approach of building on existing schemes as well as new initiatives. It welcomes the emphasis on supporting Outer London hubs which will allow people to live and work in the same place. It would like the links between the London Plan and the Transport Strategy to be more clearly stated and also to take into account the work of the Outer London Commission. While it welcomes the development of the Overground and orbital rail links, it notes that South London is likely to continue to rely heavily on buses. It would like more emphasis on encouraging sustainable travel, including Smarter Choices. It would like more acknowledgement that travel in Outer London includes other purposes besides work commuting. It supports smoothing the flow of

traffic and improving urban realm; it also supports walking and cycling but is concerned that there has been reduced funding for the London Cycle Network. Finally it lists a number of projects which are of particular importance to it: Thameslink; Crossrail 1 and 2; ELL 2a and 2b; Air Track; Town Centre Schemes; Tramlink extensions; Waterloo International utilisation and South London Overground.

Thames Gateway Development Corporation

Thames Gateway Development Corporation states that transport planning must be in step with land use planning and urban design. It welcomes the commitment to develop Outer London and work with the boroughs but states that it is also important to work with partners and that it is keen to work with TfL and the Mayor in east London. It states that to achieve regeneration, it is important that transport developments such as the DLR Dagenham Dock extension and future transit schemes in the Thames Gateway are planned in line with residential and commercial developments. It supports walking and cycling, particularly along major artery roads and at transport interchanges. It states that it wishes to work with TfL on the planned study of the Thames Gateway area (and is keen on a potential new river crossing), and in the subregional review of the area.

Thames Gateway London Partnership (TGLP)

Thames Gateway London Partnership (TGLP) supports the general principles but believes the MTS should set out a spatial strategy for transport and regeneration. The TGLP argues that it should also be clear whether transport schemes are funded or in development. It considers that major projects should be included with some indication of the priority assigned to them. There is strong support for polycentric growth. The TGLP believes that MTS should make reference to the revised London Plan and relevant strategies outside London. TGLP welcomes working with boroughs and is looking forward to working with TfL on the sub regional transport plans. It welcomes the emphasis on outer London, and supports the case for substantially increased provision of public transport, including development of bus services in east London and river transport. It supports in principle the extension of the underground network in South London. It considers that commitment to sufficient infrastructure in the Thames Gateway area is also necessary. TGLP supports more flexible public transport fares. TGLP supports the cycle hire scheme, and will consult member boroughs about Legible London. TGLP says specific measures to deal with climate change will need to be identified in the MTS. It supports airport development which supports the regeneration of the Thames Gateway, the wider economy and considers environmental issues, such as how the CO₂ and environmental impacts might be mitigated. TGLP believes that the document should include more on adapting to climate change, for example how transport and infrastructure will cope.

West London Partnership

West London Partnership states that transport infrastructure should be focussed on supporting regeneration, with fast-tracking of specific schemes like the Thames Gateway review. It calls for improved conditions for delivery and servicing including specific measures on loading/unloading and a central London retail consolidation centre. It states that TfL must be more innovative and save money, using for example technology, timed tickets, shorter bus routes and cheaper ways to increase tube capacity. Bus Services reconfiguration is needed, with development of orbital and express routes. Finally, disruption to business

caused by transport schemes must be managed, and there should be more incentives to use electric vehicles.

Education (1)

University of East London

The University of East London welcomes Crossrail, the tube upgrades, enhanced Oyster coverage and the expanded Overground. It states that it is vital to plan ahead for transport needs so work should now begin on securing Crossrail 2. It is vital that housing growth is supported by strong public transport links, not only to work but also to education opportunities, particularly for communities which have had less access in the past. It endorses the emphasis on walking and cycling, stating that there needs to be a focus on safety for cyclists, especially children, and a consideration of cyclists' allowances. It is disappointed about the cancellation of Thames Gateway Bridge and the Dagenham Dock DLR extension, and contrasts this with the pace of development in the west of the Capital.

Emergency Services Providers (1)

Port of London Authority

The Port of London Authority states that river transport should be considered alongside other modes, rather than as a separate issue. It notes that there has already been an expansion in the number of passengers using the river, ahead of the Olympics. It supports the continued expansion of river transport, but queries the phrase 'coordinating the wharves' and since document seems to focus on transport of people rather than freight, suggests that this should be removed as a number of wharves are protected for cargo handling uses.

English Local Authorities Contiguous to London (2)

Hertfordshire County Council

Hertfordshire County Council wish to see continued commitment to the Croxley Rail Link Scheme, four trains per hour aspirations for all inner suburban services, and four-tracking of the West Anglia main line. It also desires integration of ticketing, with Oyster rolled out to all Hertfordshire stations, cross boundary working with North London on smarter travel and business travel plans and a greater emphasis on accessibility. There are concerns that the new style Metropolitan trains with fewer seats are not suitable for long commutes from stations in Hertfordshire such as Rickmansworth. There is also concern over the financial stability of cross-boundary bus services, to which Hertfordshire contributes. These problems do not exist on the Underground or Overground networks because London funds the whole network. Hertfordshire County Council also supports the objective of improving access for disabled people, particularly at interchanges between mainline trains and the Underground network.

Tandridge District Council

Tandridge District Council broadly supports the principles set out in Way to Go, but states that there should be attention paid to the cross-boundary implications of transport measures

taken in London, as well as the opportunities for joint working. It supports improving public transport and hopes for early completion of the Thameslink programme. The council is opposed to an additional runway at Gatwick and states that any expansion must take account of the impacts on neighbouring districts, which are already adverse. It broadly agrees with the principle of encouraging more people to walk and cycle, provided that adequate provision is made for secure parking and hire facilities at London terminals including Victoria and London Bridge. It states that the strategy should also look at the potential for expanding the Tramlink network to Purley, Streatham and Selsdon.

Freight/Haulage Representative Organisations (1)

Freight Transport Association

The Freight Transport Association states that there has been too much emphasis on buses and cars in road network management and that the critical contribution of the freight industry to London has been overlooked. For example, 24 hour bus lanes prevent deliveries and are not always necessary. Similarly, the enforcement process has been designed for private traffic, meaning that commercial operators are required to go through a costly and bureaucratic process to cancel PCNs incurred while making deliveries. It states that there is not enough genuine consultation between TfL and operators. It believes that the Low Emission Zone (LEZ) has been too expensive and it would have been more effective to offer an incentive to operators by giving a discount on the Congestion Charge to Euro 5 (now Euro 6) vehicles. It states that Phase 3 and Phase 4 of LEZ should be abandoned. There is potential to relax the restrictions on night-time deliveries, these could be done without increasing noise and with road safety benefits. It notes that the industry has spent over £70 million fitting mirrors to vehicles to improve safety and there should be a redressing of the balance of responsibility for collisions between vehicles and cyclists. It would like there to be an endorsement and further development of the Freight Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS), which it has developed with TfL's Freight Unit and others.

GLA Functional Bodies and Commissions (3)

London Development Agency (LDA)

The LDA welcomes the broad principles, including Crossrail and the funding for public transport, walking and cycling improvements. It supports polycentric growth, but would like to see more details on the scale and type of jobs and how accessibility will be managed. The LDA also highlights the importance of working across the GLA boundaries and ensuring good regional, national and international links. The MTS should support the development of specific projects in the sub regions (e.g. major projects from TfL Business Plan). The LDA is particularly interested in the Thames Gateway and North London Corridors, where new and existing communities must be linked to each other, and other emerging opportunities. MTS needs to highlight the importance of freight, logistics and servicing London. It should also acknowledge the importance of visitors to the economy and the need for a resilient network, both for visitors and business. The promotion of walking and cycling is welcomed with support for wider roll out of Legible London. The LDA also welcomes the integration of transport and planning.

London Sustainable Development Commission (LSDC)

London Sustainable Development Commission places transport in a wider context – as a means of communication. It therefore says that the Mayor’s Transport Strategy should aim to reduce need to travel, through land use plans and new technology. It hopes that the transport strategy and land-use strategy complement each other to achieve this. The LSDC believes that the modal hierarchy is necessary and should not be abandoned. It considers that London needs at least one dedicated radial route and there should be acknowledgement of the fact that different modes don’t always mix. The LSDC considers that there is not enough emphasis on the consequences of fossil fuel travel and that there should be a specific carbon reduction target. While it agrees that it is right that the MTS is high level, more specific policies will need to be identified in the subregional frameworks. There is support for increasing the use of river transport and a belief that shared space schemes, if under consideration, should be large scale rather than in isolated pockets. LSDC suggests raising money for public transport improvements through s106 agreements. It says that the document lacks inspirational issues and innovative thinking.

London TravelWatch

London TravelWatch broadly supports the principles set out but has some concerns about the tone of the document in that it overstates problems with rude young people and crime and anti social behaviour. It is concerned that some of the policy goals are contradictory, for example championing polycentric development but providing Crossrail to bring more people to the centre. It believes that there should be improved bus priority and a better bus service in outer London. Accessibility of the transport network must also be improved and progress on this has been slow. It has some concerns about the safety of the new Routemaster and considers that articulated buses could offer a better alternative. It considers that the integration of planning and transport is important, particularly with health services. Providing well designed stations and interchanges, clean and cared for vehicles and helpful and knowledgeable staff with good information services will make public transport more attractive and feel safer. It welcomes the promotion of walking and cycling and the improvement of the urban realm, although allowing motorcycles in bus lanes is to detriment of cyclists. It agrees that working closely with boroughs is beneficial, and there should also be collaboration with London Councils and voluntary transport providers to improve door to door transport. It considers that some major projects should still be pursued, such as the extension of the East London Line and Croydon Tramlink, and these can also have a social benefit. It would like a consideration of the balance of funding from the taxpayer and the service user for transport schemes. It would like improved bus priority; high speed electric rail and for the Mayor to have a role in specifying fares and services on National Rail.

Health Organisations (1)

National Heart Forum

The National Heart Forum is pleased to see the emphasis on encouraging walking and cycling, because physical activity can directly improve health and these sustainable modes do not have adverse air quality or climate change impacts. It states that it is important to create a liveable London by paying attention to health and sustainability issues. Therefore it is important to ensure that people feel that walking and cycling are attractive options. The road user hierarchy should place pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport at the top and residential neighbourhoods should be designed for people as well as vehicles - 20 mph zones are effective in promoting sustainable travel behaviour and creating health

places to live. There should be a commitment of 10% of transport budgets to walking and cycling and people should be encouraged to use public transport to make them more active. It recommends that all transport and land-use decisions should be subject to a 'health-check' to see how they impact in this area.

London Boroughs (31)

The City of London

City of London generally supports the principles set out in WTG, particularly the commitment to working with the boroughs to improve transport in London. It welcomes Crossrail and would like to see progression of the East London Line Phase 2 ahead of 2012. It supports the emphasis on cycling and walking, including the cycle hire scheme. It also supports expansion of river services and Oyster on boats. It advocates a review of the bus network and, with regard to improving traffic flow, would like City traffic lights to be connected to SCOOT, although access traffic should be prioritised over through traffic in the borough. It cautions against the tone of language used about roadworks, saying that it will not assist relations between boroughs and utility companies. It states that some routes on the Transport for London Road Network should be returned to borough control, for example Bishopsgate. It states that Heathrow needs service improvement which may be won by adding capacity, while the Thames Estuary airport can only be a long-term solution. It is disappointed at the shelving of Cross River Tram and is concerned that there is a lack of long term (post 2017) vision.

The City of Westminster

The City of Westminster broadly supports the principles outlined in Way to Go, and is pleased to see that a place for cars is acknowledged. It welcomes the emphasis on improving the public realm and is particularly keen that the scheme to improve Leicester Square, and also create a car-free 'festival zone' for the Olympics, are pursued. While it welcomes the assertion that TfL will work more collaboratively with the boroughs, it says that there needs to be more done to free the boroughs from TfL's intervention in day to day issues. Specifically, it recommends that it would be economically effective to give boroughs control of the TLRN, since they are already responsible for 95% of roads in London. It would like to see more action to reduce noise from buses and welcomes the proposed reduction of buses on Oxford Street, which could be applied in other places such as the Strand. Similarly it welcomes the trialling of motorcycles in bus lanes. It would like a review of the policy of allowing young people free travel on buses as it can lead to anti-social behaviour. City of Westminster is positive about the cycle hire scheme but there needs to be more borough involvement and the provision of cycle parking needs to be improved. It supports the London Permit scheme for roadworks and would like to see penalties applied. Some traffic signals need to be upgraded with a green man phase for pedestrians; it is supportive of the removal of the road hump. City of Westminster would like to see more implementation of Legible London but has reservations about the tunnel under Park Lane. Finally, it would like more support for electric cars including the provision of on-street charging points.

The London Borough of Barking & Dagenham (LBBD)

The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham welcomes the encouragement of polycentric growth, to encourage economic development in Outer London and address demand for transport into central London. It states that there needs to be further development of other projects in the Thames Gateway region: Dagenham Dock DLR extension, Thames Gateway Transit and a new Thames crossing. It says it would also be easy to implement new bus routes and services in this area. LBBDD considers there should be an expansion of river transport and expansion of Thames Gateway ports. It supports the emphasis on walking and cycling. LBBDD says that the Local Implementation Plan (LIPs) funding is still too prescriptive and there needs to be more certainty on the provision of maintenance funding.

The London Borough of Barnet

The London Borough of Barnet is pleased to see the comments about the road user hierarchy and states that the car has an important role in the borough. It states that there should be a fundamental review of bus planning, which is too focussed on past patterns of demand, the tender process, and the convenience of existing users. Transport investment should be refocused on opportunity areas and regeneration locations in Outer London. It calls for more orbital bus routes and an express bus services and more trains and passenger capacity on the Northern Line. There is the opportunity to improve access to the M1 to relieve congestion on the A41 and A5, and there should be an investigation of how underused rail infrastructure could be utilised. Finally it calls for there to be investment on the maintenance of the road network, particularly in subways and footbridges.

The London Borough of Bexley

The London Borough of Bexley welcomes the Mayor's focus on Outer London and notes the lack of public transport infrastructure in this region, and the need for schemes such as North Bexley Transit and Crossrail extension to Ebbsfleet. While it is pleased that Thames Gateway Bridge is not proceeding, it is disappointed that Greenwich Waterfront Transit has been shelved post-Phase 1. It is pleased to see the Mayor's commitment to work with the boroughs and develop Outer London. It agrees with the principle of integrating transport and land-use planning, and its own plans for the regeneration of the Thames Gateway reflect this approach. However, a basic principle should be included to simplify and enhance the provision of funding for borough's local transport infrastructure proposals. With regard to the challenges facing London, it is in broad agreement with those set out in WTG and hopes that in the long term there would be further expansion of the Tube network. It also supports the principle of improved urban realm and the 'war on roadworks', though is concerned that the process for the permit scheme has been bureaucratic. Bexley agrees with the emphasis on cycling, and is keen on the development of safe cycle routes, but schemes should be local, not strategic. It would like to see Oyster available on suburban rail services and an expansion of National Rail services to serve more orbital and cross-London destinations.

The London Borough of Brent

The London Borough of Brent supports the general principles set out, particularly the improvement of the public realm, delivering key public transport improvements and working in partnership with the boroughs. It is very supportive of the development of orbital transport, noting that Wembley and Park Royal Opportunity Areas currently have poor transport connections which stifle their growth. It notes that bus services in this area are unreliable and suggests there is a need for re- structuring. It proposes a route for an express bus

service in Brent/Park Royal which would also maximise the benefit of Crossrail. It hopes that future funding for walking and cycling and providing Travel Plans are maintained. It states that area-based partnerships are key to delivering an integrated transport system. Finally it asks for high levels of funding for highway maintenance, road safety measures and bus priority schemes.

The London Borough of Bromley

The London Borough of Bromley supports the main principles of Way to Go, particularly the emphasis on working with the boroughs and developing orbital links in outer London. These links, combined with connections between transport and planning, could help to reduce the need to travel. It supports offering good alternatives to car use and thinks that the public transport experience should be improved to make this an attractive alternative. It states that, while some major projects including Tramlink, are not set out in TfL's business plan, there should be further study into other vital infrastructure plans. It will be necessary for the MTS to take a view well beyond the 2017 funding horizon and will need to offer some degree of certainty in relation to transport projects beyond that date. Boroughs also need certainty about year on year funding and there should be an explicit commitment to continue funding the boroughs, and the LIPs process should contain the principle of subsidiarity in decision-making. It supports promotion of walking and cycling, although thinks there should be a distinction made between leisure cyclists and commuters. It would like to see an extension of the Tramlink network, and the DLR extended to Bromley North.

The London Borough of Camden

The London Borough of Camden believes there is merit in retaining a road user hierarchy based on a combination of factors because it provides a tool to help the decision-making process. It agrees with the principle of connecting transport and planning, and welcomes the link between the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the London Plan. It welcomes the commitment to make all London's transport infrastructure compliant with DDA, but notes that there also needs to be a consideration of inaccessible streets. Greater emphasis is needed on the increased future pressures on the network and the challenges that this will bring. For some time, Camden has put the case for redeveloping Camden Town underground and continues to believe that this would support the area as a tourist destination and support its own improvements on Camden High Street. There is also scope to make better use of West Hampstead interchange by improving crossings and access to the different stations. Camden is very supportive of the London Permit Scheme for road works and street works and expects to be in the first tranche of boroughs to run this scheme. With regard to the free flow of traffic, there needs to be a strategic consideration of the bus network in this, in which TfL and the boroughs should work together. Camden believes that bendy buses do ease congestion and add to capacity and, so far, does not support their removal. Camden is also concerned about the safety impact for cyclists of allowing motorcycles in bus lanes. Camden is very supportive of encouraging more cycling in London but notes the need to consider the impact on the urban realm and balance the needs of pedestrians and cyclists. Camden welcomes the Mayor's interest in hydrogen fuel cell vehicles and believes that the Mayor should take a proactive approach in increasing the uptake of electric vehicles, including the provision of a network of charging points. It would like to see more detail on the Olympics; measures to ensure the taxi fleet reduces its emissions; more on the use of 20 mph zones and also freight's role in reducing air quality pollutant emissions and CO₂. Camden is keen

to work on a cycle freight scheme. It would like MTS to take a subregional approach as well as a strategic one.

The London Borough of Croydon

The London Borough of Croydon supports the principle of choice in transport but has concerns about the capacity to persuade people out of cars, particularly given the decision not to progress work on the Crystal Palace Tramlink extension. There needs to be extension of the Overground and possibly the underground in south London to provide real transport alternatives to the car. It would like more detail on the following in the MTS: East London Line Phase 2b; town centre schemes in the borough; Overground, smoothing traffic on the A23 and A232 and a review of bus provision in the area. The Mayor should lobby government for funds for transport improvements. It welcomes the joining up of transport and land-use planning and looks forward to being involved in this work. It supports polycentric growth and is keen to develop Croydon as a key employment hub. It would like more detail on providing transport for those with accessibility problems, and some of this can be funded via small-scale schemes. It would like a stronger focus on road safety and an investigation of the use of alternative fuels and it should be ensured that transport policy is well integrated with other areas of public planning, for example health and education, with an overarching aim to reduce the need to travel.

The London Borough of Ealing

The London Borough of Ealing supports the smoothing of traffic through better management of junctions, including the removal of traffic signals (particularly along Uxbridge Road). In terms of shortening pedestrian crossing signals, the borough would like close working with borough officers to ensure the balance between safety and traffic flow. The document makes no reference to road safety. Improvements to public transport are welcomed but Ealing would like to see more emphasis on Smarter Travel solutions. Ealing would like confirmation that there will work with boroughs on planning of effective bus routes (particularly orbital) and provision of suitable infrastructure. Measures to encourage walking are needed. Cycling should also be promoted to car drivers in outer London in an effort to mode shift day-to-day driving in outer London. TfL must commit to demonstration projects to determine what needs to be done to encourage mode shift from car to bicycle. Ealing would like to see transport planning more closely involved with planning and regeneration to address the needs of an area, rather than following a traditional modal based approach.

The London Borough of Enfield

The London Borough of Enfield considers that the direction of travel is in line with its thinking in most key areas. In particular, Enfield agrees that it is better to help people out of their cars by persuasion rather than by charges and welcomes the recognition of the economic importance of outer London centres and the role of boroughs in developing solutions for local problems. It agrees with the proposals for getting London moving and improving the urban environment and supports reforms to the Congestion Charge and reviewing airport provision. It welcomes the proposals on cycling and is interested in exploring the feasibility of cycle hubs and cycle hire schemes in outer London. It considers that allowing motorcycles in Bus Lanes is acceptable but needs to be closely monitored and, while it welcomes the ambitions for transport infrastructure to fully comply with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) and to improve provision for older people, regard must also be given to the shortage of on-street parking in residential areas. Enfield considers that there are a number of aspects

that require further elaboration in MTS including investment in road infrastructure to support forecast housing and employment growth; more recognition of the importance of access to health care facilities; and targets on traffic reduction and restraint. It sets out the need for measures specific to North London, including 4-tracking on the Lee Valley line, improvements to the orbital bus network and improved accessibility to town centres.

The London Borough of Hackney

The London Borough of Hackney states that there need to be disincentives as well as incentives to achieve a shift away from car use, and that this would benefit environmental conditions, road safety and personal health. It would like to see more detail on deterrent measures. It supports the provision of better travel information, including Smarter Travel programmes and also the development of 'cleaner' technologies, although there should be priority given to non-motorised travel, particularly for short trips in inner London. It supports the linking of transport and planning; the recognition of the role played by boroughs in delivering transport solutions; accessible transport infrastructure; and the development of public and sustainable transport in Outer London, provided it is not at the expense of inner boroughs. It would like to know more about the criteria used to determine value for money. It welcomes the development of London Overground (especially North London Line), and would like to know more about the future of Crossrail 2. It is opposed to motorcycles being allowed in bus lanes and has concerns about traffic light rephasing leading to more traffic and adverse impacts on pedestrians. It supports 'shared space' and suggests Kingsland High Street as a site, and supports the cycle hire scheme, while having reservations about the possible cyclists' left turn on red. There should be more information on road safety and more emphasis on walking: it believes the removal of the road user hierarchy could have a detrimental impact on pedestrians and cyclists.

The London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

The London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham welcomes the general approach of the document. In particular it welcomes the recognition of the role of the boroughs and the need to address transport and land-use planning issues together. It is pleased to see the approach to reducing traffic congestion by improving signal timings; the commitment to urban realm improvements; the recognition of the importance of choice and providing real alternatives to single-occupancy car use; and the commitment to improve the Underground. It would like to see a lift installed at Shepherds Bush Central line station to aid disabled access. It notes that the borough has very congested north-south road routes and hopes that there will be specific work on this issue. It states that London needs a quieter and less polluting bus as well as the new 'Routemaster'. It supports the expansion of river transport and would like to see high-speed rail developed as an alternative to Heathrow expansion. However, it does not support the use of the Thames Tideway tunnel for dealing with sewage.

The London Borough of Haringey

The London Borough of Haringey states that it favours a road user hierarchy and generally it gives priority to pedestrians, cyclists, buses, delivery vehicles and disabled drivers. It believes that there is a need to manage demand for car use and would like to see more detail on both demand management and Smarter Travel in the document. It welcomes the emphasis on Outer London and orbital routes and states that it has long identified a need for orbital bus services. It is concerned that there do not appear to be plans to accommodate the demand which would have been met by major projects that are now cancelled (CRT,

Tramlink extensions, for example). It questions the value of rephasing traffic lights and does not support allowing motorcycles in bus lanes. It queries how cycle highways would differ from the London Cycle Network but supports cycling hubs in Outer London. It would like to see more attention given to road safety issues, including 20mph zones.

The London Borough of Havering

The London Borough of Havering supports the response made by London Councils and would particularly like to see more detail in MTS on how transport is integrated with other sectors such as health and education. It supports the general principles in Way to Go although there are omissions. It welcomes the emphasis on choice, developing Outer London, improving the urban realm, Crossrail and the bus review. It would like there to be more consideration of how the planned new homes in the Thames Gateway will be provided with transport, and notes that Dagenham Dock DLR and East London Transit would have helped with this. It supports schemes to improve suburban rail services and states that there is a particular need on the Fenchurch St to Grays line. It would like more detail on tackling congestion and highway maintenance. Havering also states that there should be more attention to travel demand management and how the climate change impacts of transport will be addressed. It broadly welcomes schemes to encourage cycling but considers that schemes should be adapted locally - in Havering money would be better spent on improving cycle routes rather than providing cycle hire. It is concerned that there are some costly proposals in Way to Go, for example the re-introduction of the Routemaster, and that the commitment to Outer London needs to be reflected in funding.

The London Borough of Hillingdon

The London Borough of Hillingdon supports the principles for developing policy and is keen that Outer London boroughs have a role in developing the policies. It welcomes the recognition that for many, public transport is not a viable option. In particular, it would like to see improved orbital services and a stronger bus network in outer West London; Central Line and Metropolitan line extensions; more investment in travel planning; and recognition of the surface transport access needs of Heathrow. It would like better customer care practices and more attention to freight, particularly Freight Quality Partnerships. It welcomes the review of traffic signalling and roadworks programming to improve traffic flow. It is pleased to see a commitment to improve access for the disabled and providing better information so that people can make sustainable travel choices. Finally, Hillingdon welcomes the sub-regional approach to transport planning and notes that there is also a need to work in partnership with authorities outside London to deliver schemes effectively.

The London Borough of Hounslow

The London Borough of Hounslow broadly welcomes the principles outlined in Way To Go, especially emphasis on outer London. Car use in Hounslow is high, and the council says this reflects limited orbital public transport options, the unsuitability of public transport for shift workers (of which there are many around Heathrow) and the fact that walking is not suitable for many of the longer commutes within outer London. Whilst Hounslow is in favour of respecting choice, it also considers that the road hierarchy should reflect the negative impacts of private car use. Improved working with boroughs, the need to address planning and transport policies, commitments to improving the public realm, commitments to improving accessibility, tackling congestion and enabling people to make more sustainable choices are also welcomed. Hounslow considers that more specific proposals will be

necessary in MTS2. With regards to protecting the environment, there is a concern that emissions from cars, vans and lorries also need to be addressed. Hounslow feels strongly that MTS2 should include a Heathrow expansion contingency plan to provide appropriate transport solutions should the expansion of the airport go ahead. Hounslow cites poor walking and cycling environments as a barrier to these modes of travel. It would like to see improvements to the walking environment, a trial of a cycle hire scheme in outer London and more emphasis on Smarter Travel. Hounslow has concerns about allowing motorcycles in bus lanes.

The London Borough of Islington

The London Borough of Islington would like to see more information on the principles and policies contained in the document. It says more transport investment is required to enable the borough to meet its regeneration and housing targets. It supports sub-regional transport strategies, but is sceptical about the idea of polycentric development. It does not support removing the road hierarchy and would like to see more information about the rephrasing of traffic lights to ensure cyclists and pedestrians would not be disadvantaged. It also supports the dismantling of gyratories. Islington considers there should be greater emphasis on road safety and accident reduction, and cannot see any alternatives to road humps. It agrees that walking and cycling should be promoted but think there needs to be a much stronger emphasis – it would like to see more investment in Islington and questions the cut in borough funding for LCN+. Islington opposes the delay in improvements to Highbury & Islington and Finsbury Park stations and states that a comprehensive review of door-to-door services is also required. There is support for reducing street clutter, better asset maintenance and improved access to public toilets and baby changing facilities, which should be available at all new stations and interchanges. Islington does not support the extension of Heathrow and Gatwick and instead supports alternatives to flying.

The London Borough of Lambeth

The London Borough of Lambeth believes that the road user hierarchy should be maintained, and that in order to protect the environment, new technology must work alongside a suite of measures to influence mode choice. There is support for better information services. Lambeth supports the development at outer London, as long as it is not at the expense of inner London boroughs. There is strong support for the integration of transport and planning and for providing a fully accessible transport network. Lambeth understands the importance of the Value for Money agenda, but regrets the abandonment of the Cross River Tram. It also feels that Lambeth does not really benefit from the plans outlined in Way to Go. It would like to see more on measures to deal with public transport congestion, especially on the Northern Line and the overreliance on bus service; alternatives to Cross River Tram; tackling barriers to cycling (including replacement for LCN+, cycle parking on social housing stock and training); and extending the use of Oyster. Lambeth says the Mayor's Transport Strategy should also include a road danger reduction plan and there should be more support for car clubs. There is concern about the safety implications for cyclists of allowing motorcycles in bus lanes. Lambeth would also like to retain control of s106 money to ensure that local schemes are prioritised.

The London Borough of Lewisham

The London Borough of Lewisham agrees with respecting choices, but feels that cars are still given priority and this need to be addressed. It welcomes the principle of protecting the

environment but thinks this needs to be matched with clear policies to reduce emissions arising from transport use. Lewisham supports the development of out of town centres but believes it is important that transport and planning are integrated to prevent new car journeys on non traditional corridors. Lewisham welcomes the acknowledgement of the boroughs' roles and responsibilities relating to transport in London, but thinks not enough recognition is given to the work that boroughs do in implementing the strategy and this should be made explicit in MTS. Enhancing accessibility for all is to be welcomed although TfL should clarify how it will help achieve this. Improvements to London Overground are supported, in particular extension of the East London Line, although there are concerns about funding for the second phase. Lewisham welcome the suggestions regarding permit charges and already operates its own system. Objectives for urban realm improvement are supported as is the approach to increasing cycling. Lewisham would also support the development of the tube network in South London, including the extension of the Bakerloo line. It also considers that specific measures to reduce CO₂ emissions from transport are necessary.

London Councils

London Councils agrees with the principles outlined, especially greater emphasis on outer London and developing orbital transport. It supports the emphasis on choice but also realises it is not possible to provide facilities for unrestricted car use in all parts of London at all times. It thinks the Mayor's Transport Strategy should promote sustainable transport modes and encourage people to use these modes wherever they can. It strongly supports the integration of transport and planning and polycentric growth. It welcomes the emphasis on working with the boroughs but highlights that there may be some discrepancy with the way TfL deals with boroughs on LIPs funding at the moment. It also thinks there should be greater transparency of TfL's detailed future plans, shared with the boroughs. London Councils believes that the strategy should provide greater certainty about a funding settlement for boroughs. It says that major projects should not be abandoned without proper consultation with the boroughs and that government should be lobbied for funding for larger projects such as Crossrail 2. The promotion of walking and cycling is welcomed but much higher priority should be given to walking. London Councils would like to see improved interchanges between modes and within modes and believes there is a need for innovative sustainable solutions to delivering freight in London. It also calls for a review of the bus network, in collaboration with the boroughs and London Councils.

The London Borough of Merton

The London Borough of Merton supports the general principles outlined in Way to Go, particularly the move away from a modal hierarchy. It states that this will help to facilitate a holistic approach to the road network. It supports the promotion of walking and cycling, but would like to see more detail on walking policy. It would like there to be more tram extensions, and improvements to the Overground network and the Thameslink loop. It would also like to discuss further enhancements to the Northern line, resist further flights at Heathrow and has concerns regarding the Sheppey proposals. Merton would also like the Mayor to state his intentions with regard to parking. It is keen that there is a more flexible approach to parking standards, particularly in outer London where the car is used more and the regeneration of town centres is influenced by parking policy.

The London Borough of Newham

The London Borough of Newham supports the general principles outlined in Way To Go and states that the Mayor's Transport Strategy should set out a spatial strategy encompassing transport and regeneration. It welcomes the increased focus on Outer London. It is concerned about the future of major projects which are important to the borough: Thames Gateway Bridge and the DLR Dagenham dock extension. It also questions why the relevant boroughs were not consulted on these cancellations, as well as pointing out that there continues to be a need to improve public transport in these areas, and specifically to provide a river crossing. It welcomes the plans to increase river transport and walking and cycling. It is also pleased to see the emphasis on collaborative working between TfL and the boroughs, though it asks how subregional partnerships will be reflected in the second round of LIPS. It supports the development of more flexible fares and notes that many of its residents opt for long bus journeys as they are cheaper compared to other modes, and that only half its residents have access to a car. It says that there should be a reappraisal of the PPP investment programme to ensure it is fit for purpose. Newham believes that any future appraisal of the air needs of London should consider the role of London City Airports and should consider environmental impacts. It also questions plans for a river crossing in the East in light of the cancellation of the Thames Gateway Bridge and calls for a development of East London buses, including transits, express and orbital services.

The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames advocates the principle of choice but states that the modal hierarchy should be retained in order to encourage sustainable transport choices. It hopes to lead in the area of 'green' travel and will be introducing Smarter Travel in 2009. It welcomes the focus on Outer London and says that polycentric growth can help to reduce transport demand, noting that the London Plan should support this aim. It welcomes the East London Line extension to Clapham Junction and the development of orbital links. TfL should also seek to work with local Partnerships as well as the boroughs, and must have regard to boroughs' views on how plans should be delivered locally. Funding for accessibility projects must be spread across London and not just in the centre. It would like to see a reference to Airtrack, the Heathrow-Waterloo rail link, which while not in the Mayor's direct remit, is very important. It opposes the expansion of Heathrow but does not support proposals for an airport on the Thames Estuary, stating that fast rail links should replace some short haul flights. It supports urban realm improvements, the encouragement of walking and cycling and would like a reference to car clubs, which it strongly supports. It would like more emphasis on travel planning and for the Mayor to lobby the government for funding. It does not support the suspension of Phase 3 of the LEZ.

The London Borough of Southwark

The London Borough of Southwark notes that it is unlikely to benefit from the new major transport projects such as tube upgrades and Crossrail. It is disappointed that Cross River Tram and East London Line Phase 2 are not being continued, particularly given the number of Opportunity Areas in the borough and the Mayor's recognition of the important link between transport and land use. It is supportive of any extension of the Bakerloo line southwards. Southwark states that a major problem for the borough is managing traffic flows and would like to see measures to reduce motor traffic as well as managing roadworks. It would also like to see more detail on road safety policies and is concerned that the importance of people traffic flow - particularly pedestrians - could be overlooked in the transport hierarchy. It supports cycling but not the potential for cyclists turning left on red. It

would welcome a review of buses and asks how capacity issues would be addressed if bendy buses were removed. It would like to see more detail on freight policy.

The London Borough of Sutton

The London Borough of Sutton agrees that it is better to persuade people out of cars, and that it is important to provide public transport alternatives, but does not agree that a modal hierarchy should be abandoned. It agrees that there should be improved provision of information and cites the success of Smarter Travel Sutton initiative. It would like to see a wider roll-out of the Legible London scheme. It supports the reduction of CO₂ emissions from transport. Sutton is pleased to see the emphasis on improving transport in Outer London, and is keen to see express bus services and rail links. It supports the development of the polycentric city, and would like to see Croydon Tramlink extended to Sutton town centre. It supports improvements to accessibility, particularly on the Overground rail network. While understanding the need for value for money, it hopes that major projects such as the Tramlink are retained for the longer term. There are opportunities to save money in the LIPs process, and there is scope for boroughs to work together effectively. Sutton also says that there might be a need for more emphasis on revenue funding to maintain existing infrastructure rather than large capital projects. It would welcome any further influence that the Mayor can have over Overground rail, which is heavily used in Sutton. It welcomes the emphasis on walking and cycling. It would like to see greater subsidy of fares and improvements to the passenger experience. It is concerned that a longer green phase on traffic lights for motorists may generate more traffic in the long term.

The London Borough of Tower Hamlets

The London Borough of Tower Hamlets welcomes the cycle hire scheme, the plans to expand river transport and Oyster, and the High Street 2012 project. It is concerned about abandoning a road user hierarchy because it is important to allocate valuable road space to the most efficient modes and more vulnerable groups. It is also concerned that bendy buses should not be removed without a viable alternative in place. It does not support allowing motorcycles in bus lanes. It welcomes Crossrail but notes that this should not be at the expense of local public transport schemes. It would like to see a consideration of a tram network in London.

The London Borough of Waltham Forest

The London Borough of Waltham Forest states that it envisages having new working arrangements with TfL to reflect sub-regional working in partnership with the five Olympic boroughs. With regard to Way to Go, it welcomes the emphasis on Outer London, improving the public realm and the attention paid to crime and disorder. It would like to see more stress on shifting people away from cars to more sustainable modes and notes that its ambitious housing growth targets need to be catered for by public transport provision. It would like to see an expansion of the local bus network and is concerned about recent above inflation fare increases. It does not agree that it is always best to remove road humps and notes the success of 20mph zones in the borough. It supports more cycling and would be interested in the cycle hire scheme. It supports Crossrail and the PPP for the upgrade of the Victoria line but is disappointed that the capacity and accessibility upgrades at Leyton and Leytonstone tube stations seem unlikely. For Overground, the line should be electrified and there is a need for longer trains to support regeneration. It hopes that traffic signal rephasing is done without a negative impact on the safety of pedestrians.

The London Borough of Wandsworth

The London Borough of Wandsworth welcomes the commitment to working with the boroughs and is pleased to see that Phase 2b of the East London Line will be pursued. It is also supportive of the use of Oyster on National Rail and on river services. It is disappointed about the cancellation of the Tramlink Extension and hopes this can be revisited at a later date. It queries the move away from a transport hierarchy, noting that there needs to be a balance between users. It also notes that policies to smooth traffic flow would tend to favour motor traffic. It states that there needs to be consideration of whether personal choice or the environment is more important. It would like to see more detail on walking policies, and road safety. Wandsworth also states that it is important to maintain existing transport infrastructure and also provide infrastructure in Opportunity Areas, for example Nine Elms/Battersea.

The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames

The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames welcomes the Mayor's emphasis on developing Outer London as economic centres in their own right. It is keen that the Mayor recognises the role of Smarter Travel in encouraging people out of their cars and that further work on the use of regulation, incentives and technology is pursued in this area, in addition to providing transport alternatives. Also it points out that sustainable travel can help to reduce air quality pollutant and CO₂ emissions. It notes that Kingston, despite being a key retail destination, has poor transport links, both in terms of orbital links and links within the borough. It would like to know more about the Mayor's long term plans for the tube and trams south of the river. It would like to see an increase in services on the Richmond Loop. It supports rolling out Oyster to National Rail services and would like there to be zoning of National Rail stations in the borough. It notes that as it borders Surrey County Council, the development of links outside London is also crucial. It welcomes the emphasis on cycling and would like to introduce cycle hubs and collaborate in a cycle hire scheme with the London Borough of Richmond. It is concerned about the 'left turn at red' for cyclists as a potential hazard for pedestrians. It would welcome more Legible London initiatives and would like a statement from the Mayor on parking, including park-and-ride schemes. Finally it states that express coach services could be a quick way to facilitate orbital links.

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea (RBKC)

The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea welcomes the Mayor's acknowledgement that the car is not evil and hopes that this belief extends to LIPs in practice. It also welcomes the emphasis on walking and cycling and the potential to develop further 'shared space' schemes. Cleaner technology should be supported, but it remains unconvinced about electric vehicles. It supports the plans to make transport wheelchair accessible but notes the improvements planned for South Kensington station have been delayed, which would have helped with this. It supports the plans for a new Routemaster. It also supports the introduction of a Permit scheme for roadworks and a review of traffic light timings but this needs to involve the boroughs. RBKC supports plans for cleaner taxis and plans to expand river transport, but this should be started ahead of the Olympics. RBKC is pleased that the Chelsea-Hackney line is under consideration and it welcomes the cycle hire scheme though it is concerned about revenue impacts. RBKC is very supportive of efforts to improve the urban realm and reduce street clutter, and is keen to encourage walking and cycling. However, it has concerns about allowing cyclists' left turn on red. It states that it hopes that

transport policy is joined up with noise policy and there should be an overall aim to reduce noise from traffic, by developing quiet vehicle technology for example.

London Political Representatives (3)

The London Assembly Labour Group

The GLA Labour Group states that there needs to be a longer-term and more ambitious set of objectives for London and hopes that this will be set out in the Transport Strategy. It suggests the DfT's five 'Delivering a Sustainable Transport System' goals as a starting point, and is particularly keen to see more on transport's role in regeneration. It does not support a rejection of the transport hierarchy and says that, with limited road space and rising air quality pollutants and CO₂ emissions, there should be focus on encouraging sustainable transport. Schemes which are currently unfunded should be retained for future consideration and it also suggests a number of additional new projects to enhance capacity, for example a new river crossing at Silvertown. While it welcomes TfL working more closely with boroughs, there should also be engagement with other stakeholders like community groups. Outer London links should be radial to central London as well as orbital. It welcomes cycle hire but is concerned about its focus on central London and if money will be diverted from other cycling work; similarly it supports the principle of value for money but questions spending on schemes such as Kent Airport and the new Routemaster. It calls for an overarching review of buses; better surface links to airports and a review of the Congestion Charge. It supports providing good information to travellers but this should be supplemented with more regard to customer care. There should be an additional principle of safety and security, addressing gyratories, pedestrian crossings and excessive traffic speeds. It is concerned about the reduction in the target for step-free access, saying that this is especially required at Finsbury Park station.

The London Assembly Liberal Democrat Group

The GLA Liberal Democrat Group thinks that there needs to be a consideration of whether there is always a need to travel, and where there is, there should be a focus on ensuring it has minimal impact on air quality and CO₂ emissions. Particularly it would like to see an electric tramway connecting south London to the centre and the north, and says that private investment could be an option for this. It supports developing Outer London but questions why schemes like the Dagenham Dock DLR which could have enabled this, are being cancelled. It strongly supports walking and cycling, and would like to see a 'walkability' test for routes and possibly the development of a London Walking Map; it would also like to see a pedestrianised Oxford Street. It states that taxis should meet Euro 4 standard by 2010 and the GLA group should use its combined purchasing power to encourage the development of electric and hybrid vehicles. There should be a high-speed rail link between Heathrow and Birmingham via St Pancras and the Channel Tunnel should be open to Dutch and German railways. By extending his influence over National Rail, the Mayor could help to integrate transport modes and also help those in Outer London who have less access to the tube network. Park-and-ride schemes at the places where the M25 and Overground stations meet should also be considered, to discourage motor traffic into London. Express coaches would help Outer London and there should be a clear emphasis on accessibility. There should be a consideration of re-scheduling school hours or allowing night-time deliveries to ease traffic congestion.

The London Assembly Transport Committee

The GLA Transport Committee would like to see new projections for London's population and employment growth, and how these will be affected by the economic downturn. It would like more information on plans to cater for the demand envisaged in T2025 as many of the planned major projects are now cancelled, although demand remains - long term planning for new capacity is vital. It says there should be more on demand management and surface links to airports. The GLA Transport Committee welcomes the integration of planning and transport and the development of outer London. Promotion of walking and cycling is welcomed, but more detail on how this will be achieved, especially in outer London, is needed. It says analysis of the role of walking and cycling in the Mayor's Transport Strategy should take into account their environmental and health advantages. There are concerns about the effect of traffic smoothing and abandoning the transport hierarchy as suppressed travel demand may be released. It considers that high-capacity modes should be afforded priority where there is competition for road space. The committee considers that there needs to be more information on how the Mayor will address CO₂ and air quality emissions from transport. It would like a clarification of his position on alternative fuels and technology, and how this will be employed by TfL. It would like TfL to reprofile its spending to benefit business and employment, possibly through the Dagenham Dock extension and Tramlink extension. It expects to see much more detailed information in the Mayor's Transport Strategy on the plans for financing and delivering the ideas outlined in Way to Go.

London Assembly Members (1)

Jenny Jones AM

Ms Jones strongly supports polycentric development and the integration of transport and planning in order to reduce the need to travel. Ms Jones supports Transport Demand Management, more emphasis on Smarter Travel measures, more radial routes and increased capacity on existing routes to cope with increasing demand; and believes government should be lobbied to fund major projects such as extensions to the East London Line and Croydon Tramlink extension. There is a need for specific measures to meet CO₂ targets after many of the previous measures, such as CO₂ charging, have been abandoned. Ms Jones considers that cutting traffic is key, with a reduction in energy in the TfL fleet and underground and rail systems are also necessary. She disagrees with any expansion of aviation capacity in South East England. Suggestions are made for improving air quality. The promotion of walking and cycling is welcomed, but LCN+ needs more funding. Ms Jones also considers that expansion in cycling numbers will require much larger scale of investment, and that there is a similar situation with walking, with rapid introduction of Legible London across London, pedestrian zones and better signage all necessary. Ms Jones thinks MTS should pay more attention to non commuter trips, contain more measures for freight and have more emphasis on social inclusion. The cancellation of the Thames Gateway Bridge is supported. Supported measures include the expansion of 20 mph zones, the proposed improvements to Parliament Square and Victoria embankment, greater emphasis on modal shift in outer London and increased use of river and rail.

Motoring Organisations (3)

The Association of British Drivers (ABD)

The Association of British Drivers disagrees that the number of buses in London is an achievement, stating that bus ridership has only increased because the alternatives have become less attractive. It states that Congestion Charging should be scrapped, along with bus lanes and pedestrian friendly phasing of traffic lights. It does not believe that people should be persuaded out of their cars. It agrees with air quality targets, but believes that buses and taxis should catch up with advances already made in private vehicles. The ABD agrees that TfL should be working with the boroughs and supports the Value for Money agenda. It supports separate cycle routes so that there is less conflict with the motorist. It would like more orbital and arterial roads built, and a new river crossing east of Tower Bridge. It seeks a revision of road safety rules, an end to automatic enforcement of box junctions and a harmonisation of parking regulations.

The British Motorcyclists Federation

The British Motorcyclists Federation is disappointed that the role that motorcycles could play in improving London's transport has been overlooked. It welcomes the emphasis on cycling but states that there is not such a difference between cycling and motorcycling, especially with regard to electric scooters and electric bicycles.

Hillingdon Motorists Forum

Hillingdon Motorists Forum welcomes plans to review traffic light phases. It would also like to see a reform of the Congestion Charge and the potential for new roads to be built.

Non-departmental Public Bodies (3)

English Heritage

English Heritage supports a switch away from cars because traffic is gradually eroding the quality of the historic environment. It supports promotion of walking and cycling but believes infrastructure should be minimal. English Heritage considers that all transport appraisals should look at impacts on the historic environment at an appropriate level.

The Environment Agency

The Environment Agency is pleased to see that sustainability is embedded in Way to Go, and welcomes the linkage between transport and planning policies. It supports the greater use of river transport; the Low Emission Zone (and its planned phases) and supports road user charging provided that there is an environmental benefit. It also supports walking and cycling, which benefit both the environment and public health. There should be a specific commitment to develop biofuels, particularly the use of biomethane in transport, generated from anaerobic digestion of waste. London would be ideally suited for this. It would also like to see a commitment to support the development of hydrogen as a fuel, particularly with sustainable generation. This will require significant upfront investment.

Natural England

Natural England supports much of the content of the document but has serious concerns about the proposals for an airport in the Thames Estuary and considers that a number of other areas do not currently realise their full potential, including walking and cycling as modes of active travel. It would strongly advocate a greater emphasis on walking and cycling and finds the lack of prominence given to walking of particular concern. There is support for large projects which include public realm improvements and the creation of green

space, cleaner technology in buses and greater use of the river for transportation of people and goods.

NHS Greater London (2)

North West London Hospitals NHS Trust

NW London Hospitals NHS Trust notes that transport is extremely important for its staff and patients and for deliveries. The NHS is working in partnership with TfL in the Health Services Reconfiguration Programme and it is also working with Brent Council, user groups and local PCTs to plan access to healthcare facilities. It states that more needs to be done to encourage people to use public transport and encourage a modal shift away from the car. It has reduced its car parking facilities and provided cycle hire and parking. It states that providing better public transport, particularly buses, and the information to encourage people to use them, is key. It describes changes that it would like to see on specific routes and argues that the step-free access programme should be prioritised in stations near hospitals, namely Northwick Park. It would like to see more information about bus services provided at healthcare sites, including the facility to buy Oyster cards. Finally it states that customer care should be a principle in improving transport, for example ensuring that buses allow easy access from the kerb.

The Regional Public Health Group London

The Regional Public Health Group London notes that transport is a determinant of health and health inequalities, for which the Mayor has statutory duties. It states that London is disproportionately affected by low levels of physical activity, road traffic accidents, air pollution and levels of social exclusion. It supports the notion of a transport hierarchy although there are hierarchies within it (for example in the emission levels of cars). It would like there to be a commitment to achieving targets on air quality pollutants and CO₂ emissions. It supports the emphasis on Outer London and notes that the NHS is working with TfL in locating new health facilities and this approach should be used elsewhere to encourage sustainable travel choices. It welcomes the emphasis on walking and cycling and would like more Safer Routes to schools and would like there to be a commitment to 'liveable streets', and particular attention to safety. It agrees that it is important to link land-use and planning to make places accessible to all and encourage active lifestyles. It states that incentives and disincentives to encourage modal shift should be considered and suggests there could be ways to use Oyster data to reward those who choose public transport.

Political Organisations (3)

Croydon Labour Party Retired Group

Croydon Labour Party Retired Group is concerned about the cancellation of previously agreed major projects, particularly the Tramlink extension to Crystal Palace. It welcomes the bus review as travelling on some buses is not easy for older people.

Liberal Youth

Liberal Youth urges the Mayor to reconsider the cancellation of the Cross River Tram scheme, as this would create jobs and benefit communities.

Southwark Labour Group

Southwark Labour Group agrees with proposals for increased capacity and reliability on tube; improved roadworks arrangements; and reducing pavement obstacles. However, it disagrees with removing bendy buses which it says suit local roads and replacing them with more double deckers would increase congestion. It questions whether it is true that traffic lights are configured against motorists and says that it is unfair to blame young travellers and characterise buses as dangerous places. It supports the tube upgrades and Crossrail, but does not support the cancellation of Cross River Tram and the Tramlink expansion to Crystal Palace. It considers that lobbying work should continue despite a lack of funding. It would also like to see the Bakerloo line extended to Camberwell. It would like to see funding secured for the second phase of the East London Line extension; if this is not secured, the Mayor should oppose the closure of South London Line services. It believes that regular bus services encourage usage and should be maintained, despite not always being full of passengers. It supports controlling road works, but not the shortening of pedestrian phases on traffic lights. It proposes making Elephant & Castle roundabout more suitable for active modes. It does not support allowing motorcycles to use bus lanes or the removal of the Western Extension of the Congestion Charging zone. It supports cycle hire schemes as well as the increased use of the river.

Professional Organisations (1)

The Association for Consulting and Engineering

The Association for Consulting and Engineering shares the Mayor's vision of a sustainable, effective and responsive transport system. It identifies four key challenges - making use of the existing network, investing to enhance capacity, reducing energy consumption per passenger mile and setting out a long-term vision for developing London's transport networks.

Public Transport Operators (2)

London Taxi Network

London Taxi Network would like more recognition of the vital role that taxis play in the transport network and sets out a number of measures which it would like to see taken. It would like greater development of the radio taxi circuit; a modernisation of 'The Knowledge' and better marketing of taxis. It says that there is a need to ensure there are enough drivers for the future and particularly that there is a shortage of night-time drivers. It does not support the external signage on private hire vehicles (PHVs) and is concerned about illegal touting and does not support these and other vehicles being allowed in bus lanes.

Network Rail

Network Rail supports many of the principles set out in Way to Go and notes that these reflect its own approach to value for money, reducing the environmental impact of transport, ensuring accessibility and developing Outer London. It supports and will be a key player in the delivery of projects including Crossrail, Olympics and the Overground expansion. Network Rail sets out its own programme for expanding capacity and upgrading stations and states that rail has environmental advantages over other modes and also that it is working to improve its energy efficiency and develop low carbon sources. However it is concerned that a shortage of apprentices puts its plans at risk and suggests that the GLA bodies can have a role in addressing this. It also states that it should be exempted from the new Community

Infrastructure Levy (CIL), noting that it already misses out on much of the s106 money raised by boroughs and the potential cost of paying CIL could put schemes at risk. It also hopes that money can be raised from commercial developers.

Residents' Associations (2)

Eastcote Residents' Association

Eastcote Residents' Association states that safety should be a key consideration in transport policy and there should be more emphasis on transport users respecting each other. It would also like the principle of working with the boroughs to be extended to other groups. The Association considers greater attention should be paid to the efficient movement of goods and services and that cycling standards are improved significantly. It agrees that roadworks should be coordinated to minimise disruption and more collaboration between authorities to bring about effective change. It also advocates the use of smarter travel initiatives.

The Knightsbridge Association

The Knightsbridge Association agrees that outer London has separate needs which require their own approach and it considers that there is a need for a peripheral road transport system. The Mayor is commended for his general vision of improving rail, cycling and walking; however there is some concern that there is a negative attitude towards buses. The Association does not think the new Routemaster is a good idea. It thinks a transport hierarchy is important and that additional pricing schemes are necessary to manage demand for private vehicle use.

Transport and Environment Representative Organisations (17)

The Campaign against Climate Change, Transition Town Kingston and Kingston Cycling Campaign

The Campaign against Climate Change, Transition Town Kingston and Kingston Cycling Campaign welcomes the commitment to continue improvements to the public transport system, and to increase provision for cycling and to combat climate change. However they find that some of the policies are conflicting: committing to reduce local pollution and global carbon emissions, the mayor opposes the third runway at Heathrow, yet favours expansion elsewhere; to speed up car journeys, traffic light phasing is being reviewed to reduce waiting times, which may conflict with the needs of other road users, particularly disabled people; and speeding car journeys may encourage more motor road users and ultimately increase congestion and pollution. They are disappointed that the emphasis is placed on choice rather than measures to ensure London achieves its reduction in carbon emissions. They state that there is a need to look at more ways to encourage people to use public transport services.

The Campaign for Better Transport (CBT)

The Campaign for Better Transport considers that abolishing the hierarchy of modes is not helpful as it is sensible to make provision for the most efficient means of travel whilst discouraging the least efficient. It agrees with the need to move beyond the combustion engine, but says that fumes from cars, as well as buses and taxis must be challenged. It supports improved transport in outer London and would like to see better integration between transport and planning. The CBT does not think smoothing traffic flow is necessarily

desirable as it will lead to increased traffic, emissions and CO₂. It recommends instead reducing speed limits from 30 mph to 20 mph and not rephasing traffic signals. The street environment needs to be improved, not only through removal of street furniture but in a reduction in traffic volumes. The promotion of walking and cycling is welcomed, but it is noted that there are no measures to encourage walking in the document. Cycling measures are welcome but piecemeal. It supports the removal of some buses from Oxford Street and opposition to Heathrow expansion, but opposes an airport in the Thames Estuary and a tunnel under Park Lane. It would also like to see a reduction in carbon emissions from transport in London and plans for new light rail proposals, even if there is not funding for them at present.

The Campaign for Clean Air in London

The Campaign for Clean Air in London reminds the Mayor of the importance of his air quality obligations. The response calls for further Low Emission Zones and disagrees with removing the Western Extension of the Congestion Charging zone.

The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)

The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) agrees with the principles set out in Way to Go, although it believes that the list is not exhaustive and should be prioritised. It would like modal shift, climate change, sustainability, investing in the future, quality of life and local connectivity to be included. It believes that although choice should be encouraged, motorists should pay for the social cost of their choice. Managing demand of the overall network is also key to sustainability. It agrees with the integration of planning and transport policy and thinks new development should aim to reduce the need to travel. There should be more mention of climate change and an acknowledgment of how taxi and lorry traffic contributes. There should also be more reference to measures used to promote walking and cycling. The CPRE agrees with improving the public realm by reducing street furniture, providing better information, improving transport links in outer London and introducing freight consolidation hubs. It disagrees with abandoning the transport hierarchy and allowing motorcycles to use bus lanes. There is concern over the proposals for a new airport in the Thames Estuary and support for greater use of the River Thames for transport purposes.

Ealing Cycling Campaign

Ealing Cycling Campaign supports cycle hire schemes, in both inner and outer London but highlights the importance of well maintained cycles. It also supports dedicated routes for nervous cyclists, and for the same reason opposes motorcycles in bus lanes. There is emphasis on the need to ensure there are sufficient and attractive secure cycle parking facilities both at stations and elsewhere. Cycle hubs are welcomed with the proviso that the schemes are reviewed and form part of a holistic approach.

Energy Saving Trust

The Energy Saving Trust welcomes measures to increase cycle use and thinks that the environmental aims of mode shift should be more explicit, with a travel hierarchy actively promoted. The Trust is particularly pleased with the intended promotion of cycling in the outer boroughs. It would like to see the use of electric and low carbon vehicles promoted and incentivised in London. In outer boroughs, where car use is more predominant, the Energy

Saving Trust would like more advice and information provided on green choices of vehicle and the most effective driving techniques.

Friends of Capital Transport

Friends of Capital Transport welcomes the acknowledgement of the need to reduce overcrowding at peak periods, to introduce more lifts, the 24 hour Freedom Pass and the commitment to safer cycling. It also welcomes Crossrail, the East London line extension and the plans for London Overground. It notes that there can also be significant benefit from rejuvenating existing infrastructure to make London a better place in which to live and do business as well as investing in big new projects. However, there needs to be a more sophisticated consideration of the pros and cons of the bendy bus: some routes are worse than others. Similarly, Friends of Capital Transport state that the Mayor should look in more detail at the potential congestion impacts of the removal of the Western extension of the Congestion Charging zone. The moves to cool the tube are welcomed and there should also be a consideration of how to cool the buses. It is concerned about the impact of motorcycles in bus lanes on cyclists and pedestrians. There is a need to keep travellers better informed, for example maps for pedestrians. With regard to traffic congestion on Oxford St, it would like to restrictions on taxis and a review of bus contract requirements. It states that 'integration' is missing from Way to Go, and that people should be helped to choose more sustainable modes through better interchanges, information provision and pedestrian links to public transport.

Friends of the Earth

Friends of the Earth welcomes the commitment to encourage people out of cars by providing good public transport; it also welcomes the focus on Outer London and enabling people to live and work in the same place. It also welcomes schemes to encourage walking and cycling and improve the public realm. It states that both transport and land-use plans should focus on how targets for air quality and the reduction of CO₂ emissions will be achieved in the overall package of measures, There should be a focus on reducing road traffic, a low-carbon infrastructure, developing 'green' electric or hydrogen vehicles and addressing inequalities, including health inequalities. It is opposed to new road-building schemes and new river crossings and is pleased that Thames Gateway Bridge has been cancelled. There should not be a new airport on the Thames Estuary, and fast rail should replace short haul flights wherever possible.

Green Chain

Green Chain would like walking to be given equal status as a mode of transport. It thinks walking should be more prominent in the strategy, with its own set of actions. It supports a clear direction for local travel, particularly in the outer boroughs. Green Chain would like to see more specific detailed projects to support walking in particular the strategic walk network.

Greener Harrow

Greener Harrow supports the principles in the document. It welcomes the promotion of walking and cycling but considers that there should be more careful planning of cycle lanes so as not to restrict traffic flow, the security, location and quality of bicycle storage facilities should be improved, in addition to increasing numbers. These facilities should be available at all Tube, Overground and National Rail stations. It also thinks walking initiatives should be

integrated with PCTs, local amenity groups and local authorities. It thinks there should be more emphasis on School Travel Plans and the efficiency of existing public transport (e.g. by making doors open and close quicker). It suggests integrating the timetables of Overground with National Rail at interchange stations and introducing more local buses. There is concern that the accessibility programme has been slowed and action on this is urged. There are suggestions for information improvements on tubes and ticket machines. There is support for electric charge points, a review of Dial-a-Ride services and questions whether 24 hour freedom passes are justifiable in the current economic context. There is concern that new projects such as Crossrail should have contingency plans for extra capacity should plans for Heathrow expansion go ahead.

Hackney Living Streets

Hackney Living Streets states that there is an imbalance between different road users and that the prioritisation given to motor traffic leads to adverse impacts for others in terms of safety, environment and priority. It is concerned that the document does not address this and is in danger of leading to making this imbalance worse by making things better for cars. It would like to see more investment in Smarter Travel and a recognition of the role that good public realm plays in improving health and wellbeing. It welcomes initiatives to improve streets for all users and would like to see 20mph zones, changes to gyratories, pedestrian priority and the encouragement of car sharing. It opposes the retiming of traffic signals to favour motor traffic but would support upgrading puffin and pelican crossings away from junctions to zebras. It is disappointed that there was no consultation on the decision to allow motorcycles in bus lanes, which it does not support.

London Cycling Campaign

London Cycling Campaign welcomes the emphasis on cycling in Way to Go and makes 13 detailed suggestions about how increased cycling might be achieved. These are: 1. Permeability e.g. improving cycle access by returning gyratories to two-way; 2. Improved road safety for all, e.g. by 20mph limit, advanced stop lines; 3. a high standard of cycle route quality, making them easier to use; 4. Measures to mitigate the motor-traffic dominated design of highways, e.g. reclassifying streets; 5. the Cycle Highways Priority Network project needs to be progressed; 6. Development of 'Greenways' - cycle routes through parks; 7. Review the London Cycle Network (LCN) programme to find quick solutions; 8. Introduce 'Filtered Permeability' to calm streets to encourage cycling, walking and improve neighbourhoods; 9. Improvements to public realm and streetscape, which benefit everyone; 10. Help Outer London reduce car dependence, via the cycling measures given here but also car clubs, travel plans; 11. Maximise effectiveness of bike hire scheme by improving Zone 1 routes and providing more cycle parking; 12. Car Free Sundays; 13. Work with partners, including LCC and boroughs, to deliver schemes. It also emphasises the importance of linking spatial planning and transport, has concerns about road space allocation and states that there should be a consideration of road charging schemes.

London Living Streets

London Living Streets strongly supports making walking more attractive and improving the 'liveability' of London's streets, including the removal of unnecessary street clutter. It would like to see reference made to the importance of the Legible London scheme. However it is concerned that there is too much focus on motor traffic and congestion and while it is useful to unblock the traffic, this should not be at the expense of pedestrians and cyclists. It states

that there needs to be a better understanding of 'people-flow' rather than traffic flow. It notes that walking and cycling are free, sustainable and bring a number of environmental, health and social benefits. It would support zones which are restricted or free from traffic, but is concerned about removing road humps and allowing cyclists to turn left on red. It would like more information on tackling CO₂ and air quality pollutant emissions. It would also like a clearer focus on reducing road danger. It suggests that better use could be made of the Thames in getting freight off the road and a 4-day Travelcard on Oyster could help to encourage people to walk or cycle once a week.

Railfuture

Railfuture supports the general principles and welcomes expansion of the Overground, enhanced Oyster coverage, the tube upgrades and the focus on Orbital links. It states that the Mayor should bring forward proposals for Crossrail 2 and is disappointed that Crossrail 1 is a "metro" rather than a subregional scheme. It may support greater control of National Rail in the London and South East region. It would like to see more use of trams, more development of interchanges and ways to encourage private investment which could enable schemes to go ahead.

Sustrans

Sustrans identifies three challenges: coping with projected growth in demand; ensuring that the transport system benefits health and wellbeing; and ensuring that the environmental impact of London's transport is reduced in line with greenhouse gas reduction targets. It would like to see more detail on transport's role in addressing these challenges. It states that there is a benefit in having a road user hierarchy and states that because road space is finite, alternatives to the car need to be prioritised, and there also needs to be restrictions on car use and parking. It would like to see use of 'filtered permeability' - which restricts access for private motorised traffic in specific locations while allowing full permeability to active travel modes. There should be road space reallocation; speed reduction; a safe routes to schools programme and an expanded Greenways programme. It welcomes the idea of Transport for all and also supports the focus on outer London and connecting transport and planning - stating that addressing the dominance of central London could reduce need for commuting and other journeys. It strongly supports measures to encourage walking and cycling, but says that there needs to be a reduction of motor traffic and an improvement in the urban realm to promote sustainable travel, and that both the street and public transport network need to be suitable for younger, older and vulnerable Londoners.

Walk England

Walk England would like walking to be given equal status as a mode of transport and should be more prominent in the strategy. Walk England supports the removal of street furniture and changes to signal timings so that waiting times are not so long as to encourage people to cross on red. It believes that the Mayor should introduce a strategic walk network. Improved information for pedestrians is also necessary.

The Westminster Cycling Campaign

The Westminster Cycling Campaign considers that much of the current road system in central London treats cyclists unfairly. It advocates efforts to make roads safer and more attractive to cyclists and supports designated cycle networks. It identifies gyratories as a particular problem and says further improvements will be necessary to remove this barrier to

cyclists. Westminster Cycling Campaign supports dismantling gyratory systems, allowing two way cycling in one-way streets, allowing cyclists through closures and reduced traffic speeds and volumes. It supports a cycle hire scheme in conjunction with a safe and attractive cycle network. It would welcome the provision of a cycling route along Victoria Embankment but states that for this to be effective, the scheme to change Parliament Square would need to be revived.

Trades Unions (2)

The Trades Union Congress (TUC)

The Trades Union Congress (TUC) states that the document does not say enough about transport in relation to employment and business. It believes that a modal hierarchy should be retained, noting that 40% of London households do not have access to a car. It believes that public transport should be in public ownership and is concerned that cuts detailed in TfL's Business Plan will mean that, despite intentions, schemes may not be achieved, or aspects such as accessibility and staffing could be compromised. It welcomes Oyster on National Rail but there should be more integration of London and south east transport services; there should be more cycle training and provision of cycle parking. It is concerned about the cancellation of Thames Gateway Bridge and does not support the investigation of a Thames Estuary airport, believing that, with conditions, Heathrow capacity should be increased. It would like to see more detail on freight policy.

Unite

Unite is concerned about an abandonment of the transport hierarchy, because the predicted growth in population and subsequent demand for travel will have to be met primarily by public transport. It is disappointed at the cancellation of major projects such as the Cross River Tram and the DLR extension. It welcomes investment in the tube and Overground, and would like more use of green electricity in London Underground. Its main concern is the framework for bus drivers' pay and it states that it is unacceptable that there is a large disparity between the pay of drivers in different companies: it would like to see central pay bargaining. It states that while the removal of bendy buses might create more jobs, the resulting increase in the number of buses would exacerbate congestion. Rather than a revived Routemaster, it believes there should be a low-noise, low-emissions bus developed for London.

Transport Partnerships (1)

SWELTRAC

SWELTRAC broadly agrees with the principles set out but would like to see more recognition of boroughs' role in delivering the strategy, and a recognition of the importance of other partners as well. It states that it is helpful to have a transport hierarchy. It supports outer London development and orbital travel links, as well as improvements to the public realm and encouraging walking and cycling. Cycle hire schemes should be available in Outer London, and it criticises the cut in funding for the London Cycle Network. It is concerned about apparent antagonism towards buses as they are crucial in outer London. SWELTRAC supports the development of innovative technology in order to protect the environment and has been working on installing charging points for electric vehicles. It supports initiatives to increase accessibility, but says this should be addressed across London and not just in the

centre. SWELTRAC considers that transport issues relating to outer London are still not comprehensively covered: it would like an extension of the East London Line, and emphasises the need to develop orbital travel in west London post 2012. There should be a long-term transport investment programme and the government should be lobbied for appropriate funding. It would like improved bus services in Outer London; a stronger commitment to travel planning and Smarter Travel; improved interchange and a consideration of how sustainable surface links to Heathrow can be encouraged.

Utilities (2)

National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG)

National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG) is disappointed that the Mayor has declared a "War on Roadworks", blaming these works for congestion and impeding the smooth flow of traffic. Firstly, NJUG notes that many of these roadworks are carried out by highway authorities, not utilities. Secondly, it notes that the safe and reliable supply of utilities is vital for the liveability of the city, and that the providers are under statutory responsibility to provide this. Finally, it states there is little evidence to suggest that roadworks are responsible for much congestion, and the Mayor should address the main cause, which is traffic. NJUG states that it already cooperates with TfL and the boroughs in planning and coordinating roadworks. The major utilities companies also work together to coordinate works under the London Advance Planning agreement; and there is also joint working with TfL and the Boroughs under the Clearway 2012 project. It adds that while it seeks to minimise delays and overrun, sometimes these are unavoidable because of the availability of specialist teams or the requirements of particular boroughs. It opposes a penalties scheme and states that the costs would be passed on to customers in their utilities bills. It may also discourage utilities and contractors from using the most effective methods, instead opting for a short term quick fix. With regard to a Permits scheme, it feels that it is too soon to introduce one following the introduction of the revised street works notice programme in April 2008. However, if it is to be introduced, it should only apply to traffic-sensitive routes, including the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). It has worked successfully with Kent County Council to develop their permit scheme and wishes to be involved in the development of any Londonwide scheme. TfL and the boroughs should share details of their planned road works with the utilities, reciprocating the information that the utilities share with TfL via the LondonWorks scheme.

Thames Water

Thames Water broadly welcomes the provisions of the draft strategy and particularly the importance of the Thames Tunnel Project - though it states that more reference should be made to the environmental improvements within the section on river transport. Thames Water believes that the regulatory process already provides a powerful economic incentive to work efficiently and says that the chaos of unheralded excavations mentioned in the document is inaccurate as road excavations are rarely unheralded. Thames Water recognises that better coordination with other utilities and the boroughs is necessary with regard to street works, but thinks a permit scheme would have been drawn up in consultation with statutory undertakers to ensure that they have the access they require. It supports initiatives to encourage walking and cycling

Voluntary & Community Groups (2)

The Community Transport Association

The Community Transport Association is disappointed that there has been no recognition of the role that community transport organisations can and do play in delivering accessible transport, stating that this should be addressed in both MTS and the next round of LIPs. It would like to see central funding for the implementation of the plans for more accessible transport. It welcomes new schemes such as Crossrail and the expansion of river transport but notes that accessibility must be considered in their implementation. It welcomes the Safer Trains initiative and the rolling-out of step-free access in the network. It would like the Mayor to consider how bus stops could be used for disabled passenger carrying vehicles, and to address the number of invalid penalty charge notices (PCNs) that are issued to its members' vehicles. It supports the principle of the Low Emission Zone but is concerned about its impact on community organisations which use minibuses.

The London Forum of Civic and Amenity Societies

The London Forum of Civic and Amenity Societies broadly agrees with the principles, but considers that there should be more emphasis on reducing the need to travel, and how the integration of land use planning and transport policy will help London meet its CO₂ commitments. It also considers that there should be more emphasis on demand management and smarter travel measures and freight delivery. Promotion of walking and cycling is supported, not just as means of travel but to promote accessibility and tackle social inclusion issues. More should be done to improve the walking environment. Investment in public transport is also welcomed. It considers that the Congestion Charge has been successful and that the Western Extension should have been altered rather than removed. The development of outer London, with reduced need to travel is welcomed. The London Forum of Civic and Amenity Societies is unsure about allowing motorcycles in bus lanes or changing pedestrian signals as this may have a detrimental impact on walking and cycling.