

## Way to Go! Analysis of Responses

### Contents

Section 1	Introduction and background
Section 2	Question 1 of WTG: Principles
Section 3	Question 2 of WTG: Challenges
Section 4	Question 3 of WTG: Walking & Cycling
Section 5	Question 4 of WTG: Other things to do
Section 6	Next Steps
Appendix:	Summaries of stakeholder responses

## **Section One: Introduction and Background**

In November 2008, the Mayor of London Boris Johnson set out his vision for transport in London in his consultation document, “Way to Go”. This document described the main challenges facing London’s transport system, the principles for addressing these, and suggested broad approaches to policies and solutions.

The purpose of “Way to Go” was to set out the Mayor’s views and stimulate discussion to inform the preparation of the new Mayor’s Transport Strategy (MTS). Londoners and anyone with views on transport in the Capital were invited to respond with their comments by 16 January 2009. The consultation document stated that these responses would be used to shape the development of the Mayor’s Transport Strategy, which would expand and develop the principles into policies and proposals for consultation.

MTS is a statutory document required under the Greater London Authority (GLA) Act 1999. It describes how the Mayor intends to develop and implement policies for the promotion and encouragement of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport facilities and services, to, from and within Greater London. This includes services under his direct control as well as those delivered in partnership, particularly with the London Boroughs.

TfL has been delegated by the Mayor to prepare a new Transport Strategy which will cover the period to 2031. This work is now underway and there will be consultation on a draft document later in 2009, with the new Strategy expected to be in place early in 2010. Since the publication of “Way to Go”, TfL has published its ten-year Business Plan, setting out its plans for investment up to 2017 and with more information about how the Mayor’s vision and priorities will be delivered. This will also inform the development of the new MTS. The section on Next Steps provides further information.

### **Purpose of this report**

This report provides an overview of the main responses to the four questions posed in the consultation document:

*Question 1: Do you generally support our principles for developing policy? If not what other principles should apply?*

*Question 2: Have we identified the key challenges facing transport in London? If not what other issues should we be considering?*

*Question 3: We have emphasised an approach to encourage more people to walk and cycle. Do you agree with this?*

*Question 4: Are there things you think the Mayor should do to improve transport in London which are not identified here?*



Responses to this consultation are being used to inform the preparation of the draft Transport Strategy. Since we do not wish to pre-empt the draft MTS, this report does not seek to respond formally to the issues raised. Rather, it is designed as a high-level summary of responses to the high-level statement of views set out in "Way to Go" and it concentrates on summarising the overall responses to the four questions.

Responses to "Way to Go" were numerous and covered a vast range of issues. Some respondents stated that they would like more detail on a policy area, and consideration of particular factors and, again, these comments will help to shape the consultation on MTS. The responses are also informing conversations and work with boroughs and other stakeholders. Some comments were detailed and often area-specific and will be addressed in appropriate forums.

There will of course be further opportunity for respondents - and anyone else - to comment again during the MTS consultation.

In total, 107 stakeholder responses, 15 business responses and 138 public responses were received. Responses were accepted up to 18 February 2009. Summaries of responses from stakeholders are provided in Appendix 1. The tables below set out the number of responses by respondent type.

#### **Number of respondents overall**

<b>Respondent Type</b>	<b>No. received</b>
<b>Public</b>	138
<b>Businesses</b>	15
<b>Stakeholders</b>	107

#### **Stakeholder responses**

<b>No. of stakeholders responding by type</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Business Representative Organisations</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Disability and Mobility Groups</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Education</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Freight/Haulage representative organisations</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>GLA Bodies</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Health organisations</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>London Boroughs</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>London Political Representatives</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Motorists organisations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>NDPBs</b>	<b>2</b>

<b>NHS Greater London</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Non London council</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Partnerships</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Political organisations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Residents Association</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Transport &amp; Environment Representative Organisations</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Trades Unions</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Transport Representatives</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Voluntary &amp; Community Sector representative organisations</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>

The following sections consider the four questions asked in “Way to Go”. Each section sets out the question posed in the consultation and a brief description of the Mayor’s proposed approach before summarising the views of respondents.

## **Section 2: The Principles for developing policy**

### ***Question 1: Do you generally support our principles for developing policy? If not what other principles should apply?***

“Way To Go” outlined eight key principles that will form the basis of London’s future transport policy:

- Respecting your choice
- Keeping you informed
- Protecting the environment
- Developing outer London
- Connecting transport and planning
- Working with the boroughs
- Transport for all
- Value for Money

There was a strong endorsement of these principles, although there was concern about the application of ‘Respecting your choice’ in relation to the transport hierarchy. This section briefly summarises respondents’ views. Respondents’ suggestions often combined policies and principles and challenges, making it difficult to distinguish pure principles: issues which were frequently raised are described in other sections of this report. There were few suggestions which could be clearly identified as additional principles, but several respondents said that ‘Customer Care’ should be a key consideration.

## **Respecting your choice**

Most respondents were generally supportive of the principle of providing choice, and there was recognition that car use is not always wrong and, in outer London particularly, may be an appropriate choice. But many said that the road user hierarchy should not be abandoned.

This hierarchy usually prioritises forms of transport which have high capacity (such as buses) and seeks to protect vulnerable road users like pedestrians (especially those with specific needs such as the disabled or children) and cyclists. Other aspects, such as the relative environmental impacts of different types of road user, are also considered in the hierarchy. Many London boroughs said that, with limited road space, priority should continue to be given to the most effective forms of transport, in line with the Mayor's overriding objective of getting Londoners from a to b as quickly, safely, conveniently and cheaply as possible.

## **Keeping you informed**

Respondents agreed that this was an important aspect of the Mayor's future Transport Strategy. Some noted that providing both good information and interchanges could help people to choose more sustainable forms of transport. Responses from disabled groups highlighted the importance of making sure that all visual information is also relayed audibly, for blind and partially sighted people. They also suggested that all front line staff should be trained in how to communicate with deaf, hard of hearing and deaf blind people.

## **Protecting the environment**

There was broad support for protecting the environment. There were some concerns that there should have been greater detail on how reduced emissions of air quality pollutants and CO<sub>2</sub> from transport would be achieved and an expectation that this will be addressed in more detail in the Mayor's Transport Strategy. In particular, some respondents were concerned that there was not enough emphasis on the environmental impact of cars, vans and lorries, and there was some discussion about the future configuration and volume of air travel.

## **Developing outer London**

"Way To Go" suggested doing much more to develop transport provision in the outer boroughs of London, enabling people to live and work in the same area rather than commuting to central London. There was strong support for polycentric development, especially from the outer London Boroughs and partnerships. Many noted its potential for wider environmental benefits. The principle was also supported by inner London Boroughs on the understanding that it would not take place at the expense of inner London.

## **Connecting transport and planning**

Many respondents felt that the integration of land use planning and transport policy is key to sustainable transport and, more broadly, sustainable development in London. Boroughs are keen to work with TfL on this issue. Respondents were hopeful that the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the new London Plan would be complementary documents.

## **Working with the boroughs**

“Way To Go” recognises the important role of the boroughs in delivering the Mayor’s Transport Strategy and suggests that this be better reflected in the way City Hall and TfL work with the boroughs. This principle was welcomed by stakeholders, particularly the boroughs themselves who often made specific suggestions as to how this could be achieved, for example by assuring continuity of funding and ensuring that boroughs were involved in the local adaptation and implementation of London-wide policies . The sub-regional focus was welcomed, and many noted that, as well as the boroughs, it would be important to work with Partnerships and other local groups to achieve optimal outcomes, and to work across borough and GLA boundaries. A particular concern raised by Boroughs was the lack of consultation on the cancellation of some major projects. There were also some concerns over discrepancies in the LIPs settlements.

## **Transport for all**

Accessibility was an important issue for many stakeholders, including London Boroughs and disability groups. There was widespread recognition of the advances made with bus accessibility, and hope expressed that action on the Tube system will soon follow. It was felt that accessibility should be a priority of the new Transport Strategy. Some disability groups highlighted that the Disability Discrimination Act extended beyond wheelchair users; barriers to access to public transport must also be removed for those who are deaf, blind, partially sighted and hearing impaired. There were concerns that proposals for shared streetspace and allowing cyclists to turn left on red lights would compromise the safety of disabled people.

## **Value for money**

Especially during this period of economic uncertainty, TfL must offer Londoners good value for money. To this end, “Way to Go” outlined plans to discontinue work on schemes that are not funded in the current TfL Business Plan. Stakeholders were supportive of the need to provide value for money, but there was particular disappointment that certain projects like Cross River Tram and the Tramlink extension have not been taken further forward. There was support for consideration of longer term projects, and the potential for securing funding from government and possibly the private sector. Both stakeholders and public noted that since there had been an identified need for transport provision, it was important to retain these schemes – or at least keep the focus on how to tackle the issues identified – for the future. Since the publication of “Way to Go”, TfL has secured funding for Phase 2 of the East London Line extension, which some respondents stated was important.

## **Section 3: The key challenges**

### ***Question 2: Have we identified the key challenges facing transport in London? If not what other issues should we be considering?***

“Way to Go” painted a vivid picture of challenges faced by Londoners as they travel around the Capital, while acknowledging that many of these were a product of the very success of the system. These challenges included overcrowding and delays due to signal failures on the tubes and problems with articulated (“bendy”) buses taking up too much of London’s street space and acting as a hazard to cyclists. It described the perception of anti-social behaviour on buses and a failure by some to swipe Oyster cards. For visitors to the city, high cash fares were identified as a problem; for the disabled (and others), a shortage of lifts on the Tube network. Motorists, it said,

were frustrated by long waits at red lights and the prevalence of roadworks, causing delays and diversions. “Way to Go” concluded by identifying the key challenge of improving the experience for the passenger/pedestrian/cyclist/motorist on a network which is not only straining under present demand, but, as London’s population and economy grows, will be placed under increasing pressure.

Many respondents agreed that these aspects presented challenges, although there was a wide and often differing range of proposed responses to tackling them, which are not covered in detail here. Members of the public who responded tended to agree that there were too many buses on the streets, and Oxford Street was raised by many (including stakeholders) as a particular issue. Some respondents suggested that replacing bendy buses with other buses might add to traffic congestion and reduce overall capacity. A small number of respondents took issue with the tone used in “Way to Go” with regard to young people’s behaviour on buses.

The issue of traffic light phasing elicited a mixed response. A number of stakeholders, particularly London Boroughs and the transport and environment representative organisations, were concerned that adjustments in favour of the motorist should be made with regard to the impact on pedestrians, particularly vulnerable groups. The problem of the impact of roadworks on traffic flow was acknowledged, although there was a mixed range of potential solutions suggested.

There was strong support for increasing accessibility on the network, with lifts on the Underground system a specific example. A number of respondents raised the issue of the reduced target for step free access at LU stations which was in the Business Plan (this had been an unfunded 33% by 2013 and is now 29% by 2017). There was acknowledgement of the success of iBus as well as suggestions for further enhancements to information provision, facilities at pedestrian crossings, and a range of comments relating to Dial-a-Ride and the provision of door to door transport generally.

### Additional Challenges

Stakeholders identified a number of additional challenges for London, which they believed needed to be addressed and further detail about the Mayor’s approach provided. It is not practicable to highlight every issue raised, but the following challenges were frequently mentioned:

**Future planning post 2017:** many respondents strongly regretted the cancellation of a number of major projects, even given that some were unfunded. There was a concern about how the identified need that was to be met by these schemes would now otherwise be met. Areas which were identified for regeneration (for example, Thames Gateway) were particularly raised as an issue. There was also a strong feeling that while TfL’s Business Plan only covers the period to 2017, it is important to retain these and other plans for future consideration. Several stakeholders wanted to know how the Mayor planned to lobby central government for future funding for major schemes such as Crossrail 2. Many noted that massive growth is still predicted for London’s population and economy, and were keen that transport investment kept pace with this.

**Olympics:** several respondents noted the omission of the Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2012 as a key challenge. They wanted to know more about how London will meet the demands of the games, particularly with regard to accessibility and the use of sustainable transport. Respondents noted that “Way to Go” made brief references to the use of river transport (and there

was strong support for achieving this ahead of the Olympics), and a possible car-free festival zone, but wanted more information.

**Climate Change and Air Quality:** the Mayor has committed to a 60% reduction on 1990 levels of CO<sub>2</sub> by 2025 and identified Protecting the Environment as a principle, but respondents wanted to know about specific policies to limit emissions from transport. A number of potential approaches were put forward. These included: encouraging the development and use of alternative technologies and fuels; providing charging points for electric vehicles; and greater use by TfL/GLA and their contractors of low-emission vehicles.

**Transport link to regeneration:** respondents welcomed the link between transport and land-use planning but wanted a more explicit acknowledgement of transport's role in driving regeneration, particularly in identified Opportunity Areas. Respondents suggested that this needed to be included in the principle of developing Outer London and creating a polycentric city where communities are close to jobs, health facilities, education and other services.

**National Rail:** respondents welcomed the roll-out of Oyster to National Rail services but noted that the fact that the Mayor does not have direct control of these services presented a challenge to his vision of integrated and fair transport services, especially in outer London.

#### **Section 4: Walking and Cycling**

***Question 3: We have emphasised an approach to encourage more people to walk and cycle. Do you agree with this?***

Of all the issues raised in "Way to Go", responses to this question were the most numerous and positive. Stakeholders were almost unanimous in their support for this approach. At least half of all the public responses were concerned with endorsing the commitment to walking and cycling, as well as making particular suggestions for achieving it. A number of local cycling and community groups responded to the consultation, as well as the national and London organisations.

Respondents often drew attention to the wider benefits of walking and cycling. A large proportion of respondents noted that by encouraging these as modes of transport, the Mayor could also contribute towards achieving public health objectives. Many others attested to the social importance of liveable communities where everyone could enjoy their public space and felt able to access local facilities and services. Walking and cycling could contribute significantly to enhanced quality of life. Furthermore, as 'zero emission' modes, walking and cycling could help reduce CO<sub>2</sub> and air quality pollutant emissions from transport.

Of course, respondents had different views on the proposed means to achieve the walking and cycling revolution, and there were very many additional suggestions. Summaries of these comments and proposals are provided at the end of this section.

Respondents' comments on the subjects of walking and cycling very often provided a clear illustration of the complex issue of road space allocation and the interaction between different types of road users. Many felt that this was the arena where the need for a road user hierarchy which pays particular attention to the most vulnerable users, was most clearly apparent. This is made more pertinent because of the stated aim of encouraging more people to walk and cycle. The following are some examples of the most frequently-made comments on this issue.

- In re-phasing traffic lights, there should be sufficient regard to the safety of pedestrians alongside the intention to smooth traffic flow.
- While allowing motorcycles in bus lanes might smooth motor traffic, it could also be perceived as a safety hazard for cyclists, particularly if they were inexperienced or nervous.
- While permitting cyclists a left turn on red might well protect cyclists from motor vehicles, it could be inimical to pedestrians. There was also concern that cycling along the near side of freight vehicles could be dangerous for the cyclist.

Shared space might be attractive for the majority, but there would need to be safeguards for blind and visually impaired people who are accustomed to a kerb in alerting them to the presence of traffic.

## Cycling

In "Way to Go", the Mayor set out specific ways to make cycling more attractive, including a cycle hire scheme for central London, which could have parallels in the outer boroughs; providing safe routes for cyclists; tackling the physical barriers to cycling such as gyratories; and having cycle paths in the Royal Parks and along the Thames. Accompanying this would be an increase in cycle stands and secure parking and the development of cycling hubs in the outer boroughs. The possibility of allowing cyclists to turn left on a red traffic light was also raised.

The cycle hire scheme for central London was generally welcomed, and many respondents were keen for similar projects to be rolled out to the outer boroughs, albeit with appropriate modifications. A number of boroughs had specific concerns about the impact of the schemes, and stated that TfL must work closely with them on local implementation of the facilities. Many respondents reiterated the importance of providing dedicated cycle parking facilities and pointed out the adverse safety and urban realm impacts of cyclists chaining bikes to signposts and railings. Heritage groups, whilst supportive of the scheme, were concerned that cycle infrastructure should be minimal and appropriate to the local context.

There was strong agreement from cycling organisations about the need to address gyratories and the other circumstances where even the safest cycle route has to interact with the mainstream road network. There was general support for having dedicated cycle routes in central London although freight groups raised the issue of how cycle lanes could impede access for loading/unloading.

Respondents had a number of additional suggestions to encourage cycling. These included allowing cycles on more types of public transport without time restrictions, and making it easier to actually do this – for example providing ramps in tube stations. There could be cycle parking and servicing facilities at major stations and interchanges. Some respondents advocated cyclists being permitted to go up one-way streets the wrong way; others noted that reduced traffic speeds and air pollutant emissions from motor traffic would make cycling much more attractive. One respondent noted that workplace facilities for cycle storage and showers are important, but are particularly difficult for smaller employers to provide.

## **Walking**

“Way to Go” described the need to improve the urban realm and set out various measures such as removing obstacles like railings, planting trees and encouraging the use of lower-emission vehicles to achieve this. Respondents strongly agreed that improving the urban realm would be essential to encouraging walking. However, many respondents felt that while there was considerable detail on how cycling would be encouraged, there was insufficient information on walking policies.

One disabilities group pointed out that *all* street clutter – not just the guard rails and signposts associated with street management – posed a hazard to pedestrians with disabilities.

There were a number of new ideas put forward. For example, the development of a walking map for London akin to the famous London Underground map; and developing walking routes similar to the cycling routes, so that people can get between locations more easily on foot. Many noted the success of Legible London and called for there to be more use of this scheme, and not just in central London. Similarly, many were enthusiastic about travel planning, which enables people to plan their journeys by sustainable modes, and were keen that this is used more widely.

Also noted was the fact that many people choose to travel by car (or not at all) because they are deterred by having to make changes and connections on public transport. Providing good interchanges and better information about completing journeys – including how connections can be made on foot – would help to address this. A further suggestion was that walking should be recognised by TfL as a mode in its own right.

## **Section 5: Other ideas to improve transport**

### ***Question 4: Are there things you think the Mayor should do to improve transport in London which are not identified here?***

The Mayor’s priorities for improving transport, set out in “Way to Go” and TfL’s ten-year Business Plan, are as follows:

- Expansion of public transport capacity: including the upgrade of the tube and the completion of Crossrail.
- Improved traffic management: re-phasing traffic lights and tackling the disruption caused by unplanned roadworks
- Increase in cycling and walking in London
- To deliver London’s 2012 transport projects and secure a lasting legacy: completing the East London line extension to the London Overground network and increasing capacity on an extended DLR
- To improve further the safety and security of the travelling public
- A better experience for the traveller, walker, cyclist through better information and improved urban realm

Respondents welcomed many of these commitments, particularly the plans to increase capacity. There was a range of views on how some of the plans should be implemented, and respondents

often asked for more information about how the aims would be achieved. These issues will be considered in the development of the MTS.

This section focuses on *additional* ideas put forward by respondents. It should be noted that some of these additional ideas have already been covered to some extent in Section 3 (Challenges) and Section 4 (Walking and Cycling). Following the summary of additional issues is an overview of areas where respondents stated that they would like more information on the Mayor's approach.

### **Additional ideas put forward by respondents:**

**Further policies to reduce transport's environmental impact (reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and air quality pollutant emissions):** There was widespread agreement that we need to protect the environment and a call for more detail on the specific means proposed to achieve this. "Way to Go" mentioned emissions from buses and taxis and many respondents agreed this was an area to tackle while noting that emissions from lorries, vans and cars are also important. The idea of cleaner technologies for taxis was raised; also there were suggestions for the more efficient movement of road freight or moving freight off road onto rail or river. Developing lower-emissions buses – which could be a feature of the 'new Routemaster' - was also a popular idea.

Many respondents went on to make suggestions for how alternative fuels and low carbon technologies could be supported. For example by providing investment for the development of hydrogen vehicles and providing charging points for electric vehicles, as well as leading by example in the TfL fleet, and by GLA using its influence in procuring vehicles. A number noted the potential environmental benefits of the Mayor's other approaches and said that these should be maximised - such as developing Outer London hubs (helping to reduce the need to travel long distances) and encouraging walking and cycling.

Similarly, respondents felt that providing good information about public transport options and better interchanges could help to encourage sustainable choices. This links in with the principle of ensuring that there are real alternatives to private car use. Many respondents specifically mentioned the success of Smarter Travel, which includes initiatives like school and workplace travel plans and car clubs to enable people to make 'greener' transport choices. The Legible London scheme, which has placed easy-to-understand street maps for pedestrians at key central locations, was frequently referred to as a scheme which could be extended.

Some respondents noted that there should be explicit policies which seek to encourage modal shift: using a range of ways to encourage people away from car use to public transport, walking and cycling. A few stakeholders said that there should be specific incentives (and disincentives) for decreasing personal car use.

A few respondents also raised the prospect of fast rail links acting as an alternative to short-haul flights, which could help to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from air travel.

**Customer Care:** a few respondents suggested that this should be an additional principle. Respondents who raised this issue referred to making public transport a more attractive option, for example via better information. Others noted that certain practices, such as ensuring that buses stop close to kerbs, could make services more accessible.

**Extend Mayor's influence over National Rail:** this issue was referred to in both public and stakeholder responses. The argument made was that in order to provide a fully integrated and

strategic approach to transport, the Mayor/TfL would need to extend their influence over all rail services. This would be particularly important for Outer London and people who commute into London from surrounding areas.

**Recognising transport's reach:** a number of respondents were keen that as well as enabling people to live and work in the same place, transport's role in enabling people to access education, healthcare and leisure should be explicitly recognised. It was also noted that transport has a key role in regeneration. Some respondents described 'liveable communities' where accessing these facilities did not necessitate long trips. This would both have environmental benefits and help to ensure fairer access. Others pointed out that encouraging active travel would have significant health benefits, and that this should be an important consideration in policymaking.

**More on accessibility:** while transport for all is a stated principle, some disability representative organisations and others asked for more specific commitments. These included a completion of the review of door-to-door transport services. One group recommended a consolidation of the various taxi services (Dial-a-Ride, Capital Call and Taxicard) and others made suggestions for how access to buses could be improved. There were suggestions for specific improvements to pedestrian crossings and the provision of information. Respondents said that there should be a broad definition of 'accessibility' to cover a range of disabilities; and a consideration of their needs in improving the public realm.

**Maximise use of existing (and planned) assets:** although there was considerable disappointment about the cancellation of projects, respondents acknowledged the need to concentrate limited resources on funded schemes. With this in mind, there were a number of suggestions for squeezing the most value out of existing and planned resources, as well as bringing disused infrastructure back into use. A number of boroughs made a case for sustained funding for highway maintenance. The importance of interchange – and linking up different lines and modes – was frequently raised. This included, for example, ensuring that as many as possible have access to new Crossrail stations by providing bus services and providing information at stations about the onward journey, be that the location of a bus stop or a signposted walking route.

There were suggestions for considering disused railway lines, for example in North West London. Some respondents suggested a pragmatic approach for achieving orbital links through joining up existing links with, say, express buses.

**Bus Services:** a number of respondents stated that there should be an overarching review of buses, including the routes, service levels, types of buses used and the tendering process. There was agreement with the identification in "Way to Go" of Oxford St. as a problem. However there was some disagreement over the removal of bendy buses and a consequent loss of capacity and accessibility, as well as the congestion impacts if these were replaced with (more) single or double deckers.

**Recognise the role of Partnerships as well as London Boroughs:** the principle of TfL working more closely with the boroughs was strongly supported (and most boroughs had specific recommendations for how this could be achieved). There was also a strong feeling that the role of local partnerships should also be acknowledged. Partnerships comprise a number of key stakeholders in a particular area of London: relevant boroughs, business and community groups and transport organisations. Respondents believed that TfL should use these Partnerships to identify the needs of sub-regions and maximise the effectiveness of potential solutions.

**Better surface links to airports:** several respondents made comments about the need to have fast and accessible access to airports, both within London and from the major cities in the UK. This could be in the form of high-speed rail links reaching across and beyond London, and also express coach services, which could be more quickly and cheaply provided.

### **Areas where respondents would like more information on the Mayor's policies**

In making suggestions for other ways to improve transport, respondents often stated that they would like to know more about the Mayor's policy in a particular area which they felt had been missed or insufficiently covered in "Way to Go". They then sometimes went on to explain what they thought should be in this policy. This particularly applied to the following areas:

**Road safety:** some respondents recommended increased use of 20 mph zones. A number of disability and other organisations were concerned about the safety of shared space schemes. Many respondents were opposed to the approach of allowing motorcycles in bus lanes (which is an 18-month trial) and the potential for cyclists' left turn on red, both of which may have an adverse impact on the safety of cyclists and pedestrians, respectively.

**(Car) Parking policy:** respondents asked for the Mayor's views on range of issues including the provision of parking spaces, park and ride schemes, harmonisation of parking policies and shortage of parking spaces. Cycle parking attracted a lot of comment and is covered in Section 4.

**Freight policy:** with regard to road freight, some respondents called for a review of the loading and unloading facilities in the Capital, and a possible adaptation of the enforcement regime. Others asked about moving freight to rail, the river and even cycles.

**Tackling road congestion:** while smoothing the flow of traffic has already been identified as an objective, many respondents asked for more detail about potential mechanisms to reduce road congestion. Some particularly wanted to know more about the potential to re-schedule deliveries and use travel demand management, including road user charging.

**Taxi policy:** there was some concern about whether there were enough taxis in the right place at the right time; suggestions were made for reforming the Knowledge and addressing vehicle emissions.

**Future use of new tram schemes in central London:** for example cross river, Oxford St.

London Boroughs and Partnerships usually made detailed comments on the transport improvements that they felt would benefit their area. Summaries of individual responses are provided at Appendix 1.

### **Section 6: Next Steps**

TfL has been delegated to prepare the revision to the Mayor's Transport Strategy, and the responses to "Way to Go" will be used to inform its development. This report is intended as an initial summary of the responses and the types of issues raised. Copies of all the responses submitted to the "Way to Go" consultation will be made available to the Mayor.

The views and information in the responses will also be used to inform TfL's ongoing conversations with the London boroughs and other stakeholders, and more detailed modal planning. TfL is also intending, in conjunction with boroughs, partnerships and other stakeholders, to develop sub-regional transport plans, which will seek to translate the MTS and London-wide policy to a more local level. This will also draw on the comments set out in the "Way to Go" responses, particularly those of the relevant boroughs and partners in each sub-region.

TfL intends to consult on the Mayor's Transport Strategy during 2009, when the public and stakeholders will have further opportunity to comment. It is envisaged that the consultation on the London Plan will take place at the same time as this consultation; because of the different legal requirements there will also be an Examination in Public for the London Plan during 2010, with the Plan finalised by the end of 2011.

The timetable for the statutory consultation on the MTS is set out below.

