

**Transport Committee
9 March 2011**

Transcript of Agenda Item 6: Congestion on the Road Network

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Let's welcome our guests to our session on congestion on the road network.

Can I warm up the topic and ask you - I will throw this out generally - whether or not, from the information that has been shared and the information in the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS), everybody is satisfied that the analysis and the data and the information available is accurate? Are we looking at a potential 14% net growth in congestion on London's road networks? I would be very interested if you think there are any gaps in our information and analysis. What effect do you think traffic congestion will have on London's future economy, although there are other issues?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Thank you, Chair. You used the word accurate. I am not sure that is quite the right word. What I would say is --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Reasonable then.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Plausible.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Plausible. The best available.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): I do think TfL has a good long-term record of doing good work in predicting, as far as one can, what is likely to happen. It seems plausible to me that if you believe the growth forecasts in population and employment, and if you believe - and I do, no reason to doubt it - the view about the likely locations of those jobs in relation to their homes, then it follows in a very simple way that you have got a worsening problem over the next couple of decades. It is really that simple. Garrett Emmerson [Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, Transport for London (TfL)] and his colleagues are doing very good work on measuring the performance on the road network today. We are getting to know much more about it. If the new population is anything like the existing population things are going to get worse. It is that simple.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): OK. Anybody else want to comment? Garrett, I think you have had a vote of confidence.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): I will step in before Garrett gets into more of the specific detail. I agree with what Stephen just mentioned; it is about plausibility. There is another word there: it is about certainty. It is very difficult from what I have seen over the last few years and the research that we did when we were looking at developing the MTS about what certainty can actually be plotted around the needs and growth around traffic and congestion, predominantly because of the number of measures that can be implemented and the uncertainty we have about the effectiveness of some of them. Some can be extremely effective and some might not be.

Hence I know there are parts in the MTS that show a variability about effectiveness of measures. That could result in a 14% increase. It could also result in a 4% decrease if they are very

effective. Really it is about a measure of certainty over a very long period of time - a 20 year period. The measures we are looking at now, the things that we may do in the future and how that would affect the level of congestion, especially when we do see an increase in demand, or what happens in terms of our encouraging modal shift on to other modes as well.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Kulveer, that is not in the MTS document. There is not a figure in there that says it could be as favourable as you say. Where would we see that research that suggests there is a breadth of range there?

Mike Keegan (Transport Strategy Manager, TfL): The figure which shows the potential increase in congestion in terms of delay, if we do not do anything, shows an increase of about 20% and 14% if we just deliver the funded schemes in the plan. What that now shows is a range of potential effectiveness of the three main areas of intervention. We have got more public transport, better management of the roads and mode shift initiatives. What we showed in the MTS was the effectiveness that we can measure as best as possible, given all the caveats that were described earlier. The models themselves will never be perfect. That gave this figure: the difference between the 20% and the 14%.

Recognising that people's behaviour may well change over time. Recognising that, for example, as children grow up that are more used to using public transport as a result of the bus fares policy they may well have different travel behaviours. That is shown out in this graph with potential impact through the shading. If you add up all those shaded areas it would bring the range back to today's levels, to zero.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): There is another aspect to this. We are learning all the time, particularly in terms of the management of the road network, as Stephen has pointed out. What we know now is a lot more than what we knew 12 months ago, even when the MTS was written in terms of the effectiveness of some of these measures. If you had told me 12 months ago that we were going to take 20% out of delay and disruption from roadworks I would have struggled to have believed you, but we have. I did not know, 12 months ago, that 34% of all of the unplanned disruption on the network - all of the accidents and breakdowns and the serious delay it causes - occurs on just four roads. We can target those things and we can deliver a proportionally much greater difference.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): We are going to get into sections about what can be done and how effective it is --

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): It is important in understanding that figure.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): OK. You are trying to cast doubt on the projections that are in the MTS but those projections are still there and at the worst end.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): I do not think I am trying to cast doubt on them. What I am saying is any strategy document - and I was involved significantly in writing it in my previous role - is a point in time document. It says this is the best available information we have at the time we set it to paper but that work is continuing and it is continuing at a very fast pace, particularly on our understanding of the interventions.

The other point though is about the figures. As Mike has said, the 14% is a measure of congestion related to speed and congestion is a much more complex phenomenon in terms of the way people understand it. That only relates to a 5% growth in traffic over that period. One of the issues with it is, because the population growth and the economic growth is not evenly spread, that growth is not likely to be evenly spread across the city. In some areas of London you are looking at significantly less than 5% traffic growth and you are not looking at major problems. In other areas, particularly in the east, you have got concentrations of development and concentrations of population growth that are going to give you some very specific problems potentially on key corridors and on key roads. It is a mistake to think it is a pan-London issue; it is an issue that you have got to target.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Thanks, Garrett. We will come back to that geographical hot spot issue as well shortly. As part of the introductory section, could you say something, all of you, about what the impact of potential growth of traffic congestion is on the economy in London and on road users? I use that phrase very broadly. Everybody who uses the road; not just the car drivers.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): You have got the figures in the briefing document. The ones that people trot out. I am not really, myself, terribly enamoured with that particular way of calculating things. It represents something.

What I do welcome is your inquiry because it gives attention to such a major part of the transport network and people's daily activities, which is not given the attention I think it should have. When you bear in mind that the simple facts are, as I understand them, of all mechanised personal trips in London, 60% are by car. In outer London, which is most of the land area, 76% are by car. When the roads do not work well - and they often do not - it is actually interfering with the quality of life of a very large proportion of the population. Of course all the freight goes by road. Everything we consume. Every shop servicing. Every office servicing is going by road. All the buses go by road. When the roads do not work well it is, in that general sense, causing serious loss of quality of life.

In terms of measuring the effect of all of that - as I say I do not really give much weight to the numbers in the brief - I would give much more weight to the appraisals that we routinely do that say, "If you could spend more effort on this particular measure - like clearing up the roadworks more effectively or improving the traffic signals, whatever it is - the benefits of doing that in terms of the time saved and the reliability you get are, in many cases, overwhelmingly greater than the cost of doing it". We should recognise that if we do not do it it is a failure.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): John, do you want to say something about the impact of congestion on businesses and your industry?

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association): Certainly. The big problem from the road haulage industry is that every minute they are sitting in traffic is a cost to the whole of the economy. We have this problem. Most operators would tolerate a level of congestion as long as they had what they call journey time reliability. If they knew that that congestion is going to be there the same day every day at roughly the same period they can plan that into their journey times. What they cannot cope with - and what causes so many problems to the industry - is the fact that congestion is a moving feast; one day it is an hour, the next day it is three hours. It is so unpredictable. You cannot plan for it. You cannot look at how you are going to achieve those journey times. Increased journey times equals increased cost to the operator. There are issues over drivers' hours, where they can make the deliveries, other vehicles get parked up in the wrong place so the next day's deliveries are

affected. The whole issue of congestion in any city, particularly London, is a major issue to the economy.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): What is the scale of the problem for you at the moment?

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association): It is a case, at the moment, that many operators will tell you they would rather not come to London if they can help it because they are so concerned about the levels of congestion they are seeing in the city. They know that when they send a vehicle to London it is a vehicle lost almost to their delivery schedules. Except for a few operators who have to service London on a regular basis, many operators look at ways of avoiding getting into London.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): On that point, I understand that frustration. That is exactly why, almost three years ago, the Mayor was so vocal about saying that there really needed to be something done about looking at London's roads, not just roadworks, but taking an approach to say what we would do. If London depends on the road network for its economy and businesses and servicing of the city and it plays such a vital part, as Stephen has just said, in terms of quality of life throughout London, we really must take an approach that looks at the various facets of the road network and treat the road network like a national piece of infrastructure and take a forensic approach to understanding operational issues. Network operational strategy needs to be developed around the road network that takes into account all the various issues, not just roadworks and not just traffic signals, but how long it takes to clear up accidents --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Kulveer, in a sense you are making some summary points. We are still trying to tease out some of the introductory points --

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): I am giving an overarching - I am sure we can go into detail on each one of them but I am trying to give you --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): We have got quite a lot of questions we want to ask so, sorry, do bear with me. We will bring you in later on if you will bear with us.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Sure.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): What about impact on the Mayor's broader strategic responsibilities? We talked a little bit about the economy. What about the impact of congestion on environmental objectives within London, and health?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): You moved us off the economy before I had the chance to say something!

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Garrett, come and tell us quickly.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): John's point very neatly illustrates Stephen's point. If you look at the different figures about what is the cost - and I notice you have got two figures in your document from different sources that both originate from TfL data. The £4 billion cost that is being quoted is one that I am very nervous about and very wary of because it is a figure related to traffic speeds that relate to free flow conditions in the middle of the night. What is the extra cost of time relative to driving around the city at 2am when there is no traffic. It is very theoretical. It is like looking at what can your pay cheque buy you if you do not have any tax. It is never going to happen. The

£2 billion figure though is much more credible because that is the cost of disruption of unreliability of the network and journey time varying from what might be a reasonable journey time at a given time of the day - which is obviously going to be different at 8.30am in a rush hour than it is going to be at 2am.

John also illustrates that all of the work that we have done and the work that has been done by others including the Motorists' Forum and so on indicates that, whether it is business, private individuals or whoever is using the road network, it is managing that reliability and giving you reliable journey times that is the most effective thing you can do. That is the real cost to business. That is the real cost to the economy.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): The work you have done and the Mayor has done on putting attention on reliability is absolutely right but please do not lose sight of the fact that if you can improve average speeds you are reducing the cost of the whole London economy. There is so much of the cost of doing business which relates to people in work being stuck in traffic jams. If you can get the average down that --

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): That is only true if you can keep the reliability good. If you can improve average speeds but reliability is worse, your travel time budget gets longer and --

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): I am just saying it is both.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): You are struggling to find more sensitive and meaningful analysis and indicators of what the problem is. Garrett, do you want to say anything about the impact of traffic congestion on environmental issues in London?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): They vary, depending on where you are, around the network. The density of use of the road network and the density of development and usage in central London in particular gives us acute problems and gives us acute problems on some of the busiest and most important roads around. They range from air pollution issues to safety issues to other environmental issues about quality of life and so on. In all these things what you are inevitably doing is you are balancing conflicting demands. We want our major roads to function as a means of travel and movement and we also want them, in a lot of places, to function as places. The A23 in Brixton is also the local high street. It is a strategic road as well. There is an inherent conflict there.

One of the things we have to balance is the relative priorities and they will vary wildly depending on where you are. I have never been keen to try to paint a blanket approach and say there is one way to do this. It is going to be very different. The way you manage the A23 in Brixton is going to be very different to the way you manage the North Circular or something like that on dual free and then carriageway. We should recognise that. The MST takes that on board and gives us the ability to do that. That is really one of the things we have to do.

Richard Tracey (AM): I wanted to follow up the discussion you were having, Chair, with John Howells about the freight operators. John made one rather telling statement I think that a good many operators would really rather not be coming to London at all. Can I ask you, are you convinced that the freight operators are scheduling their delivery times with whomever they are delivering to sufficiently well? It is a fairly fundamental view of the public that too much delivery actually goes on during the day - major lorries coming to the various places - when, quite frankly, the delivery really ought to happen during the night. Are you convinced that that is being sufficiently well organised?

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association):

That is one of the big issues. Obviously with the London lorry ban and the controls on vehicles operating in London at certain areas at night it does restrict and really tighten down the period of when commercial vehicles can have access to certain areas. Modern vehicles are much quieter. When the lorry ban was brought in many, many years ago it was designed to reduce noise pollution at night, to make quieter streets for local residents. Modern vehicles do not create those noises they used to. I accept the fact there can still be ambient noise from loading and unloading of vehicles but the actual vehicles themselves entering and going through the city are much quieter. Technology has moved on.

If we could have more access to the city overnight, through night delivery periods, then you would see a greater use of that time by commercial operators. They are happy to get into the city and deliver at night and get out before the cars begin to master the road.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): I do think London is an anomaly in this. There are many parts of the world where you are not allowed to deliver during the day and you have to deliver at night. You look at it today. It just seems, given the shortage of road space and the problem we face, crazy that we still have this ban. At the very least I think it ought to be looked at very hard. I know how controversial it is.

Richard Tracey (AM): Who is that down to then? It is a matter for the Mayor or the London boroughs really to change that kind of control? Is it TfL? Can you tell me who should --

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association): It is the London boroughs that manage it.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): It is the boroughs. London Councils.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Who wants to come in on this one? The boroughs do implement the London-wide lorry ban.

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): We want to be a part of the discussion but we would never suggest that we, on our own, could make that decision. The major impacts in terms of lorries are on the TfL Road Network (TLRN). Those impact the boroughs as well. Working with TfL I am sure boroughs would be willing to review the situation, take into account modern vehicle standards and take into account that most of the vehicles out there are not necessarily up to those modern standards because the fleets are a few years back. Yes, that would be something that we would definitely want to look into and work with TfL on co-operatively.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): It is London Councils responsibility.

Richard Tracey (AM): It could make a major difference could it not? Quieter lorries? As Stephen has said, other cities in the world ban deliveries during the daytime.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): I would like to add that there has been a lot of work done with people like the Freight Transport Association, particularly looking at peak time for congestion and looking to have minimal deliveries, specifically where we are looking at having increased levels of cycling as well and saying, "Can we have less lorries travelling at that time of the day?". There is progressive work happening.

I welcome the comments that suggest that the boroughs would be interested in looking at the lorry ban again. The Mayor would be. We could look at working with TfL.

Mike Keegan (Transport Strategy Manager, TfL): There is a statement in the MTS.

Murad Qureshi (AM): On the environment front, I wanted to make a comment on what we have heard from the briefing and the Panel so far. I am surprised I have not heard what assumptions are being made about car ownership. That is the more important thing as much as population growth. I do not know what the trends are there and what the assumptions are. Can that be usefully be done? I suspect the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency has got those figures. I note, for example, in the last year of the Labour administration when it had the car scrappage scheme, something like 35,000 cars were scrapped in London. We need to look at that as much as the numbers of people. That is my comment there.

Can I go into the impacts on other areas of policy that the Mayor has and ask Kulveer about the environmental impact, particularly the Air Quality Strategy, which is of particular concern to me and others here? To what extent has the Mayor taken on board this projected increase in congestion and its impact on air quality as he has presently got responsibility for?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): You are exactly right to link air quality and congestion together, which is why the tackling of congestion – in fact the whole area of smoothing traffic flow – is to say that we want to see traffic flowing more quickly through the city and less stop start. That, we also know, plays a part in increasing pollution. We know where the hot spots are. We know, as Garrett was mentioning, where there are crucial corridors of traffic through the city which correlate directly with increased poor air quality.

What we are trying to do is target those areas quite specifically, understand the performance issues and understand at a micro level other small interventions that have an impact in terms of detrimentally affecting traffic flow, such as when there is an incident or accident and the time it takes for the police to resolve that issue and reopen a road and how quickly we can get those things done all having an impact on --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Kulveer, do you have any data on how the congestion might impact on changes in air quality particulates in London?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): That is what we are looking at right now and that is what the corridor assessment that Garrett's team is doing right now --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Would you be willing to share that data with this Committee?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Yes, once we have got it actually done and in place. I think we are almost there are we?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): There is, as you will know, a fair amount of national modelling about the effect of something like reducing traffic levels through road charging. I do not want to discuss that as a subject but those models do give you estimates of the benefit of such a thing in terms of reducing carbon emissions.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Carbon emissions?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Carbon emissions. If you manage the demand both to reduce the total amount of traffic but, more importantly, to spread

it out and reduce the amount of congestion, use the road network more evenly, you will produce significant carbon savings because you have got much less stop start driving. There are estimates of that benefit. I am sure there are specifically for London. I have got some. Maybe Garrett has some too.

Jenny Jones (AM): I wanted to say that sometimes costs are not borne by the people who have to pay for the mopping up. For example, roads are often damaged by very heavy lorries and then it is the boroughs or TfL who pay for them. Lorries do not directly pay for some of the damage that they do - just to redress the balance a little bit.

There is also the fact that lorries do make a noise. It is not just their engine noise; it is about the quality of loading of the lorries. A lot of loads are very noisy as they travel, particularly with the state of the roads that are relatively poor in some places, so the worse the roads the more the lorry will make a lot of noise and the lorry is damaging the roads further. There are a lot of factors in talking about economic benefits of freights speeding through the capital. I wanted to redress it.

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association): I appreciate the comments. When it comes to road infrastructure and who supports it everybody pays a level of taxation into the economy so I will not go down that route. What one has to look at is, if one wants commercial vehicles to service the city - whether it be local boroughs or the centre of city, wherever - unless the provision is made for those vehicles to get good access, easy access and, as you say, the road infrastructure should be there to carry on - then quite happily lorries can say, "We won't come down those roads". But you will see local shops die and you will see local businesses suffer. Whether or not we like the way that the whole structure is put together, the fact is lorries do still have to return to those streets and service them.

Yes, I do appreciate there is ambient noise from loading and that does need to be looked at; how that can be reduced to the minimum. The advantage of using those streets at night is the fact that you do reduce congestion levels on the streets and you make the area that people are living in far more pleasant.

At the moment, if you go through some of the borough areas, you will find a sealed wall between two sides of a street. It literally breaks the local street in two areas because you have got a wall of lorries either side delivering or making their passage through. You get those out during the day and suddenly the area becomes more of a community again. It loses that false barrier that is building between them.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): It may be not a matter of banning lorry movements but a matter of making sure they are done in a sensitive way. We have that problem with building work. The Tube has it with the work it does. Nor does it interfere with residents at night. There are lots of things you can do to enforce more sensitive ways in which these things are done without banning them.

Jenny Jones (AM): When I was on the Food Commission we looked at ways that we could remove lorries from the road network because there is a massive amount of damage done, not only deaths and maiming of people but all sorts of other damage: distribution centres on the outside of London and then using fleets of smaller cleaner vans to bring in supplies. I know you cannot do that with scaffolding poles and things like that. There are other options to changing the lorry night ban.

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association):

People have looked at the idea of consolidation centres to make further deliveries. The problem is they only work in very small restricted areas. They do add cost so it does add a significant cost because you are double handling all your goods. You are also going to increase the number of vehicles on the road. You take one large commercial vehicle off and you add 20 vans. You are increasing the number of vehicles actually on the highway.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): OK. Let's move on. Jo, you are going to kick off on the hot spotting issue?

Joanne McCartney (AM): One of the things that is quite clear from the data is that congestion is not evenly spread across London. From TfL's figures 30% of London's traffic is confined to just 5% of the road network. Because of that and because we have talked about growth areas in the future where regeneration may take place, there are some areas that are going to be affected disproportionately to others because of congestion. Could you start by telling us what areas of London are at greatest risk from increased congestion?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL):

Most significantly it is east London where a great proportion of the development is going to take place. You have got some busy and very fully trafficked corridors like the A12, the A13 and the Blackwall Tunnel corridor that are already taking very big amounts of traffic today. You have got a lot of growth projected which is going to increase the demand on those. That is the area I would point out.

In central London as well you have got significant economic growth forecast and development. That is going to continue to put pressure on it. You have also got a lot of other conflicting demands on road space in terms of people movement round the city and in terms of some of the public realm and aspirations in quality of central London. All of which are going to apply more pressure to the network.

Balanced against that you have got the ability to deliver more public transport capacity and the MTS sets out some very significant additions that are going to help in those areas. You have got the ability to change travel behaviours. You have got the ability to manage the road network more efficiently in the future. I do think I have said already that there is scope to do more going forward. We cannot, necessarily, predict everything that we will be able to do towards that.

Then also, in the MTS, you have got the ability to provide more road capacity in key locations. I do not think anybody would interpret that as a remit for wide scale road building. At key points in the network - and I think the MTS mentions specifically east London river crossings for instance - there is clearly a need for more capacity, particularly in terms of resilience. The Blackwall Tunnel is the most obvious issue. On a good day the Blackwall Tunnel, which takes 100,000 vehicles a day - it takes more vehicles than most of the M1 - through a two lane tunnel - one of which was built 114 years ago or whatever - just about works, as long as nothing goes wrong. As soon as you have even the smallest disruption what you see is a complete lack of resilience in the road network because there is just nowhere to absorb the demand so you get huge traffic queues north and south. The actual incident might only take a few minutes to clear up - and the people at the tunnel are very, very good at clearing up incidents quickly - but the knock on delays go on for much, much longer. It is those issues of resilience that you are going to see becoming increasing problems in some of these high stress areas and growth areas across the city.

Joanne McCartney (AM): These are the pressures. How are you going to manage those pressures? You talked in east London about the river crossing, yet the Mayor has cancelled a scheme to provide a river crossing, a road bridge, to the east of London. How are you in future managing that?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): Specifically in relation to the river crossing?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): The Mayor has --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Can we hear Garrett's answer first?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): A lot of this is linked to development and one of the things that we need to do - and we are now in a position to understand much better - is the impact of individual developments and what impact they are going to put on the network, how we mitigate it and what the options are for providing more capacity; whether it is on the existing road network or whether it is managing traffic differently? We have known for quite a while and are getting an increasingly better knowledge about what degrees of modal shift we can expect from different types of development.

There is work to be done over the scale of the development that is forecast over the time period of the London Plan and the MTS to understand what the best solutions are for the long-term. I do not think we would pretend to have all those answers today.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): The question about east London is exactly as Garrett is mentioning: we do know that there is an issue around the expansion there but we are also looking at providing a set of crossings that are acceptable to both local population and also in terms of handling the level of demand in congestion that we think there will be there. That is what the Mayor has been looking at. It is in the MTS. He is looking to get a set of crossings to see what can be done to improve it and ensure that that works effectively when we can deliver them.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): It is not in the business plan at all is it, Kulveer, so what about funding for that project?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): We have to look at what needs to be done before we put it in the business plan so that is what is being worked on through the Strategy and Planning team.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): There are a couple of maps in the briefing paper which show TfL's estimates of the geographical spread of congestion. East London is a problem. If you look carefully you will see south London and west London and all sorts of other areas of London will have it. Unless we can get a lot more capacity out of the existing road network in the way that Garrett has spoken of you have to expect widespread increases in congestion across the piece. There will be hot spots but just in every town centre up and down the area of London I imagine you will find things getting worse unless we can get enough new capacity. You are dealing with a 16% increase in population so you must expect - other things being equal - a 16% growth in the demand on the network.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): I would have to challenge some of that, Stephen. We cannot just say, "It's going to continue to get worse", if we base that on the

projection that everything remains the same and people continue to buy cars, drive cars and do not move in terms of modes of transport. What we are seeing, in terms of some of the efforts we have put in over the last couple of years in a completely different approach to managing the road network, is a 5% decrease in serious delay and disruption from last year to this year. We are also seeing an improvement in --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): We are going to come on to traffic lights and the sorting out of the roadworks issue in a minute --

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): If I could just finish the point about ...

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): -- Kulveer, because we want quite a lot on that.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): I would like to finish one point today, Chair, if that is all right!

Richard Tracey (AM): I am fascinated by some of the interchanges that we have just heard. It sounds to me honestly, Stephen, you are almost suggesting that one of these days in the not very distant future we will be talking about a congestion charge control for the whole of London within the M25.

Jenny Jones (AM): That is the next question!

Richard Tracey (AM): What about that? You have covered practically the whole of London. You said there is congestion here and there is congestion there. Of course with more people --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Dick, can I park that question with the cars? We do have a section on road user charging and road pricing because we do want to ask about that. Let's do it in a slightly less combative way.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Do not get me started yet!

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): We are trying to hold off the fury for a minute because we are having quite a good exchange of information and ideas at the moment, but I will come back to you, Dick. James?

James Cleverly (AM): I do not know whether I can ask mine because I was going to ask - I know we have got a whole section on road pricing - specifically with east London, whether there had been any plans to swap the Western Extension Zone for an Eastern Extension Zone and whether you have had any lobbying from anyone to extend that way in terms of a method of dealing with projected traffic growth in east London?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): It has been absolutely clear from the public response that there was a rejection of the Western Extension Zone. I do not think there has been any public outcry to say that they would like to see one in the east. I would like to hear if there has been.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): OK. Let's not re-fight old battles. Let's move on.

Murad Qureshi (AM): Can I go one step back? On the areas of London which are at greatest risk, one point I wanted to emphasise was, apart from geographical areas, there are different times of the day or times of the week when you can have congestion. I am not sure that has

been picked up at all. Certainly as someone who lives on the edge of the West End I can vouch for a lot more congestion over weekends. That is not on the basis of people's work patterns, that is based on Londoners' leisure pursuits at the weekend. I have no problems about that, Londoners move around. I have not heard anything on that front. How do we cover this if it is covered at all in the MTS?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): It is an excellent point because, as you say, for some parts of London the most congested day of the week is Sunday when people are driving to shopping centres or whatever it is. It does go back to the point we did not address I am afraid - I apologise - about the growth of car ownership. Garrett will be able to give you more detail into what has gone on behind the modelling but the general point is that London is quite different from the rest of the nation in its car ownership patterns because it has had relatively good public transport. Within that, inner London is utterly different from outer London. Outer London is much more like the rest of the country.

The forecasts - Garrett will confirm - are that in outer London it is expected that car ownership will continue to grow, perhaps at a slightly lower rate than the rest of the country - but it will continue to grow as people get richer and cars become more available. That is a simple fact of life and it is very hard to see how that will be stopped. It may be mitigated by improving public transport and those other things but I do not think you can expect to stop it unless - and we will come to this later - you have quite aggressive road charging in London.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): There was a point there that Murad was getting at about Sunday shopping and the change of lifestyles and yet most of the parking regimes and rules of the road that are in operation at the moment were designed 50 years ago maybe. Is there anything about that really fundamental change to our lifestyles?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): That is a key point that will perhaps be drawn out in the detail of how you respond to this. You are absolutely right that we have got to look at times of day and days of the week and it is a different picture right across the seven days of the week. Increasingly, as you drill down into the detail, for instance in terms of the development of journey time reliability data, we have actually got the ability to drill down to journey time reliability on individual corridors for every five minute period of the day, seven days a week. It tells a very different story, not surprisingly, at different times.

It is related to a combination of lifestyle and what people want to do and where they want to go and, also, what is going on on the road network. We talked about lorry deliveries. I am sure we are going to talk about roadworks and utility works and other things that are going on - all of which have an impact. It is a case of when is the best time to manage all these conflicts. When is the best time to do roadworks. Is it better to do it overnight. It might be fine from a traffic point of view but it is going to be a problem from an environmental health point of view and a noise point of view. Is it better to do it at the weekend. That is fine from a business perspective because it takes it out of the working week but that is going to have an increasing impact on leisure activity and so on.

At the end of the day the easiest answer to this for road operators and road management authorities is to balance those conflicting demands as best they can. We do have to look at all the levers, from looking at lorry bans through to whether we have got parking restrictions right and the way we use roads and lane space for different aspects of travel - whether it is motor vehicles, buses, pedestrians or whatever - at individual locations. You cannot make blanket statements and assumptions about the best thing to do. You have got to look at individual

parts of the network: how they operate locally for the benefit of local users and the place functions and how they operate together as a network.

That is what we are starting to do now. We are starting to have the raw data and the detailed analysis to be able to make much more sophisticated judgements on those things. It is still very much an area where we are developing this concept of actively managing the road network.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Garrett, the point here is that the world is changing very fast. Demographics and behaviour are changing very fast. People are getting cars available to them and they are using them, as you would expect them to. We see it on the Underground. Traffic patterns on the Underground changed unbelievably in the last 20 years.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Patterns are changing but also, as you quite rightly said, Stephen, people are also continuing the modal shift pattern of giving up cars and relying more on public transport as that improves, as we see things like Crossrail emerging and as we see more overground services developing. We have seen that people start using cars less --

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): That is just not true on Sundays in outer London.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): OK, gentleman --

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): We are talking about going forward.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Through the Chair, if you do not mind. We understand there will be some conflicts of perspective on this issue and certainly if there are any points that you do not manage to make during today perhaps you could write to us with them. We do want to press on with some of our questions if you do not mind. Murad?

Murad Qureshi (AM): I apologise for that excursion but I thought it was a point --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): It was a very stimulating point and a useful one.

Murad Qureshi (AM): Thank you very much. What do you feel are the main risks to the successful delivery of the policies intended to manage the congestion that you forecast before 2031?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): At the moment what we have - and we started on this topic - is the uncertainty. What we are trying to do is develop enough information and raw data to understand what is happening in London. Things that have emerged, as Garrett has been mentioning, over the last couple of years are this pattern that there are only specific corridors in London that provide a specific amount of congestion. That has just happened because we have been looking at them and analysing where these problems occur and what the knock-on effect to areas around those corridors are. As we understand that data better we can target specific initiatives.

A lot has been happening around how we manage traffic lights on these corridors. I do not mean just about taking them in or taking them out. When we have regeneration schemes those schemes sometimes demand that there are traffic lights put in to enable those retail centres or residential housing to be facilitated by the road network. That can have an impact on

traffic flow on a major key corridor and that is a key risk for us to manage. Those are the kinds of things that are emerging through the work we are doing and we have to manage those risks quite specifically.

To answer your question I would say, as we develop certain parts of London and see regeneration and residential housing being developed there, we need to handle the risk of increased congestion around those areas.

Murad Qureshi (AM): OK. That was a prompt for you to say your bit on the Split Cycle Offset Optimisation Technique (SCOOT) really¹. You tried to say it earlier. I spent half an hour on Monday morning at Knightsbridge Corner. I understand there is a SCOOT there.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): There is.

Murad Qureshi (AM): I could not see the difference quite honestly unless you tell me otherwise. That was one of the things I had been picking up from the Mayor's Office; that you were going to manage this increased congestion. That Knightsbridge Corner is very busy at most times of the day, let alone in the morning.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): I am sure Garrett will give me the exact figures. Scotch House Corner is one of the busiest junctions in London. We have implemented SCOOT there. From the analysis that we have seen so far we have seen an improvement - in the am about 12% and in the pm about 6% to 6.5% - of traffic flow through that junction because of SCOOT. It is all relative to how busy the junction is. Maybe when you were there it was extremely busy.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): It is very difficult to stand on --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Have you got some data on how effective SCOOT is?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): It is very difficult to stand on a street corner and see the difference in these things. One of the things that has come out of --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): That is the Londoner's experience. We hear about this new investment but it is difficult to perceive it. Tell us more.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): I can give you some figures on SCOOT but, before I do that, one of the things that has come out of the research that has been done not only in London but across the country into motorists' views and issues - the work that I referred to that the Motorists' Forum led - was the scale of the difference that you have got to make before people can see a difference, even notice it. You are talking something like a 20% to 30% reduction in delay before you notice it.

The figures that I am going to give you are in this context because with SCOOT we reckon, with that one type of initiative in terms of having SCOOT or not having SCOOT, we can on average deliver a 12% reduction in delay. Actually we are delivering slightly better than that. We have quoted figures of around 500 odd sites that we have installed so far, out of the 1,000 that we are committed to. We have got detailed monitoring on about 270 odd of those to date and

¹ (TfL's automatic traffic control system)

they are showing just under 14% average increase. Some sites are much, much higher. Some sites are up to 20% and 30% where you can see a difference and some are lower. It depends on the location and the type of junction - every junction is individual - but across the network we are delivering something in the region of a 14% reduction in delay.

On its own and on any particular site - and I am afraid I do not have the records for individual sites in my head - you may or may not be able to see a particular difference. What we can see and we can demonstrate - and we are very happy to show you the figures - is the cumulative impact across the network.

It is not only about delivering infrastructure; it is also about signal timing reviews and things like that on existing sites where we can deliver another 6% across a whole load of other sites.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): For the benefit of our international visitors can I just explain that SCOOT is a computer controlled mechanism for changing the timings of traffic lights so it is more responsive to the road conditions and how much traffic is around. Is that a fair ...?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): That is a plain English explanation.

Murad Qureshi (AM): When road congestion pricing came in for the first time I think most Londoners did notice the difference almost straightaway. That is what I was looking for in some ways when I was there that morning.

Are we going to expect developers to put up the cost of this new infrastructure or is TfL going to do it willy nilly? Otherwise we are going to be left in the situation, if we accept that SCOOT is working and can manage things, that it is only when we have prime developments being done by developers that it is going to happen. Those are not, necessarily, the places where most Londoners are passing through.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Sorry, I am going to answer this because it is basically about a policy issue here about how do we fund this technology. We should be looking at developers to fund it. Around the Scotch House Corner we had a significant investment. This Mayor got the investment from the developers there to get SCOOT into that location. It was not there before even though the development was happening.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): OK. We hear you.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): We do want to look at developers to do that. You asked me what would be the key risk, not what was a key mitigation. I answered the key risk as regeneration areas, developments, commercial and residential. Yes, those are the areas where the key risks are so we would expect developers to help fund techniques, SCOOT and others, to help improve and manage those risks.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Can I bring Eric in here because most of the traffic lights in London are on borough roads? Do you have any comments on this?

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): It is worth noting that most of these busy junctions probably have more pedestrians going through them than vehicles. Pedestrians drive regeneration more than any other mode. It is, more or less, a predict and provide type of approach we are talking about here. We are looking at the

impacts now, the trends, how bad is it going to get and how can we manage efficiency better - add a bit of capacity here and there.

If each borough was able to work towards the vision that it has in its spatial plan, its core strategy - we just had ours adopted. Looking at the A1, as an example, in Islington, we have got Archway. We want that to be a place where people like walking around, people like spending money and people like being in their local community. That is so important. The Nags Head: same thing. Angel: we are making some good progress.

It means you have to make some compromises on vehicle movements. Everybody locally, if asked that question in the right way, would say, "Yes, that is what we want. We want a vibrant local community". Not necessarily more cars or the same number of cars going through. Not freight deliveries. Yes, that is essential as well for regeneration.

I think we have to look at the vision for each of these areas - east London, central London and all around. What would the impacts of achieving our goals actually be. Then how can we manage the network, even if it requires some pretty drastic crazy measures to make sure that we still get all the things that we want?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): What you have heard from Garrett Emmerson seems to me to be a statement that he is able to document the benefits of more careful management of traffic through better equipment, better software and more careful attention. He has demonstrated that, if you do that, you can make a big difference - often to everybody. You get better results for pedestrians and for traffic. Not always, there are always conflicts.

The question that that leaves me with is, ok, if you can document those extraordinary benefits, are we spending enough on it. Given the problem we face is it being done on a big enough scale across the whole of London. Those are the benefits. He can demonstrate really rather well that it has an effect. He can tell you how much it will cost and, presumably, he can give you, if pushed, a cost benefit analysis. Are you doing enough.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Can you comment on both of those?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): I can comment on both of those and Kulveer may want to come in on the last point. In terms of what Eric said in general initiatives on the network I would not disagree with you - and I said earlier - that it is about a need to balance all of the demands on the road network but, specifically, in things like traffic signal technology, SCOOT and investment and in signal timing reviews as well.

It is an absolute prerequisite that we deliver benefits that are not at the expense of pedestrians. We have got the documentary evidence that Stephen is referring to to demonstrate that and demonstrate it across different times of the day, to the earlier point, and different times of the week. It is not only an average that there is no disbenefit to pedestrians; we can demonstrate it at individual times in the am peak, in the pm peak, in the inter peak, at weekends and so on. That is built into the engineers' outcomes when they develop these projects. The fact that we have been able to deliver on average a 6% reduction in delays through signal timing reviews and at least 12% through SCOOT is a win/win benefit.

Are we doing it on enough sites. We are moving from having 2,000 to having 3,000 of London's 6,000 sets of traffic signals equipped with SCOOT. That is a major investment over the current business plan period. That will deliver a demonstrable difference.

The other point about it is that we do this on the right sets of traffic signals. There has been a lot of work going on - to go back to some of the earlier points - about understanding where the key pinch points are on the network and where you can get the most benefit out of a 12% or a 14% or whatever it is reduction in delay. It is not only the benefit at that junction, it is the benefit to the wider network as a whole.

We are using the investment that we have got and making sure we can target it in the best way possible to maximise the overall benefit to the network as well as to local sites. Whether it is enough or whether you can do more.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Are there technical constraints as to how much of this work you can get done at any one time anyway, as well as financial?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): There are certainly resource constraints in terms of the people that you have got to do it because it is fairly specialist work. There are some constraints.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): I do think, in international terms, London has fallen a long, long way behind in keeping traffic signals up to date.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): I would not agree with that, Stephen. No, I would say quite the reverse.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Stephen, do you want to give us some examples of where you think is the best practice in the world? Which cities should we be looking at?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): I think you should be looking at London.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Sorry, Stephen.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): We have yet to find anywhere that has anything like what we have --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): London needs to look to the rest of the world. Stephen?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): I defer to what Garrett says in terms of technology. London was early in the game. SCOOT was introduced in the 1960s I think --

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): 1980s. Mid 1980s.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): It does not matter - a long time ago! There were other systems before then. A lot of our equipment is old is my simple point. Maybe Garrett will tell you it has all been replaced and it is all up to date.

In terms of other cities, the Chinese cities invested a very great deal in traffic control systems. Beijing and Shanghai I have been to recently. They are very well advanced in their traffic control systems. It is recent. That is one of the reasons.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Let's move on to the next bit. Victoria, did you want to finish off this section?

Victoria Borwick (AM): My two questions were really only the first two which were: could you give us an overall look at the level of congestion - because we talked about that at the beginning - and what do you think your smoothing the traffic flow is actually going to achieve because, presumably, you have got some high hopes for that in view of the figures you gave us at the beginning? What contribution overall - we talked about individual boroughs - can smarter re-signalling and re-sequencing of the traffic lights make? We have had individual examples but do you want to give us --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): What kind of percentage difference would it make?

Victoria Borwick (AM): -- the things that you are doing that you are pleased about and how you think they are going to have an impact.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): I can tell you what we have tried to do in measures and I am sure Garrett can give you the specific figures. On the point of what we are trying to do - we talk about modern technology and Stephen and Garrett have had this debate - we are trying to implement that, but this has just been happening over the last three years. Since 2000 to 2008 there was a 25% increase in traffic signals in London. Those were not signals that were getting SCOOT implemented with them. Those were not modern technology being brought to the fore. That was just a case of, "We're going to put them in and see what the impact is". What we have tried to do is have the debate around what data we need, look at the technology and catch up with modern techniques that are happening.

I see a lot of delegations from various parts of the world coming to London and saying, "You're now leading the way". The work that Garrett's team is doing and the analysis and implementation of the data that it has, applying that to corridors and to re-profiling traffic signals and identifying where we do not need those and finding out where we can better manage the road network has had a huge effect. Each one of those facets has a benefit to the road network. As Garrett says, if it is something between 20% and 30%, then you can see that visible difference. What we are doing is having a cumulative effect by doing each one of these initiatives.

Our ambition, looking at SCOOT, is we have said about 12% is the average benefit of traffic flow we get through a junction. We are now building on that to see if we can tweak the system even further to maximise it. We are learning. It is really a process that is going on at the moment.

Victoria Borwick (AM): These are average flows?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): These are average flows, yes.

Victoria Borwick (AM): They are not particularly on one day of the week or you can tweak it sufficiently so that it can alter on one day of the week?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): That is exactly what Garrett was saying. We can look at every five minute period. We see these flows. The road network in London is run on a knife edge. The amount of traffic that we have running through this city and the events and various things that the traffic engineers manage are really run at a --

Victoria Borwick (AM): We had the advantage of going to Palestra last week.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): I know Garrett's team look at every element of that at a time of day to understand how they can appropriately handle the information and the technology to get the best result at that given time, as well as anything else that might occur.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): In terms of the knife edge as you put it Kulveer, I thought, Victoria, you were going to ask a little bit about the lane rental scheme? Would somebody like to pick that up?

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): I will pick that up. We have heard a lot about lane rental. I have been to one of Garrett's other sessions talking about that kind of thing. We have heard about the current permit scheme. We have heard about lane rental. Is it likely to happen? What would be the effect of not establishing this pilot programme to be on congestion in London?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): Sorry, I am slightly frustrated because there were still some points I wanted to raise on the last question. Could I start with that and move into lane rental?

Victoria Borwick (AM): Can we finish that off?

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Traffic lights and then get into lane rental.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): The thing you have to remember about London is the intensity of use of the road network. If you look at the statistics compared to other major cities around, the amount of road space relative to the amount of people trying to use it, it is really quite stark. If you look at the amount of traffic on our road network relative to other major conurbations in the UK I think, on average, our roads are about 40% more densely trafficked, there are more pedestrians, there is more demand and so on.

On the technology side of traffic signals, we have had to develop the technology to keep the city moving. You see sometimes when we get technical failures or we get power failures on key sites and locations - there is one that sticks in my mind last year at Hangar Lane where we had a major power failure so there was nothing we could do until we got the power back. We had six hours of really serious and severe disruption in that whole area just because we did not have the technology up and running to keep the city moving. We are very reliant, and we are becoming increasingly reliant, on the technology --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Have traffic police with the white cotton gloves there!

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): That is where I would say that we are very much ahead of the game. It is about the intensity of use.

If I come on to lane rental because we are moving into a different area.

Jenny Jones (AM): I was just going to say to Eric, I do not know if you felt the wave of love that came from this side of the table when you talked about pedestrians because, on many roads, there are far more pedestrians and none of you mentioned them as a valuable part of the economy in London. SCOOT, we heard last month at TfL, could assess the relative number of pedestrians to traffic and incorporate that into the reasoning and stop the motorised traffic if there are a lot of pedestrians. 30 pedestrians waiting to cross the road for ten cars with a single driver, that is not good for the economy either.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): That is another area of development.

Jenny Jones (AM): When is SCOOT going to take into account pedestrians?

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Pedestrian flows.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): That is a piece of work, as you have heard, we are looking at doing now. I am not in a position to give you answers and say we will do it for next year or anything like that --

Jenny Jones (AM): By the end of the year?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): I do not know where we will be at the moment. I cannot answer you on that question. I can get back and give you some more information on the development.

Jenny Jones (AM): We really need to know that. It is very frustrating when we see hordes of pedestrians waiting for very few cars.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): SCOOT is not the only means by which we can look at improving the performance for pedestrians. As I said --

Jenny Jones (AM): When you push a button to say you want to cross the road as a pedestrian. They work do they? They actually make the lights change?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes. Unless you are going to point to locations where you are suggesting they are not working properly!

Jenny Jones (AM): They are very slow in some places.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): There are various different types of crossings. Some are fixed timings, some are reactive to pedestrians and so on.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): We are going to get into lane rental now I think so let's move on. Caroline, did you want to ...?

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): I have asked my question. Sorry. You wanted to finish off --

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): What difference is lane rental going to make?

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): The key thing is - the Mayor talks about it, Kulveer talks about it, you talk about it, Garrett - what would be the effect of not establishing such a programme on congestion in London?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): I think, quite frankly, it will limit what we are able to deliver in terms of reduction of delay and disruption at roadworks and we will fall short of what is a pretty common public and political aspiration to do more to remove roadworks. Roadworks are a significant cause of the disruption that we are talking about. There are many issues in terms of what needs to be done. Everybody accepts that, particularly in terms of utility works, gas, water and electricity supplies as they are as essential to an efficient and modern economy as keeping the road network moving, but there is an obvious conflict in managing them.

What lane rental gives us that we do not have is a way of incentivising economically doing this type of stuff differently. It incentivises the development of new technology, particularly in the construction industry, to enable more work to be carried out successfully out of peak hours, to be done overnight and to have roads reopened in the morning. This is an area where we do lag behind other parts of the world. Stephen mentioned Singapore a while back. It is an obvious example where people do use this type of technology but where there is no incentive, in this country, for that to happen at the moment.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): What sort of technology are they using in Singapore that we would like to see in London?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): It ranges from being able to plate over trenches, being able to fill in holes that you dig in the road on a temporary basis to run traffic over them in peak hours and then open them up again and carry on working out of peak hours --

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Tunnelling under the road rather than digging it up.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): Tunnelling under the road, minimising the amount of digging you need to do - faster reinstatement of curing. There is a very significant piece of emergency roadwork going on in Trafalgar Square today at the moment which is just about to finish, if it has not finished. You are not going to be able to open that road for 24 hours because the concrete has got to be poured and then it has got to cure. If we can develop more rapid setting materials we could save a day's disruption there. It is things like that that. If there is an incentive on the persons digging that hole to get off the road quicker and it is going to cost a significant amount more money to be there, then there is automatically a financial incentive to develop that sort of technology to enable them not to be there.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): Kulveer, you had indicated on that?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): I am waiting for the Chair to allow me to speak before she interrupts me.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Quickly, Kulveer, because you have been taking up rather a lot of time so --

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Have I? I apologise.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): -- briefly if I can be so rude.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Coming back to Caroline's point about lane rental. We have done a lot, as you are aware, with the Code of Conduct that we developed with the main utilities and that has resulted in a lot of joint-working and a reduction in some of the amounts of disruption that there has been. Again, not really noticeable to the public but we can quantify it and say what has happened.

We have also implemented a permit scheme with 18 boroughs which has meant TfL has provided almost 45,000 permits over the last year or so but declined 9,000 permits, which would have caused a significant amount of disruption. It has had very good reason and justification to do that.

Lane rental is really, as Garrett has been talking about, about changing the culture and the approach of those people who dig up our roads and the way they look at how they are going to do it. Re-prioritising what they think is their reasoning for it rather than just a commercial sense that they want to do it or they want to fix something. Also understanding the impact it has on pedestrians, all road users and the wider economy of London and making sure that that is as much a priority for them as it is in terms of the commercial priority. That is why we really do need lane rental.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): I do hope you succeed with that because, as Garrett has indicated, the problem is fundamental incompatibility of incentives in the current system. Until you sort that out it will not be sorted.

One of the other things that has to happen to make utilities embrace this, in my view, is that the regulators change the view they take of this to recognise the costs of doing roadworks as being part of the legitimate costs of delivering services to end customers. They are commercial organisations, the utilities. If they are allowed to put the costs of digging up the road and paying the lane rental into their charges, which is the right thing to do in my view because it is a legitimate cost, as long as it is done economically and efficiently, then they will not resist it. In fact they will welcome it because, like everything else they do, they can make money out of doing it more effectively than the regulator allows for, if you see what I mean. That is the whole basis of the regulatory regime. At the moment they are frightened that they will pay higher costs and it will come off their bottom line so they resist it.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): I am sure London's customers will not be thrilled at the thought that this would be passed on.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): The problem is that these costs have to borne somewhere. At the moment they are being borne inefficiently and by the wrong people.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): I would like to respond to that by saying that we have done an extensive amount of work with Government and the Mayor has been talking to the Secretary of State for Transport about this issue. The key concern has been about what happens with potential costs. There are two things that could happen there. One, there is a

win for the utility that actually gets its work done quicker and it can have a reduction in potential costs because of the time it is spending --

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Hence the incentive to innovate.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Exactly. Secondly, any charges that there are that could be developed from the scheme we are now discussing about having an innovation technology fund that those charges go into that the industry then invests in developing new technology. It is, effectively, funding the development of research and new techniques through the scheme.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): We would very much appreciate figures if you can write to us afterwards on this. One of the things that Garrett said was that it is not just about new technological developments, there are technologies in use, tried and trusted, elsewhere in the world that we would like to see installed in the UK. Obviously that would --

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Yes. Simply putting more people to work on the hole to get it done more quickly is not technical, it is just about getting the right incentives there.

Richard Tracey (AM): We are talking about coordinating roadworks and so on but it is a different area I would like to ask you about in terms of pedestrian. Are you satisfied that developers, the various borough planners, Network Rail and TfL coordinate sufficiently when a new development comes into being? In my own constituency, particularly in the Wandsworth part of it, there are some very large developments proposed and some of us sometimes wonder whether sufficient advance discussion has gone on before you put up a whole lot more apartments and then the people are thrown onto the road or onto the rail network. Is there really sufficient advanced coordination going on to make sure that the infrastructure can cope?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Everybody sitting around this table has probably had some frustration where there have been developments going on and a lack of coordination amongst traffic managers - be that at a local borough level or at a strategic level for TfL.

What we have done over the past few years is build that expertise up further. There is a group called CEntraL LOnDon (CELLO) that brings boroughs together, brings TfL together and looks at analysing major projects and major development and the impact of those, not just on what is coming up shortly but on a year-by-year basis looking ahead two, three or four years. It reviews those in detail on a six monthly basis to understand what is the impact, how are we mitigating it and if are we still doing the right things.

Where this sometimes goes awry is where, at a local level, decisions can be made that some piece of work needs to be done and a borough decides to do it. Fair enough, that is its prerogative. We need to make sure that the relationship and communication between the borough and TfL is stronger when those decisions happen. If that combines with something like a closure on a Tube line or some other significant activity happening - and I know numerous times when there has been an exhibition at Earls Court, there has been a closure on the Circle and District line and a borough has decided to do some other work - you can get a very bad situation and potential gridlock for a certain amount of time, especially at the weekend. We have been taking a look at those areas and really beefing up the work that boroughs and TfL do to make sure that does not happen, through this group called CELLO.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL):

Very briefly. Have we done this well enough in the past. No. Are we getting better at it. Yes, we are getting much better at it. Are we where we want to be yet. No, but we will be.

Mike Keegan (Transport Strategy Manager, TfL): I was going to say that obviously for big developments areas, the opportunity areas that are set out in the London Plan, there is an Opportunity Area Planning Framework that has been developed for each of those. Some of them already exist. They set out the trigger points in terms of levels of development that would then require further public transport capacity to be provided by the developers.

What we are also developing within TfL is our modelling capability to understand the impacts of these developments. You might be aware that we have developed a set of sub-regional models which will enable us to understand the impact of growth at a sub-regional level – in other words a greater level of detail than the London-wide models that we have. What we are encouraging is for developers and boroughs to use those models. We are making them available for them to use so that the impacts can be assessed on a consistent basis across London with a consistent set of assumptions about things like car ownership but also population growth, economic growth and other assumptions about public transport and the wider transport system. That is something that we are doing as well.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Eric, do you want to comment?

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): Yes. It is important that we do not couple development with growth in car use. In Islington maybe we have got a fortunate situation where there is very good public transport accessibility and we have got control of parking zones covering the entire borough. Since about 2003 we have been requiring a lot of car free housing and our new core strategy adopted last month now says that all development – that is not just housing but commercial as well – will be car free, aside from operational need for vehicles to run the business. With car free development you are saying, “We have this growth and it is not going to lead to additional traffic, congestion volumes and all the other negatives”. It is just unfortunate that the national planning policy has recently changed to stop encouraging that but here in London we do still have that as an option. It will work throughout central London and in many parts of outer London at least close to key regional centres.

Richard Tracey (AM): I was not so much thinking of cars or not cars, I was thinking about longer trains. One of the big problems we have, especially in west London and south west London, is that South West Trains particularly are putting the brakes on having ten car trains rather than eight car trains. It is very significant. I do not know whether any of you travel in that area but I do and the trains are very congested because, clearly, what is needed is longer trains and longer platforms and so on.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor’s Transport Adviser): We are moving slightly away from congestion but it is an appropriate point. It is why the Mayor is making a case to Government about having a stronger role to play in the franchise discussion because that is exactly the kind of issue where a commercial decision will be made by the franchisee whereas we all know we are looking for a different outcome there.

Richard Tracey (AM): Indeed. Thank you.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Which we have supported as a Committee as you know.

James Cleverly (AM): You mentioned about having the coordination between borough work and TfL work. It rather strikes me that if we add in the Royal Parks, particularly in central London, we add in the Royal Parks and works that may go on there. Is there an opportunity to create a central repository of work, something that would be very easy for utility companies, TfL and the boroughs to feed into so that when someone is doing a piece of non-essential work, or is planning a piece of non-essential work, they can look at – in my mind I am thinking a joint outlook calendar but I am sure there must be something a bit more sophisticated than that – where, in terms of project planning, there is a particularly congested place and time to avoid non-essential work then. Is there something --

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): We already have that. It is called London Works. It is a significant piece of technology invested. I apologise if I am saying it incorrectly but I thought it was referred to in your discussion document. I might be wrong in that. Yes, that exists and it is used widely by TfL and all of the boroughs to do exactly what you suggest.

James Cleverly (AM): I know I am being a bit cheeky here because we are looking at the implementation of the road pricing scheme, but might there be an opportunity to use differential pricing to encourage semi time dependent work so that we can use the lane rental scheme mechanism to help steer utility companies in terms of time and place?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): James, that is exactly what the lane rental scheme will do. It will be quite a sophisticated scheme that would look at the locations specifically, the impact that location has if there is disruption there, the volume of traffic that flows through there at different times of the day and take all these various elements into account before assessing what would be a specific charge of use that part of the road network.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): That is very helpful.

James Cleverly (AM): That is good. Thank you very much.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Can we move on to other demand management measures.

Jenny Jones (AM): Perhaps we can first go to the snake pit of road pricing because I know the RAC Foundation has clear views on this.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Our interest is national. In terms of London, it seems to me the issue is this: we have to decide to what extent we believe the chart – which is in the MTS, which is reproduced in your briefing note and which we discussed earlier – shows a central view – I know there are variations on central view – that on current policies, with population growth, congestion will get worse by 20%. That is an average of course and, as others have said, locally it will be much worse than that and in other places it will be better.

The policies on the table to deal with this give a central view of reducing that to a growth of 14%. The only thing which will deal with that beyond the policies on the table is a different way of charging for the use of the road network across the London area to the point that Richard Tracey was mentioning earlier.

We will have to take a view about the risks involved in delivering these additional ways of reducing traffic. Maybe there is not a problem. That is a view to take. If you come to the view – and I think I come to the view – that there is a real prospect of things getting substantially

worse and there is no other way of dealing with it in full, then mitigating the use of the road network by charging for it more, effectively, is something we should look at very aggressively.

As the Transport 2025 document set out - and it is a good document, I do recommend it - the only way of meeting the overall targets on carbon reduction and on congestion and raising money to do what you want to do in London is by having an intelligent pricing mechanism across the whole of the city. It is not extending the current technology for central London to the whole of the city. That would not be sensible at all. It is using what is used in many other parts of the world to charge for the use of the road network at the right rate - different rates at different places at different times - to reflect the congestion. That will solve the problem and give you lots of money.

Jenny Jones (AM): It could be a very sophisticated system?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): One of the things that opponents of road pricing say is that it is not a fair system so how do you make the system look fair?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): You have to define for me what you mean by fair. Do you mean across income groups?

Jenny Jones (AM): I do but I do not know what other people - that is what I would say.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Let's take that. Then you need to analyse the proposal. What is the proposal? Here is a set of charges. Who would be paying it - presumably car users. What are you going to do with the money. You are going to invest it in public transport I assume. What is the net effect of all of that. Clearly there will be gainers and losers. We are not at all clear that the net effect will differentially make poor people worse off. You have to have a firm proposition. You have to analyse it carefully and see who the winners and losers will be.

What is bad news at the moment is to just let congestion get worse and worse because buses get stuck and public transport cannot work. It is not at all clear that car users in the outer part of London are rich. People have to get to work before the bus services start. Bus drivers themselves get to work in cars. It is not at all clear that it is, necessarily, inequitable.

Jenny Jones (AM): There will be a lot of opposition. To make it work properly you are going to have to make it a fairly inelastic top price aren't you? People say to me at the moment, "Congestion charging isn't working anymore". I think that is because it is too cheap. What would you see as a top price for a peak hour major road?

James Cleverly (AM): So that only rich people can drive?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): It is terribly treacherous to talk about the top price because that is the one that everybody alights on.

Jenny Jones (AM): That is why I am asking!

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): That is why I am not answering! What I urge you to do is look at schemes that have been worked out for London - there is more than one around - and see what the spectrum of prices is. How many people are going to be

paying a lot; how many people are going to be paying little. What will be the benefits which you will generate with the money.

Whether it would be acceptable publicly I urge you to look at the evidence from round the world. We have London but we also have Stockholm, we have Singapore and we have a large number of charging schemes in Scandinavia - Norway - and Australia. These are for major strategic routes: France, Italy, Portugal, Spain and schemes in America. There are a lot of these schemes around. I can, afterwards, refer you to a couple of documents that have looked at the public attitudes to this. The experience is universal: when it is proposed it is opposed, when it is in people like it and do not want to take it out because they can see the benefits.

I understand the political difficulty there. It is a matter of conveying to the general public that doing nothing is going to produce a bad outcome and there is a better one on the table. There is really good evidence that, when these schemes are in, people do like them and see the benefits.

Jenny Jones (AM): Could I ask John what his view would be?

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association): It depends what you want congestion charging to achieve. If you are looking to reduce vehicles then placing any level of congestion charge on commercial vehicles would not stop them entering the city because they are not there because they want to be there. They are not like the car driver who has an option. Parcels cannot jump on the bus and take a different route into the delivery point. If congestion charge is designed to reduce vehicles and to keep vehicles out of the city it will not work against commercial vehicles. Therefore, there is no point in putting that charge on the commercial vehicle. It is like a bus, it is there because it has to be for a purpose.

On cars I would agree a congestion charge would free the road network.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): John, how about the impact on a vehicle's ability to move around?

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association): A congestion charge against cars which reduces cars means that commercial vehicles, buses and anything that is there for a purpose to help the economy would be able to move freer in the city. It does have a benefit if it is on cars. The problem is if you start loading it on the commercial vehicles, light vans or whatever, they are not going to not use the road; they are still going to be on the road at the time they are now.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Chair, I did use the phrase an intelligent charging system. That means you vary it by time of day and by place. The purpose is only partly to reduce the total. It is about changing the time of day patterns of use. The evidence is very good that commercial users as well as private cars have a lot of flexibility about the times they do things and the places. It is not true that freight would not respond. It would respond.

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association): Within the City of London the problem is freight has a very short timeframe for delivery. Again, it is going back to the night-time delivery issue. Yes, if there was the night-time delivery availability then a charge would encourage commercial vehicles to move to those times. You

have to look at both. You have to say, "If we are going to have a charge against commercial vehicles, we have to give them an opportunity to deliver at alternative times".

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): I rest my case.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): The system is rather too blunt in central London. You do not pay more the longer you are in London, for example.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): While I have got the floor shall I move on to a couple of other demand managements? What about things like 20 miles an hour default which the Transport Research Laboratory says would smooth traffic flow, which is what you were talking about earlier, Stephen?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): As you know, you and I have talked about the safety benefits of properly enforced speed limits. The enforcement is a big part of this. I would hesitate about a default across the whole piece because a lot of the time 20 miles an hour is unnecessarily slow. What is important is that the flow is matched to the road conditions so you can get a regular flow and that it is safe. In minor residential areas 20 miles an hour, no doubt, may be right, but for our major strategic roads I do not see that that would be sensible.

Jenny Jones (AM): If you had an opt out system for those?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): We are agreeing that you need to set the speed limits for the particular circumstances, yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): While I have got the floor, John did say earlier about one lorry equals 20 vans. I would challenge that figure because that is not what has come out of the London Food Commission and also those vans would be doing shorter distances and could well be cleaner.

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association): I appreciate that my figures may be slightly wrong but it is around about that figure. It is something like 20 vans and 300 cars for one single commercial vehicle. That is what they need to move the load. The thing is you would be increasing vehicle numbers by taking one commercial vehicle off the road. You are going to be increasing --

Jenny Jones (AM): But travelling smaller distances. With this idea of an intelligent road pricing system it could reduce costs?

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association): It would not reduce costs because you are double handling. You have still got to take the goods off the vehicle when they arrive at the depot and transfer.

Jenny Jones (AM): Small businesses would have to employ people to work at night. There is cost everywhere.

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association): There is. I agree. If you do night-time deliveries you have got to have people there to take the deliveries. If you are going to do that we then also have to look at public transport at night. We have already said bus drivers have to go in by car. If you are going to have people working

through the night in lots of venues you are going to have to look at your night-time public transport issue. Do you need more public transport through the night to get people to destinations to do this work?

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you.

Richard Tracey (AM): Just going back to these different systems of road charging. To start with, surely, any discussion about any extension of road charging would require a different system of monitoring it. It seems to me that the cameras that are used in central London, but previously also in the Western Extension, really are not acceptable. I have experience in America. What is it called: the Flag and Beacon system?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Tag and Beacon.

Richard Tracey (AM): Tag and Beacon. Sorry. In the day and age of satellite navigation we know perfectly well that the satellite technology is there which, presumably, could cope with making it a lot more efficient.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): It is a while since I spoke to Garrett's colleagues but last time I did the view there was that satellite technology is risky in London. Tag and Beacon is probably the way to go and can be made to work and there are some experimental sites near here which have been working adequately successfully for a long time.

You cannot get precise resolution but you do not need it. One of the mistakes I believe some people make is to think you have to charge everybody exactly right for precisely where they have been. You do not need to do that; you just need to vary the charges in a reasonable way to get most of the benefits at much less cost.

Richard Tracey (AM): Has Garrett got anything to add on that?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): In terms of road pricing it is clearly a major policy issue and TfL's role is on the implementation side of it. The implementation in central London, yes, it is effective in terms of it delivers the scheme and it has been effective and it continues to be effective in reducing the amount of traffic in central London. The issue then is what do you do with the road space you free up because of all the demands that we have talked about previously we are doing a lot of other things with road space in central London so it is assisting them.

In terms of the MTS, it is quite clear that there are a whole load of other things that we can do first in managing the road network better. We have been talking about them on and off through the morning and I am sure we will carry on to before you would consider that.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): You do need more money to do that. That is the problem. You are short of funds I would suggest. Charging for the network would give you lots more money for public transport and also for improving the road network. It really is a much better outcome than doing nothing, in my view.

Don't forget, on day one when the central London scheme was introduced, traffic fell overnight by 20%. There is nothing else that will deliver anything of that magnitude.

Richard Tracey (AM): It is hugely contentious as Garrett said.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): If you took a referendum on it now from Londoners they would keep it: the central zone.

Richard Tracey (AM): What about the other parameter I mentioned to you before? You were beginning to sound as though you wanted to put congestion charging within the whole of the M25 I thought.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Correct. I want you to consider it. It is worth looking at.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Eric has been trying to comment.

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): There are all sorts of costs, local anomalies and difficult things you have to work through for any type of road pricing mechanism and the easiest one is fuel prices. A little bit out of our scope perhaps but I can imagine a London-wide levy that would hit everybody equally and we do not have to measure where they go; we know that they are paying the extra price and that levy goes towards public transport funding other alternatives.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): A levy on fuel?

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): The trouble with fuel though is you can buy it anywhere and it is very difficult to see the geographical control.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): There are local gas taxes all over the United States. It is not unheard of to have local gas taxes. I believe there is a city in Canada which has differential fuel duty for precisely that reason. Is it Montreal or Toronto, I forget. It can be done but it does have the disadvantage of fuel tourism.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Exactly. There would be issues there.

James Cleverly (AM): A couple of things that I wanted to pick up on. I have forgotten one of them so I will go straight to the other one and hopefully come back. One of the things that strikes me with regard to congestion is there is an awful lot of road space which is very irregularly used. I am thinking particularly about marked up bus lanes outside marked up bus lane operating hours. The real frustration I have is the bulk of drivers habitually avoid driving in marked up bus lanes irrespective of when the operating hours are. Are there any policies or plans to alleviate congestion, often on some serious routes? I am thinking of the A2 coming in from Kent into south east London through Greenwich and Lewisham. A two lane road in each direction is used as a one lane road for the vast bulk of the time, despite the fact that along much of that route, the bus lane is not in full 24 hour operation. Is there something we could do to coordinate that so that we --

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association): There are ways that that can be encouraged. Car users habitually avoid them because they are worried about going in the incorrect time zone and being fined so they do tend to avoid them. In other authorities now they are starting to look at using bus lanes outside the peak hour usage for commercial vehicles and having them sign that they are a commercial vehicle route. Two fold. One it frees up space and it keeps lorries where you want them; out of the main flow of the car. It encourages a better flow of traffic. It has got to be managed so that they are only using it outside of the peak bus route.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): John, where have you seen that operating?

John Howells (Southern and Eastern Region Director, Road Haulage Association):

There is a route in Birmingham which is being used now. Originally that was designed for two person usage. It is now being used as a freight route. Up in Derbyshire they have been starting to use bus lanes for freight routes; treating freight as a freight bus. It is carrying goods. It is a vehicle with one person but a lot of passengers, if you like.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Talking about road user charging I thought you might ask for the Mayor's perspective on it, Chair, but you have not so I may give it anyway. I was listening to Stephen's comments quite closely and he said when schemes are in people do like them and do not want to stop them. It has been categorically proven with the Western Extension Zone that that is not necessarily true. We still had, after almost two years of operation, the majority of people not wanting that scheme in there. That proposal. We --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Kulveer, this is why I did not come to you, because we have had that battle and I did not want to use up the time on debating the Western Extension again.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Chair, I am not. I am talking about what we are trying to do and why we are doing it.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Do you want to talk about the Mayor's policies for the future on this because there was a reference to the potential for road user charging in the MTS?

James Cleverly (AM): That reminds me of my second point.

Garrett Emerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes, there is.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): What the Mayor has actually said - and the RAC Foundation's own report says - is that the interventionist approach that we are undertaking is welcome. That is what we have been debating and discussing today: all the various initiatives that we have done over the last three years, rather than clobber Londoners with an increased charge or a blunt tool that eventually the benefits are dissolved because there is not a cohesive approach to managing the road network. That is what happened. When you say, "Day one. 20% decrease in traffic flow". Yes, but several years later same amount of traffic - less cars - same amount of traffic in central London in the central zone. Why is that? Because we did not have a cohesive strategy about how we were going to manage the road network. We can provide you with the figures to support what was happening in terms of congestion in central London.

That is why we have taken this approach to say we need to look at every facet of the road network - be it roadworks, be it traffic lights, be it SCOOT technology or be it better coordination - and say, "What can we achieve if we really focus on these areas?", before we start clobbering the average Londoner with further charges at this point in time when we know everybody is feeling the pinch.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Kulveer, I do not want to inflame this but there was a reference to it as a potential tool for the Mayor in the MTS. I think some of these figures are debatable but one of the things that is very evidenced - Garrett referred to it - is that there has been a transference of road space to things like the biking scheme, to buses and to pedestrians. There

has been a change in the quality of the environment and life in central London. Having put that in the MTS - I appreciate what you are saying that it would be the Mayor's first call but do you think the Mayor would be interested to look at this as a potential tool in a broader framework of ways of dealing with congestion? We all understand there is not one magic answer to the issue.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Stephen has mentioned other cities and there are different ways of looking at charging. What we are saying and what this Mayor is saying quite categorically is he wants to explore every area of managing the road network better before we start putting further charges on individuals for driving and before we start making a social economic issue of whether you can afford to drive. Before we start entering that debate we really owe it to Londoners and everyone who drives in London to make the most of every other approach we have.

It has to be in there as one of the tools because, amongst everything else, you would not just ignore it. What we are saying is we are focusing on these other interventions.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Chair, for the longer term, the --

James Cleverly (AM): Chair, can I pick up the points that I wanted to pick up? Sorry, Stephen.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Let's hear Stephen and then I will come back to you, James. Go on, quickly.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): On that point, taking a long view, no one could dissent from what Kulveer just said; you have to look at all the things. You would have to take a view about whether all of those other things will or will not make a sufficiently big contribution to the problem set out. If not, you have got to decide what to do and you are left with road charging as the only solution.

James Cleverly (AM): Kulveer, back to the coordinating time of the bus lanes. Perhaps Kulveer and Garrett you could give me some views as to what might be the implications, challenges and opportunities to coordinate those bus lanes so that the significant percentage of road space which is habitually not used and could be is freed up to alleviate congestion.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): James, you make a very valid point. One of the challenges here is when you go from different borough boundaries in terms of the times that they allocate for bus lane usage. Every person who is out there, whether they drive or do not, or use the road space, would generally have a frustration about standardisation of bus lane operating times. Because we are all uncertain, "Have I crossed a borough boundary? Where am I? What is the time on this lane?" as you quite rightly pointed out, people stay out of the bus lane. TfL does try very hard to keep a standard approach on the roads and the road network that it manages: the TLRN and the red routes. Across boroughs that is really a localised decision.

There could be more work done to help standardise the approach and then communicate that better so that people do not feel that they just cannot go in there because it is demarcated as a bus lane. They feel confident that they will not get a Penalty Charge Notice if they enter in and it is the wrong time. Something about communication and standardisation is something we should look at.

James Cleverly (AM): I will give you a classic example. On the route that I cycle into work, as I come along Evelyn Street on to Jamaica Road it is the London Borough of Lewisham where the bus lane is 7am until 10am and 4pm until 7pm. You then go round the one way system past McDonalds - I am sure you are familiar with. As you cross the boundary into the borough of Southwark that same bus lane converts, midway round the one way system, into a 24 hour bus lane which means that drivers who had been using the bus lane suddenly, halfway round a busy one way system, have to filter back into the traffic. That causes a huge amount of congestion at that point. Garrett, can I get your feedback on that?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): Probably there are two halves to this as Kulveer has outlined. There is a half that is about general awareness and there is a half that is about specific sites and making sure that we have got the right times on the bus lanes and we have got the right signage up so that people understand the usage. If you have got specific examples where you do not think that people are understanding that usage, we are more than happy to look at them. To me, it is about those two things. I am very happy to look at specific examples and review them.

James Cleverly (AM): Eric, from a borough point of view?

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): You may have noticed this going through that junction on your bicycle but I wanted to note that out of hours bus lanes are an important cycle facility. We do not really have enough cycle capacity in London as it is. What we are starting to see with the very successful cycle hire scheme is a real - pardon the pun - critical mass of cyclists, to the extent that more cyclists cross a number of the bridges in central London at peak time than vehicles. We can really see the potential of cycling to clear up vehicle congestion if we provide the facilities to make cycling safe.

I also wanted to mention that we had asked, in relation to the draft MTS, to see the specific threshold where road user pricing would be considered but it has not been specified in the final MTS.

Jenny Jones (AM): Another wave of love, Eric!

James Cleverly (AM): The second point I wanted to ask about was back to the road pricing. It has been a bugbear of mine. I have pulled the Deputy Chair of TfL up on this and the Mayor up on this. Sorry, Kulveer, it is your turn now! It is with regard to road pricing trending to zero in the TfL budgets. There are two things we can look at. We can throw our hands up and say, "This is nothing to do with congestion charging or air quality; it is a road tax by another name". If we are content to do that then I am content to drop this issue. If we are maintaining that it is a congestion reduction tool or potentially an air quality improvement tool that is there to drive behavioural change, if we say that we expect this tool to work and for behaviours to change then surely we must trend towards - probably never get to - zero for the budget derived from congestion charging. Is that going to be the case moving forward?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Trending to zero? Sorry, James. Are you saying you want to see --

James Cleverly (AM): What we are saying is if we are encouraging people to --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): James, can I just ask you, are you talking about the penalty charges as opposed to the charge? The penalty charge should trend to zero because --

James Cleverly (AM): No, this is total revenue. If we are talking about generating behavioural change and if we are trying to discourage volume of road users then, if we are successful, there will be fewer people paying the charge and/or the penalty fare. Therefore, we should be looking, in absolute terms, a reduction in the revenue generated.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Are you talking about the clean technology exemptions?

James Cleverly (AM): It does not matter. What I am talking about is whatever behavioural change we are trying to drive, if we are successful in driving that behavioural change, we should expect to generate less money from these charges.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): I understand what you are saying, James. It is all about behavioural change. What we are trying to do is use the Congestion Charge to do two things here. One is, yes, to get less congestion in London by dampening down demand for driving into central London. We also understand that there will be people who will need to drive in, and some people will choose to drive in, despite that charge. That behaviour will not change. What else can you do to help get the right benefits from the charge. That is things like the Greener Vehicle discount which says that if you drive in with a cleaner vehicle then you get a certain benefit from doing that. That is trying to make the charge a bit more sophisticated in terms of driving two different sets of behavioural change that are linked together.

What we will continue to do is keep it under review. We would not keep it the same. We are looking at having a review at setting the limit of carbon dioxide (CO₂) per mile per gallon that is emitted by the vehicles that get the charge and continue to drive that downwards. At the moment that has been set at 100. We have already indicated that, before the end of 2012, we will review it with the potential to taking it down to 80 and so on and so forth. Continuing to make it an effective behavioural change technique and then seeing, if it does work, how else do we then drive more benefits from it.

I hope that is addressing the point you are saying about what are we trying to achieve.

James Cleverly (AM): I do appreciate the point that you are not sitting on this as just a blunt number of axels in a certain geographical area paying a certain amount. That is welcome and that is moving in the right direction.

At some point, if we project forward as to our ideal solution that we all have an aspiration towards, there will be a smaller number of vehicles in totality; those vehicles using the road network in London because it is essential for them to do that and there are no other credible options for them to do so and for those vehicles to be clean and green.

If we were - and I know it is a slightly artificial projection - able to tick all those boxes then I would ask myself what would we be driving to achieve through a road pricing mechanism. If we were able to tick those boxes, then we should expect to generate no revenue because why would we be charging only green clean essential vehicles in that area. What I am saying is, as we move towards that - and I do not expect perfection so I do concede that there will always be a residual amount - we should be expecting a reduction in charging. I would like to see that.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): I would respond to that by saying as people move to cleaner and greener vehicles we still have the primary change that we are trying to do which is keep the level of vehicles down. You would still charge those vehicles because, effectively, they would still be producing congestion in the city, which you would not want to see increasing.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Thank you. Do you think you have done that one? Yes? I am not quite sure I fully understood what you were saying.

James Cleverly (AM): I think that is very telling that you do not.

Jenny Jones (AM): I am always with James except it is very difficult to --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): You can do it on green taxes but if there is a Congestion Charge system there is always going to be --

James Cleverly (AM): If the desire is to find a way of getting money out of vehicles then, yes. If your desire is to drive behavioural change, once you have driven that change, then what are you charging for?

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): That is something you can do with Penalty Charge Notices and it is something you can do with green taxes. At the end of the day, if you have a Congestion Charge system, there must be some level of income even if it has declined. That is the bit I do not understand.

Jenny Jones (AM): It could even be a negative. You could get to the point when it is a negative amount. You are losing money on it and then you have to change the criteria.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Those are the maintenance costs.

Jenny Jones (AM): Green taxes - which I see this as - are meant to change behaviour. Once you have driven down behaviour to the point where you have anticipated it, then you have to anticipate a different level of behaviour.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Can I just come back? The charge --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Let's hear from both of you.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): -- is about two things. It is about congestion and what we are talking about is the greener side of it. If you achieved the utopia of everybody driving green vehicles you still would not want everybody to be driving in the zone because you would still get congestion.

Jenny Jones (AM): You are still taking space.

James Cleverly (AM): I am not talking about the removal of charging. What I am talking about is, because people have changed their behaviour, no one is triggering the charging. That is the point I am making.

You are saying then we need to find a new way of getting money off of them. What I am saying is we should then try to stop taking. If we have asked them to wear brown shoes and they all now wear brown shoes, we should not be charging them.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): I think we all understand the point you are making now, James.

James Cleverly (AM): I am not sure we all do.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): We are getting where you are at now. We want to get on to the issue of car clubs; something novel for this Committee to discuss. We have got Eric here. They have done a lot of work on this issue in Islington.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I understand Islington set up a borough-wide car scheme and your aim is to reach 20,000 members by 2015. Can you confirm that that is correct and what benefits do you see in a borough getting involved in this sort of scheme and how you think that is going to help congestion in Islington?

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): TfL has provided a lot of support to all boroughs for car clubs in recent years. We have taken advantage of that and gone further and created new resource streams for ourselves. We have been very successful. I should mention that I am also the Chair of the national charity promoting car clubs which is called Car Plus, based in Leeds, so I have got a national perspective as well.

We started our car club in 2003. We had about 200 members in 2006 and we now have over 12,000. We do aim to reach 23,000 members by April 2013. We have been seeing 40%/50% growth per year so that is not very ambitious. We have done a study that suggests that, based on current demographics of current car club members, we should be potentially able to reach 40,000 members in Islington. It is the ideal type of place to do a car club but it is successful in other types of places as well; certainly central London, certainly further out in regional centres once again and other cities.

In terms of benefits, I really look forward to the result of the census form that I received in the post the other day because we are still using 2001 car ownership figures and we had, at that stage, 42% of households with one or more cars, so 58% without any cars. Even at that stage second lowest car ownership figures and second highest car density because we have so little space in Islington, so it is a problem. In all this time, up to 12,000 members, the figures show that we have got about 55 members using each car of the 200 on street and another 15 off street cars that we have in Islington. Each car leads to about 25 fewer cars on the street.

These figures are so incredible that sometimes we scale it back because we want people to believe the potential benefits of car clubs. It comes down to something like 12 of those 55 members get rid of an existing car and another 13 decide they are not going to buy a car that they suggest that they would have bought. We are talking at least 12 fewer cars. Let's say 2,000 to 5,000 fewer cars on the streets of Islington. That is great in terms of parking pressures. Figures have shown this as well. They are making fewer trips because they do not have that impulse incentive, "I've already paid for the car that's parked out front so I may as well use it". We do not have the quantitative on it but that should be a significant decrease in traffic congestion.

If we were to reach our goal of, say, 40,000 members in Islington, then we are talking about approaching half of the 40,000 or 50,000 cars in Islington being gone potentially. We are not convinced that the current demographics are the limit of the potential because it tends to be at the moment a bit of a middle class phenomenon. We are interested, in Islington, to particularly make sure that the car club benefits the poorest members of the community because some of them have a car and are required to run it because they have not got involved in the car club. Joining the car club they could save £3,000/£4,000 a year. We want that opportunity to get out to them. Could we be talking 50,000/60,000 members in Islington; fewer cars on the street - less congestion.

There is great potential, I believe, and I am glad that TfL continues to support it and that many boroughs are really jumping in behind it.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Very good.

Joanne McCartney (AM): You said you have got a national perspective. We are concerned with London particularly but some boroughs will have similar characteristics to Islington and some will not. You mentioned a few things earlier on. You said that Islington is currently borough-wide covered by a controlled parking zone (CPZ). I wonder if that has had an impact, do you believe, in increasing membership of car clubs as an incentive? Have you seen applications for CPZ permits go down by the same amount over the period? You also talked earlier about your planning policy about having no car developments. Is that a driver for people joining car clubs?

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): Yes. The Head of Islington's parking service is very angry at me at the moment. He is losing some income. As you point out, James, when you are successful, gosh darn you are successful! There are some problems with that. Luckily we give him all the income from our car club parking permits so that is a little sweetener.

We have seen a decrease in permit sales. That is because of a range of factors: maybe the car free housing, maybe the car club, maybe other measures, Congestion Charge, cycle hire - all sorts of things that have led to that. That is why I am so keen to see these 2011 car ownership figures because I think we could see a significant drop.

The car free housing is very important for the car club. First of all it means we have all these new residents coming in who say, "Yes, OK, car free but I can do that. I don't really need a car. Anyway, I am getting one year's free membership to the car club [which we often do] or at least I know we have local access to a car club car".

Joanne McCartney (AM): You incentivise people by giving them a year's free membership of the car club?

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): That is right, and a couple of hours' use to make sure they get started. If they do not use it after the first year then they will probably drop out. Some people, who do actually value it, then will probably carry on.

We also get some income from those developments to pay for new car club bays to continue to expand the network, which is why we have not had to take advantage of TfL's generous offer of money for new car club bays. We have our own revenue stream. Yes, the car free housing helps.

I should mention - sorry - that that is not just having no cars parked on site but having no eligibility for a parking permit which is why the parking service Head is particularly angry at me!

Joanne McCartney (AM): Are those disincentives for having a car - CPZ charges, lack of parking and development restrictions - replicated in other parts of London you can point to for having had a similar effect?

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): Yes. We have always stayed just ahead of a few other boroughs in relation to the number of car club

members. Wandsworth, Camden, Lambeth, these are the central London boroughs who have really jumped behind it. They are all very similar. Kensington and Chelsea, for instance, has one CPZ covering the whole borough, whereas we have smaller ones. Basically if you have to register to park then you have fewer people who are eligible to get a parking permit. It just leads to people thinking it through. Thinking, "What are my costs? I can pile up my £3,000/£6,000 a year. I do not use the car very much. I am going to join the car club instead".

Joanne McCartney (AM): Do you have any success stories in outer London because that seems to be the area where it would be, I would think, more difficult to encourage a car club?

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): Yes. I would be happy to provide the Committee with the detailed breakdown. I am pretty sure Car Plus has membership figures for each of the boroughs. It gets them from the car club operators. I think Richmond and Kingston and Croydon – there are a number of outer London boroughs who have really got involved and have a lot of members. It may not be borough-wide, every house is within a five minute walk, which is where we have reached because every part of Islington has good access to public transport. There are certainly parts of these outer London boroughs where every member has just the same incentive to join as they do in all of Islington.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Very interesting. I was going to make the point that outer London is a bit different but we will be very interested to see the results.

It is not just car clubs. There are lots of other initiatives around like lift sharing and the new schemes where people can hire each other's vehicles, so I would hire out my vehicle to another person.

At the RAC Foundation we are following this very closely and we are publishing quite soon various bits of research to try to assess what the national potential is for this and, in particular, try to see how much difference it will really make to road traffic. Owning is one thing, using is a different thing. There are potentials here, we just do not know how far they will go.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): The Mayor is very supportive of car clubs. We have been supporting Car Plus. London is the car club capital of the country. We have 1,600 vehicles in London as part of the car clubs. We are looking to see those develop and we support that through smarter travel initiatives. We do see a social economic issue here, as has been highlighted even just by the boroughs that are involved, and so we do need to tackle that and see what other things we could do to broaden the appeal and usage of car clubs.

Murad Qureshi (AM): I am a recent convert to the car clubs having joined Zip Car. I will confess, the driving force for me was petrol prices, and the recent spike has led people like me, in dense areas, to say, "If we can get our overheads covered by a car sharing scheme – insurance, parking etc – at least that reduces the cost when we do get in a car". I am wondering to what extent is this driven by sensitivity to petrol prices, particularly in recent times?

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): Because there are all those other costs. It is buying the car, maintaining the car, parking the car, insuring and road tax. The petrol only comes into it when you are using it. If people are using their car daily or most days of the week, particularly for commuting, then the car club will not work for them because they would drive to where they are going and pay for eight hours of parking before driving back. For them or for people who drive further, the petrol prices will be more of

an impact to them, but then they are not really the target audience - so to speak - for the car club.

It is the people who have the car parked there and use it for a few local trips to drive to Ikea or whatever --

Murad Qureshi (AM): That is me.

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): They are the ones who will really benefit. Hopefully that does not reduce the potential traffic congestion benefits. It does a little bit but it is still those impulse trips that people used to take. If you have such a big chunk of people that you are taking out of the car ownership market then my hope would be that that is fewer trips happening on the streets.

Mike Keegan (Transport Strategy Manager, TfL): Just a quick point to say it is great to hear the news of the success of the car clubs. The rapid growth that you described and the vast potential in places like Islington is exactly why it is so difficult to forecast 20 years ahead what London's growth will do to congestion.

As people's perceptions change and their awareness changes of what options are available to them - environmental awareness also - it can have a bigger impact on their choices of how they travel. We can see quite big changes over quite short amounts of time but they are very difficult to predict. Just the way people think about cycling now is quite different to the way it was only a few years ago. Again, these things are extremely difficult to model. Bear that in mind when you think of that famous 14% figure.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Can I ask a follow up on what Murad said. If I understand correctly, you have a deal with Street Car. Does that mean, for example, if Murad is a member of another car club he cannot come in? I am concerned about movement and freedom of movement and people's freedom to travel. In other words, I know in Kensington and Chelsea we allow all car clubs and everybody has free parking at all of them. I come, therefore, with a view of thinking that we should allow the freedom. Can you clarify therefore, the benefit is that Murad does not have a car but then if he wants to come and see something in Islington - shopping or commercial or whatever reason - does that mean you cannot bring another car club company in to park?

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): One clarification on the way car clubs work is, first of all, that they have dedicated parking bays and you would use the car and go somewhere and then bring it back to that bay. You can use the car to go anywhere but when you are out somewhere, even if you are in the same borough, you are going to have to pay to park it somewhere else, just as you would your own car, and then you bring it back and park it in the dedicated bay.

To answer your question in terms of multi operational --

Victoria Borwick (AM): Not in Kensington and Chelsea of course but that is different --

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): Multiple operators are about having different operators using the different dedicated bays in your borough. We happen to be a single operator borough. We started with the City Car Club - or Smart Moves as it was called at the time. It changed to Street Car which has recently been bought by Zip Car, so Murad will be able to use all of our cars very soon.

Murad Qureshi (AM): Right. I will travel around Islington now.

Eric Manners (Head of Policy and Programmes, London Borough of Islington): That is, once again, not the issue either. For us, we made the procurement decision because if all of our cars are one operator then any member in Islington has access to all of our other cars. We were thinking, "What's the best way to provide a good service for the people of Islington?"

Things are changing a bit and the procedures that are used by other multi operator boroughs are improving and clarifying. We are considering that possibility. We have also got into that critical mass again of cars out there so that Islington members have access to so many - well why not have access to a few more of another company. That is something we are looking at. Yes, every borough does it differently.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I appreciate this is still developing, which is why I wanted to ask the question. In fairness, hopefully, people will look at what we are doing here in London and possibly think that is something they may be doing elsewhere. I wanted to have an honest debate about the fact that if you could take it forward so there was more freedom between them then, to me, it would seem preferable if we wanted to encourage freedom of movement and not restrict people to just shopping in one particular area or for any commercial reason. Thank you.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): We have covered that but that is a really interesting and encouraging development. We need to talk a little bit about the sustainable transport alternatives. Caroline?

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): I wanted to pick up the issue of what is most likely to encourage drivers to use their car less? What forms of public transport or other sustainable transport are most likely to get that modal shift that we want to achieve?

Mike Keegan (Transport Strategy Manager, TfL): One of the things to bear in mind that envelopes all of the discussion that we have had is the broader strategy for accommodating London's growth, which is largely about improving public transport, significant investment in the rail network and in the Underground and Crossrail, together with national rail investment. There are schemes beyond what is currently funded now - potential extensions of the Docklands Light Railway (DLR), Tram Link, Bakerloo line etc - and also maintaining the bus network. In the long-term, over the next 20 years, the key to providing a good alternative for car use is a good public transport system. That is what this strategy sets out. It envisages a continued mode shift towards public transport, walking and cycling so that, in 20 years' time, we could have a reduced car mode change. The sustained investment in public transport is a prerequisite.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): That would have a huge impact on congestion if we do not see the level of investment in public transport.

Mike Keegan (Transport Strategy Manager, TfL): Precisely. That is exactly right. That is what we need to do. It is a prerequisite, as well as all the stuff that Garrett has mentioned about running the network as efficiently as possible.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): I recall previously that there was evidence that certain forms of public transport are more likely to get car users out of their cars than on to them. I do not know if there is still evidence around that.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): I am not really aware of that. To state the obvious, what you have to provide car users with is a reasonable alternative to the trip they are making. The important dimensions there are the quality of the service in its general sense, in other words its frequency of provision, its reliability and whether or not it goes there. If you do that then the expansion of the bus services over the last decade has demonstrated – at considerable expense; nothing wrong with that – that if you buy better levels of bus service people will transfer to it.

The problem is that in outer London – as I mentioned earlier – you have got this figure that over 70% of the trips are by car and that is because they are making very, very complicated trip patterns all over the place and it is very, very expensive to provide good alternatives by public transport for a lot of those trips. It could be done but you have not got the money.

It is not to do with the particular mode; people will use buses if you have a good bus service and they will use trains if you have got a good train service. It is a question of the quality of the service and its substitutability for the particular trips you are making.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): What about cycling and walking? Do you think that there is more room to encourage car drivers to use those as forms of transport?

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Of course there is but the ability of cycling to attack the problem we have been discussing is inherently very, very limited. There is nothing wrong with cycling. I am a cyclist. I came here by cycle. Look at the arithmetic. If you were able to persuade 20% of those car journeys which are less than three kilometres to transfer to cycle that would increase the cycling share from 2% to 5%, which is what the Mayor wants to do, but it would only reduce traffic by 3% because the modal shares are the way they are. You have phenomenal success with cycling but it does not make much difference to the amount of traffic on the roads because it is a small proportion.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): That is 60% of the forecast growth in the next 20 years. I want to get some perspective on this. The MTS is talking about a growth in traffic of around 5% across London over the period of the plan. If you put that in context with what you have seen in London over the last ten years, which is a 6% reduction in traffic and certainly in the last two or three years actual increases in speed, you are broadly talking about levels of traffic in 2031 that are the same as the levels of traffic in 2000 on London's roads.

The issue, and the reason that you have got a potential problem in terms of congestion and this 14% figure that is bandied around, is not because of the huge increases in overall volume of the traffic, it is because of the location of it and it is because it is targeted because the growth is in key points. We have mentioned the east of London. You are right to mention specific areas of south London.

The issue that has come out of the debate is it is about how you deal with those targeted areas. It is where I disagree with you, Stephen, when you say we have got a widespread problem. You have got a specific local and targeted problem. Cycling certainly can have a big role to play in those areas. I am sure Kulveer would be very keen to push the Mayor's enthusiasm for this because it is in those key targeted areas where cycling can make a big difference.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): And walking of course, which is by far the bigger mode as well.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): Do we have evidence from the Smarter Travel pilot from Sutton and Richmond about outer London and getting that modal shift? Have you got some evidence there of how they have successfully managed to get car users using other modes of transport?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): There is significant evidence certainly from Sutton and, increasingly, from Richmond. I do not have figures in my head but we can certainly provide that, yes.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): It might be useful to feed into this if we can get up to date figures on that.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): You know about the evidence from the other towns, from Darlington and Peterborough and one other, where broadly the bottom line is --

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): Winchester.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): The bottom line is, in those cities, they have achieved something like a 10% reduction in car traffic. Is that the right statistic? It is significant.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): That would be very helpful.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): There is literature.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): That would be very helpful. In outer London, when touching on the car club point earlier, the issue for me is it may be about households getting rid of their second car and using the car club. That might be one of the issues.

Mike Keegan (Transport Strategy Manager, TfL): In the MTS there is a Figure 17 which shows the imperial trends in traffic volumes back to 1993 which shows that decrease that Garrett referred to. Then it shows the forecast to 2031. This is with just the funded plan which does show a very small increase in car use. What it shows though mainly is quite a significant increase in van use. That is an area where we are working at the moment with the freight industry through the Freight Operator Recognition Scheme and delivery and servicing plans with businesses to see what efficiency improvements we could make. It is worth bearing that in mind: the difference in growth between passenger use of the roads and freight use of the roads.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): That is reflected nationally. Car use nationally has stagnated but van use has gone up very rapidly. I am not sure we really understand why. It is partly because people who would have had cars are now using vans both for their professional work and as private vehicles. It is a major cause of national traffic growth: vans.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Can I ask Garrett a niche question on this. We have not mentioned taxis at all during the day and the black cab drivers would be very upset that we have not mentioned taxis. One of the things I have noticed from a presentation I saw done by TfL some time ago is that black cabs are relatively inefficient users of road space because they are moving around a lot not necessarily carrying a passenger. Is there something that could be

done in terms of additional taxi ranking to look at how black cabs could be more efficient in terms of road space?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL):

It is something that we already do in specific locations in terms of events and making sure that we get the most use out of taxis. The taxi industry is often very supportive and is looking for us to do that so it is a question of how much we can do and how much resource we have to do that.

In terms of general usage, the taxi industry is not only Hackneys, it is also private hire so you have got different types of use across the city and very different densities. If you are talking about central London the issue is very different, potentially, to the opportunity and the use of taxis in outer London. You have got to relate all of the opportunities back to what I was saying earlier where your problems and issues are. At key nodes on the network taxis potentially do have a significant role to play in supporting the movement of people and controlling volumes.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Could they be made more efficient than they are?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL):

There is a combined incentive. Clearly, there is an economic incentive for the taxi industry itself to be more efficient in delivering better outcomes for its business. There is also an incentive there in getting better use out of the road network. I am sure there are still opportunities and we will continue to look at them.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): You have to be a bit careful.

Taxis are just a car club with a driver! They do, as Garrett says, make a very important contribution. The reason the black cabs work well is to do with quality of service. You can pick one up when you want one. That depends on a significant proportion of vacant circulation.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): Let's leave that there.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): I wanted to pick up a question to you, Kulveer. We talked earlier about freight and better ways of reviewing the night time lorry ban and things like that. What role could the Mayor play in encouraging alternative work and travel patterns generally in London?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): That is a key question which we sought to examine at the start of his term when we were developing the MTS and the London Plan and, for the first time, brought the two together to say, "When we are looking at the way that travel planning is working, going forward over a 20 or 30 year period, where are those centres that we see emerging? Where is there capacity for transport that exists already and potential capacity there and we should look to have development around those areas? If we are seeing development that is going to be increasing in other areas, how do we map against the requirement for additional transport capacity and projects like Crossrail, Crossrail 2, and look at what happens with the East London line and potentially further improvements of the overground network? How can we provide the right level of mass public transport capacity to reduce the demand for radial journeys into central London because, effectively, there is only so far you can really go?" You could continue to build and build and build but we would keep having hotter and hotter points in London and key interchanges becoming even more intense.

That is where the London Plan and the MTS have correlated and have tried to see where we see regeneration - East London. What can we potentially see in areas like Croydon and other town

cities so that we will not have as much of a demand potentially going into the future of people continuing to want to come into the centre and go out again.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): What about issues like ticketing?

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Ticketing as in variable ticketing prices?

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): The Mayor may well be looking at that. You have only got so much fiscal capacity if you spread the peak hours.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): There are two points there. You are absolutely right, we can look at it and we are looking at it. We have looked to provide a discount on a certain Oyster rate - it escapes me at the moment which figure it is. We are looking at seeing where we can provide a different charge at different times of day for usage.

We do have an issue where, predominantly, a lot of the Underground network is substantially at peak capacity for large parts of the day. The peak keeps growing as people become more flexible and where employers and jobs are seeking to be more flexible with people who come in and commute in. That is happening. There is, potentially, more of an opportunity there to look at having different rates for using the public transport system at different times of the day.

Professor Stephen Glaister (Director, RAC Foundation): Same principle as road charging.

Caroline Pidgeon (Deputy Chair): Absolutely. Thank you.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): I think we have exhausted most of these topics now unless there are any last questions. We will be looking to make some recommendations so if there are any additional suggestions you want to be making to this Committee now is your last chance to make them. Is there anything you would particularly like to see in our recommendations?

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): One point that I wanted to really draw out in the way you frame your deliberations and discussion. We have talked a lot about what you might loosely term carrots and sticks in measures, and the traditional congestion strategy over the last few years has been about that. Whether it has been about investing in public transport or behaviour change or demand management measures to control growth in traffic volumes.

I keep coming back to this point that all of the stuff that is in the MTS is going to be pretty effective in doing that and the evidence is there. That is why we are only talking about a relatively small growth in volume of traffic, about 5%.

To come back to the very beginning in what John said about what do I want from a road network and reliability and things like that, only 10% of the disruption that we see on the network on a daily basis is actually caused by too much traffic in any one place at any one time. 90% of it is caused by all these other things that we have touched on in terms of operating the road network. It is one thing to say how we are going to manage the growth in traffic and make sure we do not have too much traffic on the network. You have got to put equal weight, for the traffic that we are going to have on that network --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): How we manage the disruptions.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): -- how are we going to keep it running? There is absolutely no point, if we are very successful in controlling that --

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): I think that has come across, Garrett, very well.

Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, London Streets, Surface Transport, TfL): -- and not managing it efficiently around the network because it will be no good to businesses and no good to customers.

Mike Keegan (Transport Strategy Manager, TfL): To reiterate that point, the way that we need to manage London's growth, including its potential impact on delay on the road network, is through a broad integrated strategy. Integrated across the different modes of transport but also integrated, as Kulveer said, with the land use planning and the way we deal with everything from a strategic level across London down to individual developments: mixed and high level density. It is a broad approach. We need to do all of that to accommodate London's future.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): This debate has shown it is not just a question about roads and congestion but how many various different facets impact the road network. It is a vast debate. We have touched on various points over the last two hours.

I know it was mentioned a lot about pedestrians. They are key road users. We take that point very seriously. That is why innovations such as pedestrian count down and looking at providing more certainty, safety and security for pedestrians is something that we have been trialling and, in fact, something that we want to see accelerated. We have had an 18 month trial. I am now calling to say that we should reduce that to 12 months because we see significant benefits being achieved by that kind of approach. We need more innovation of that kind that balances the need of the pedestrian and all the cars, the lorries and the cyclists. Everyone here is aware of the amount of work the Mayor and TfL have done in cycling.

When it comes down to it people do get frustrated about congestion. We cannot say that we are winning this war despite the figures we talk about. We have seen a 5% decrease in severe disruption since last year. We have seen journey times come down, so an average 30 minute journey is now 30 seconds less than it was taking a year ago. That can add up to something like 80,000 hours a day of people spending less in disruption because there are 10.4 million journeys done by car in the city every day.

We will continue to work on it. The work we are doing to pull together a network operation strategy is fundamental in treating the road network, as I said at the start, with the amount of effort and respect it deserves, and continue to embed its work in every other part of transport.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I believe road deaths have also gone down.

Kulveer Ranger (Mayor's Transport Adviser): Yes, that is right.

Valerie Shawcross (Chair): A continuing trend. Thank you all of you very much for your time and your expertise today and for the leads you have given us on to further things that we should investigate and explore. I hope you agree it has been a really interesting and worthwhile debate and a very difficult and multi faceted one as well. Thank you very much indeed.

This page is intentionally left blank