
From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good morning,

(I am willing to appear at the EIP.)

Please specifically acknowledge receipt. (My formatting of italics and underlining has been lost, but never mind.)

Regards,
John Cox

=====

1.0.7 "GOOD GROWTH"

I wish to submit that every reference to "good growth" in the plan should be replaced by "inclusive growth", to emphasise the major change of direction from mainly economic growth (of anything going).

That may require other changes in your text to maintain a clear and consistent context.

'Inclusive' is justified because it emphasises the necessity for economic activity and infrastructure investment that leads to greater, rather than less, social cohesion in London, between different economic classes, ethnicities, lifestyle groups, and ages.

"Good" growth has to be continually explained.

"Inclusive" growth does not.

CHAPTER 10 TRANSPORT

POLICY T1: STRATEGIC APPROACH TO TRANSPORT

T1 A1 should start "an explicit transport hierarchy in London that minimises the need to travel, and as a result, leads to the delivery of ..."

This is currently not explicit.

Lower down that hierarchy are more and more capital intensive public transport modes, for generally increasing numbers of people, that is: buses, guided buses, light rail, Underground and heavy rail. At the bottom is the evil private car.

T1 A2 should say "proposed transport schemes and studies" because just "schemes" does not capture alternatives to certain schemes mentioned in the Mayor's Transport Strategy (such as further orbital tram systems in London, instead of just orbital buses) and possible additional ones, any of which may become "schemes" if justified by the studies, at this 'formative stage'.

The London Plan is the longest-term statutory strategic planning to face an EIP. It should not exclude feasible aspirations that develop within its timescale, which may firm up over time as a result of those studies.

POLICY T2: HEALTHY STREETS:

10.2.7 The Healthy Streets Approach wording for "Pedestrians from all walks of life" should be extended with ", ages and mobility".

The first word is to make negotiating streets child-friendly. The second to include 'pedestrians' using mobility aids (whether accompanied by 'real' pedestrian companions or not) and prams.

POLICY T3: TRANSPORT CAPACITY, ...

T3 A should say "Development Plans should develop effective transport studies, policies and projects ...".

This is justified by comments above.

Table 10.1 should be enlarged to cover the following funded studies (you can ask the frit DfT and NR for help, depending on who the Secretary of State happens to be):

(a) Main line railway tunnels from interchanges on London's edge, to the approaches of central London terminal stations.

This is justified to gain capacity on London's suburban network for London's local trains. It is unlikely that metro frequencies can properly be introduced without this, particularly south of the Thames.

No stations are needed in such tunnels, which dramatically reduces the cost.

As a specific example, a partly combined Brighton Main Line and Chatham Main Line tunnel might be feasible.

Such action may reduce the need for future Crossrails to be tunnelled through the suburbs, and could be tangential to, rather than fully crossing, central London, to further reduce their cost.

This will also increase the likelihood of fundable new interchanges (like Streatham Common and Brockley) and better interchanges (like Herne Hill and Lewisham) between London's suburban lines.

With proper metro frequencies and cross-platform interchanges, individual lines can run to single central London terminals with far less opposition.

(b) Orbital tram systems in addition to the Croydon system.

There is no proper transport evidence base in front of the Inspector to favour orbital bus systems on the outer edges of London, compared to possible tram systems rather further in, in higher-density areas.

For instance, orbital buses across north London need to be compared with possible trams systems connecting town centres, opportunity areas and Underground and heavy rail stations.

One section of the latter might eventually be from Hillingdon/Harrow, via Kingsbury station, Colindale station, RAF Museum (on the West London Orbital Extension Railway from Hendon to Mill Hill Broadway), then taking over the Mill Hill East to Finchley Central Underground line, then east to, say, Arnos Grove and stations in the Lea Valley.

Needless to say, the West London Alliance's West London Orbital Railway is strongly supported.

It is not necessary that orbital link proposals take Londoners long distances; it eventually becomes clear that a journey through central London is more appropriate, or at least quicker.

(c) Variation of the current fare zone structure to capture greater fare income for orbital public transport schemes.

There must be less tilt towards radial schemes simply because they raise more cash from passengers.

=====

(end)

Please feel free to attach supporting information with your enquiry
Further supporting information

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/node/15165/submission/270941>

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.
