

*Version: 4 April 2001*

# **Greater London Assembly**

**Review of Transport Strategy - Draft for Public  
Consultation – April 2000**

# Contents

## Foreword

Executive Summary	i
1 Introduction	1
2 An Overview of the Revised Transport Strategy	1
3 The Executive Summary of the Transport Strategy	2
4 A Transport Vision for London	3
5 The TfL Business Plan and Local Implementation Plans	4
6 The Time Periods and Horizons	5
7 Integration within London's Transport	6
8 Integration with Other Mayoral Strategies	7
9 Integration with National And Regional Agencies, Strategies And Policies	8
10 The Boroughs	9
11 Targets	10
12 Costs and Funding	13
13 Programming	15
14 Policies and Proposals	15
15 The Spatial Dimension	16
16 Air Quality, the Environment, Road Safety and Health	16
17 Traffic Reduction	21
18 Transport, Economic Development and Regeneration	23
19 Transport and Social Needs	24
20 Outer, and Inner, London	24
21 Freight and Servicing Business	26
22 The Reallocation of Roadspace, and Managing Demand	28
23 Traffic Enforcement	29
24 Bus Costs and Revenues	29
25 The Underground	30
26 National Rail	32
27 Public Transport Ticketing	34
28 Congestion Charging	35
29 Major Infrastructure Projects	36
30 Airports, and International Connections	38
Note	38
Appendix	39

## **Foreword**

**In this Review of the public consultation draft of the Mayor's Transport Strategy we offer a constructive commentary on a document already improved since its initial draft, but which still has serious deficiencies.**

**In this Review of the public consultation draft of the Mayor's Transport Strategy we offer a constructive commentary on a document already improved since its initial draft, but which still has serious deficiencies.**

**The Mayor's draft Transport Strategy is a key document – the Mayor's plan for delivering a world class transport system to London. We welcomed the Transport Strategy back in December, and agreed with many of the Mayor's proposals.**

**However, it is unsatisfactory that so many of the concerns we expressed in our previous Review have not been addressed. By definition, scrutiny is critical. Our intention is to improve the Mayor's Strategy so that it becomes a truly viable and visionary plan for the future of London's transport system.**

**This Review highlights the lack of measurable targets, the inconsistencies and the lack of a coherent vision for the whole of Greater London in the present draft Strategy. We hope that this time more of the criticisms and advice in the Review will be heeded by the Mayor.**

**I sincerely thank the panel, John Biggs (Vice-Chair), Angie Bray, Samantha Heath, Jenny Jones and Bob Neill for their work and excellent contributions to this scrutiny. I should like also to extend my own and the panel's thanks to Martin Richards, our adviser, for his continuing high standard of advice.**

**I commend the Review to you.**

**Lynne Featherstone  
Chair of the Scrutiny Panel and the Transport Policy Committee of the Assembly**

## Executive Summary

### The Background

- 1 This Review of the public consultation draft of the Mayor's Transport Strategy builds on our Review of the initial draft. This version of the Transport Strategy is much improved, a more coherent, and consistent document. Many of the concerns raised in our Review of the predecessor have been addressed, at least in part, and there is much in this draft of the Transport Strategy with which we agree. Indeed, we welcome the fact that there is Transport Strategy for London. However, many of our concerns have not been addressed. We find that unsatisfactory.
- 2 The purpose of this Review is to seek to make the Mayor and his advisors aware of the weaknesses we still perceive. Our intention is that the final version should be a much stronger document, better suited to the needs of Londoners, and London. Thus, by definition, this Review is critical.

### Six Key Points

- 1 **There is no clear transport vision for London. Further, there is no clear definition of what the Strategy is intended to deliver, either by the end of the first three years, for which more detailed plans are provided, nor by the end of the ten years, the Strategy's main horizon.**
- 2 **The Strategy is seriously deficient in the setting of measurable, time specific, targets for the changes in London's transport system and the use made of it. Without targets, the effectiveness of the proposed measures cannot be determined. Neither can the performance of those responsible for delivering them, including the Mayor, be assessed.**
- 3 **There are serious inconsistencies in transport related matters across draft Mayoral Strategies e.g. air quality and transport. These are of vision, of delivery and of fact. The Mayor must be consistent in ensuring total consistency, in every respect in order that his proposals and policies are effectively delivered.**
- 4 **The Strategy appears to be focused on central London. It also appears to adopt a "one size fits all approach" to many matters. London benefits from being a city of great diversity. The Mayor's Strategy must foster that diversity. In particular, it must recognise the particular needs of the different parts of outer, and inner, London. At present it fails to do that.**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 5 | <b>We are concerned that the traffic reduction policy is too dependent on congestion charging in Central London, which has yet to be approved and which will not achieve an overall reduction in traffic across London</b>   |
| 6 | <b>This Strategy should have been used by the Mayor to set out his vision for the Underground, defining in measurable terms the standards of service he believes the system should provide Londoners. The fact that it does not represents a missed opportunity.</b> |

## Vision

- 3 We are strongly of the view that an inspiring, succinct, transport vision is required. Regrettably, there is still no such vision, even though the revised Executive Summary in the Mayor's Strategy provides the basis for defining one. (Section 4)<sup>1</sup>
- 4 Indeed, we see the Strategy as being too strongly based on the "here and now", failing to adequately address the changes which might occur of the next ten years, and beyond. (Section 4)

## Delivering the Strategy

- 5 Of the 150 Proposals, we consider that only 23 relate to actions leading directly to a change in transport services or infrastructure. 77 relate to the preparation of plans or programmes, from which actions might emerge, in due course. 43 describe principles, informing plans and actions. This does not describe a Strategy committed to driving the vitally necessary change. (Section 14)
- 6 We note, with continuing concern, that there are no linkages between the Transport Objective, Policies and Proposals. This seriously inhibits appreciation of how the Proposals ensure that both the Policies and, at the higher level, the Objectives are to be satisfied. (Section 14)
- 7 The Strategy should contain targets that are specific, measurable, assessable, realistic and time limited. Without published targets, and intermediate milestones, it is not possible for the Assembly, or others, to properly monitor whether the Strategy's objectives are being achieved. Without targets, the Strategy has little credibility. (Section 11)
- 8 Although this version of the Strategy contains some performance targets, there are still too few relating to the delivery of actual changes to London's transport system and services and in the demand for travel and transport. Under the Government's Best Value regime, TfL is required to set targets against which its performance can be assessed, as are the Boroughs. (Section 11).
- 9 We find the Mayor's reluctance to set a full range of meaningful, measurable, targets for the delivery of transport improvements unacceptable. We look to the final Strategy containing a comprehensive set of such targets. (Section 11)

---

<sup>1</sup> These numbers refer to the relevant Sections of the main document.

## **Executive Summary**

---

- 10 In our Review of the initial draft we called for a description of the arrangements for consultation on, and approval of, TfL Business Plans. This has not been heeded. Yet, with a Strategy which provides too little in real delivery, this could be a vital document in the planning and programming of the change so vitally needed. (Section 5)
- 11 The approach taken, in this version of the Strategy, to working with the Boroughs appears to be more constructive. In particular, there is recognition of the need for partnership. However, we are concerned that some Proposals continue to put emphasis on direction, rather than partnership, even though the roads to which they relate are largely under the Boroughs' jurisdiction. (Section 10)
- 12 We called for a statement of the principles of funding the Boroughs' Local Implementation Plans, LIPs, to be included in the Strategy. That, too, has not been provided. (Section 5)
- 13 The foregoing, taken together with the 2001/2 funding arrangements made by TfL for the Boroughs' Interim Transport Plans, cause us continuing disquiet. It is evident that we shall need to monitor the relationship between TfL and the Boroughs. (Sections 5 and 10)
- 14 Delivering the Strategy involves many uncertainties. We note that there is no explicit treatment of risk, nor identification of alternate actions. We find that a serious omission, which should be addressed. (Section 13)

### **Funding the Strategy**

- 15 The costs of providing London with a World Class transport system, and of addressing its environmental and social needs, should be identified. This should be a bidding document, setting out the funding needs for transport in London over the next ten years. While costs have been provided for a number of Proposals, the Strategy remains seriously deficient on information on costs. Since needs may well exceed current funding expectations, the Mayor should have set out options. (Section 12)
- 16 As a public consultation document, the Strategy should have presented information on the likely costs and impacts, or effects, of the measures proposed, so that interested parties could assess choices or priorities. (Section 12)
- 17 We are not convinced by the argument that detailed planning is only possible for the next three years - the time covered by the current Comprehensive Spending Review. The Government's Ten Year Plan for Transport sets out spending plans for London for each of the next ten years. Other organisations plan with at least equal uncertainty about funding. (Section 12)
- 18 We are concerned by the widening gap between bus revenues and costs, and the lack of a clear statement about the combined effect of the policies set out in the Strategy on TfL's, and thus the GLA's, finances. We think it essential that the advantages of the proposed policies are carefully assessed against other possible uses of the available funds. (Section 24)

### Consistency across Mayoral Strategies

- 19 We have compared this Strategy with the draft Economic Development and Air Quality Strategies, and have identified serious inconsistencies in transport related matters. In contrast to this Strategy, the draft Economic Development Strategy seems to see transport as playing only a minor role in regeneration and economic development. And the draft Air Quality Strategy expects far more of the Transport Strategy in delivering improvements in air quality than is recognised in the Transport Strategy. (Section 8)
- 20 These potentially damaging differences of vision, of delivery and of fact must be resolved. The Mayor must take full and direct responsibility to ensure total consistency across his Strategies, in every respect. (Section 8)

### Recognising Diversity

- 21 London is a very diverse city with widely varying needs. The Strategy still appears to be based on a "one size fits all" approach, with a strong focus on central London. These are serious deficiencies. The Strategy should recognise and build on that diversity, rather than establish a set of straitjackets, which could be very damaging. (Section 15)
- 22 We continue to find the treatment of outer London, as well as inner London, most unsatisfactory. This is despite the inclusion of a useful new section on the key issues, but which seems to have had no material influence on the actual Strategy. Given this very serious failing, we have agreed to pursue a Scrutiny on ways in which the transport, and the associated environmental, economic and social, needs of outer London may be better satisfied than appears to be the Mayor's present intention. (Section 20)
- 23 The Strategy must be clear about the suitability and cost effectiveness of the transport measures intended to support regeneration, as well as economic development. We do not consider this draft does this. (Section 18)

### Managing Demand, and the Environment

- 24 We find the Strategy much too weak on transport measures that could contribute to environmental improvement. Indeed, we find it curious that the draft Air Quality Strategy is much stronger on measures concerned with managing demand, and reducing the use of cars, than this Strategy. (Section 17)
- 25 We are pleased to note that the Strategy now recognises the Boroughs' statutory responsibilities under the Road Traffic Reduction Act. However, we are deeply concerned that the Mayor sees *facilitating car travel in outer London* as one of his ten key priorities. This conflicts with, and is likely to seriously frustrate, Borough plans to reduce car use. (Sections 17 and 20)
- 26 The current draft contains a much fuller recognition of the complex issues relating to the allocation of road space. However, we continue to find it difficult to understand how all the competing demands recognised in the Strategy, and which the Mayor appears to be seeking to accommodate, can be balanced

- without seriously disadvantaging some of them. This must be recognised. (Section 22)
- 27 We consider it essential that the final Strategy makes a much greater commitment to measures directed to changing travel behaviour and reducing car use. (Section 17)
- 28 We continue to be concerned that the Strategy offers little more than plans to meet the needs of business for the distribution of goods and the provision of services. We are also concerned by the lack of urgency with which the development of these plans is to be pursued. That must be changed. In addition, hard actions to achieve real change must be identified and pursued as a high priority. (Section 21)
- 29 We are concerned that there continues to be no direct recognition of the Boroughs' statutory obligations with regard to Air Quality. We see no grounds for believing that the Transport Strategy will enable the Boroughs to meet the 2004 and 2005 National Air Quality Standards targets for PM<sub>10</sub>s and NO<sub>2</sub>. We find this most unsatisfactory. We consider it essential that, through his Transport Strategy, the Mayor fully addresses the transport issues relating to the achievement of the National Air Quality Objectives within London. (Section 16)

### **Delivering Transport Services**

- 30 We continue to be very disappointed by the treatment of the Underground in the Strategy. We saw the initial draft as being a missed opportunity, and regret that none of the changes cause us to take a different view of this draft. (Section 25)
- 31 The Strategy should have been used by the Mayor to set out his vision for the Underground, what he thinks the Underground should be delivering for London. This should not be determined by the funding, and management, arrangements. Rather, those arrangements should be designed to deliver what London needs - a decent, modern metro. We fear that the failure to set out this vision in the current draft may have been contrary to London's best interests. (Section 25)
- 32 Given the importance of the Underground to London, the current debates about funding and management, and the failure of the Mayor to respond to the key principles of our previous Review, we have to pursue a Scrutiny of the Underground. (Section 25)

### **Congestion Charging**

- 33 We are surprised that our advice on the presentation of the proposals for the Mayor's central London congestion charging scheme has not been heeded. We do not consider the single question on congestion in the public consultation document on the Strategy Highlights is adequate, given the issues the proposed scheme raises. As a consequence, it seems probable that the consultation on the Scheme Order will need to address all aspects of the proposed scheme, with the exception of the very basic principle of there being a charging scheme in central London. That must increase the possibility of the need for some form of



## **Executive Summary**

---

public inquiry, or of legal challenge, either of which would threaten the Mayor's current implementation programme. (Section 28)

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 The Assembly prepared a Review of the initial - stakeholders' - draft of the Mayor's Transport Strategy. This was approved on 6 December and submitted to the Mayor.
- 1.2 Having considered the responses received from the statutory stakeholders, the Mayor published a revised draft on 11 January for public consultation
- 1.3 As a first stage in assessing this revised draft, the Transport Policy and Spatial Development Policy Committee undertook a comparison with the Assembly's Review of the initial draft. At its meeting on 6 February 2001 the Committee considered and approved a report: Transport Strategy - Draft for Public Consultation: Commentary on changes relative to the Assembly's Review of the Previous (Initial) Draft.
- 1.4 Noting that there are some important differences between the initial and current drafts, the Committee then resolved to prepare a review of the new draft, focussing on that material which is either new or represents a significant change, which should be brought together with the comments on the changes relative to the Assembly's review of the initial draft in a single document. The Committee's intention was the resulting report should represent the Assembly's response to the Mayor on the Draft for public consultation.
- 1.5 Thus, this document represents the Assembly's views on the Draft for public consultation of the Mayor's Transport Strategy.
- 1.6 There is much in this draft of the Transport Strategy with which we agree. However, the purpose of this review is to identify those parts which cause us concern. It is therefore critical, by design. But it is not negative. Its sole purpose is to seek to make the Mayor and his advisors aware of the weaknesses we perceive, with the intention that the final version is a much stronger document, better suited to the needs of Londoners, and London.
- 1.7 The next section provides an overview of the new draft. That is then followed by a series of topics, several of which run across the largely modal structure of the chapters which describe the Strategy.
- 1.8 Given our concerns about the shortage of measurable targets and costs associated with Proposals in the initial draft, we have include a table, as an Appendix, showing all the Proposals together with an indication about the provision of the associated information.

## **2 An Overview of the Revised Transport Strategy**

- 2.1 This revised version of the Transport Strategy is much improved. It most certainly gives the impression of being a much tighter, more coherent, document, with much greater internal consistency. It is a document very much better suited to its purpose than the initial version.

## Review of Public Consultation Draft of the Transport Strategy

---

- 2.2 Many of the concerns we raised in our Review of the predecessor have been addressed, at least in part. In particular, the recognition of the roles of the Boroughs, and of other agencies, in the implementation of the Strategy, as well as their particular responsibilities, is much improved.
- 2.3 However, there are also many concerns which have not been addressed. In particular, our call for targets has been largely unheeded, and there is relatively little further information on costs. This will have served to prevent a sensible, well-informed, discussion on alternatives, thereby seriously devaluing the Public Consultation on this draft.
- 2.4 Further, there remains a perception of the document being a collage of existing plans and policies, rather than being based on a fundamental review of future needs and opportunities, societal, economic, technical, environmental which we had called for (Review, Executive Summary, para 6).

### 3 The Executive Summary of the Transport Strategy

- 3.1 Although much of the text is the same as the previous draft, we are of the view that the revised Executive Summary provides a better impression of coherence and drive.
- 3.2 We note that the list of six key issues which must be solved in order to satisfy the central objective - *to increase the efficiency and quality of London's transport system* - has been replaced by ten key priorities to satisfy the central objective, to which has been added *so as to create a world class transport system*. This provides the basis for the definition of a transport vision.
- 3.3 We find it curious that the Executive Summary seems to contain material which does not appear to be included in the main document. Thus, for example, the statement *the needs of the different parts of London must be addressed – inner and outer, east and west, north and south – with flexible policies to meet local requirements* (para 10) does conform with our interpretation of the Strategy with respect to either outer London or the spatial dimension. These are topics to which we return later.
- 3.4 We also note that the Executive Summary states that *particular attention will be paid to the transport requirements of the new information, telecommunications and media based industries that are at the core of the new economy* (para 10). While we support this intention, we can find no evidence of direct measures to satisfy it in the main body of the Strategy.
- 3.5 We encourage the Mayor to ensure that the policy intentions set out in his Executive Summary are properly represented in the Policies and Proposals set out in Chapter 3, the sequence of Chapters 4, and Chapter 5.

## 4 A Transport Vision for London

- 4.1 The Assembly considered that the Strategy requires a Vision which is:  
*inspiring, it needs to be about the future, about new opportunities, about change, about the challenges of the 21st Century. It need not be limited to a particular time horizon. It can be challenging, but it has to be realistic.*

*It has to provide a route map by which the current, serious, transport problems of London will be improved. It has to set out what can be expected in ten or twenty year's time. It has to provide the "headlines" of how changes in quality, in reliability, in environmental impacts, in the social and economic functions of transport, can be achieved, to make London a much nicer place in which to live, to work, to play.*

*To satisfy these demanding requirements, we think it likely that the Vision will need to allow for on radical change. Without such change, we fear that there must be a real possibility that the problems will grow at a faster rate than they can be overcome.*

*We suggest that there should be a concise statement setting out the Vision. That should embrace the future, standards, change, and commitment (Main Report, paras 4.2 to 4.5).*

- 4.2 Although there is a much improved Vision for London (para 3.2), there is still no Transport Vision. We consider this to be a serious deficiency and regret that the Mayor chose not to heed our advice.

- 4.3 We are strongly of the view that a Vision is necessary if Londoners are going to sign up to the Strategy. We also think it necessary to help ensure Government appreciates the core principle of what the Mayor is seeking to achieve - and support that through funding.

- 4.4 We also note that the Government has a vision for the national transport system:  
*Our vision for transport in this country is for a modern, safe, high quality network that better meets people's needs and offers more choice to individuals, families, communities and businesses (Transport 2010 - The Ten Year Plan).*

- 4.5 Although we recognise that this Strategy is different in many respects to the Local Transport Plans (LTPs) which English local authorities outside London are required to prepare, we are mindful of the advice given by the DETR on the preparation of LTPs:  
*one of the keys to a plan's success will be the extent to which it meets the local vision of where a community wants to be in the future and how transport will contribute.... plans which are built around a vision, with coherent themes, will make it easier to set priorities which reflect the needs and wishes of local people.*

- 4.6 Thus, if the Government and other Local Authorities have, or are expected to have a vision for transport, why not London? Further, as we have noted, the Executive Summary provides the basis for defining a Vision. We see no reason why one cannot, should not, be included in the final version. We trust it will.
- 4.7 We were also concerned that the initial draft of the Strategy was too strongly based on the "here and now", and that it was lacking foresight. While Chapter 2 provides a stronger commentary on the future, it appears to us the Strategy itself is largely unchanged. If the new appreciation of the future, and other changes in the early parts of the document, are not reflected in the Strategy itself, they have little value.
- 4.8 We recognise that many of the pressing needs reflect past neglect. However, we continue to be concerned that this is a Strategy for today, which fails to review - and thus address - the changes that might occur over the next ten years and beyond, and thus the evolving needs of London, and Londoners.

## 5 The TfL Business Plan and Local Implementation Plans

- 5.1 In our Review of the initial draft, we called for an explanation of the hierarchy of documents including *the arrangements .. for approval and for prior consultation* (Part A, para 4.2), as well as an explanation of the relationship between TfL Business Plans and the Boroughs' LIPs (Part A, para 4.5).
- 5.2 We note that para 1.15 states:  
*Transport for London and the London boroughs will be required, respectively, to produce a Business Plan and Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) to set out how they will implement the Strategy. These will need to include detailed plans, and timetables for delivery. Funding decisions will be made in the light of these plans and in the context of available funds. For major initiatives, clear action plans will be required. The Strategy also sets the framework for guidance and instructions to the Strategic Rail Authority.*
- 5.3 However, we do not consider this properly addresses the requirements we identified in our comments on the previous draft.
- 5.4 We recognise that the Mayor might consider that this information is better presented in another document. We would have accepted that, had the draft of such a document had been made available at the same time as this draft of the Transport Strategy. However, we are not aware that any such document has been published.
- 5.5 It is our impression that the preparation of the TfL Business Plan has been delayed and may well not be available before consultation on the draft Transport Strategy is complete. We find that highly regrettable. Given the

interdependence between the two documents, it would have been very beneficial to have been able to review the two together. We would be very concerned if the TfL Business Plan were not available until much of the 2001/2 expenditure to which it will relate might have been committed. That would greatly devalue it.

- 5.6 Since the Strategy provides so little in the way of real deliverables, actions to directly improve London's transport and to affect the way cars are used, the TfL Business Plan could be a vital document. We hope it will provide be much more informative on the planning and programming, at least for the short term, of the actions which are so vitally needed.
- 5.7 We are concerned that our call for *a statement on the principles of how funding for LIPS is to be determined* (Part A, para 4.8), has not been heeded. We do not consider para 1.15: - *funding decisions will be made in the light of these plans and in the context of available funds* - particularly helpful in this context. Further, while we note para 5.27:  
*the Strategy ... gives the context for bids for funding from the boroughs to TfL for transport funding under Section 159 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999,*  
it is not evident to us how or where this information is provided.
- 5.8 Given the key role the Boroughs will have in implementing much of the Mayor's Strategy, we are convinced that the final Transport Strategy must be very much more explicit on this matter.
- 5.9 Our concerns on these crucial allocation arrangements have been heightened by the recent presentation to our Transport Policy and Spatial Development Policy Committee on the proposed allocation of funds for 2001/2 between TfL and the boroughs for their Interim Transport Plans. It is difficult for us to conclude other than that the process for 2001/2 has been unreasonably biased in favour of TfL.

## 6 The Time Periods and Horizons

- 6.1 We considered that *the lack of an early statement on the horizons is a serious deficiency, which requires correction* (Part A, para 5.2).
- 6.2 That is now covered by the opening paragraph of Chapter 1: *this Transport Strategy sets out an integrated set of policies and proposals for transport in London which broadly span the next ten years* (para 1.1).
- 6.3 While we recognise the constraints of the three year funding arrangements, we are of the view that a Strategy has to set out what is required and can, within reason, be expected to be delivered over the ten years to which it relates. It is important that it is presented as a clear statement of London's needs.
- 6.4 Thus, we find statements such as *the Strategy gives additional detail for the three years 2001/2 to 2003/4, where there is greater certainty on funding through*

*the Government's recently completed Spending Review 2000 (para 5.1) a potential, serious, weakness. At the very least, the Strategy should lay firm claim to the annual forecasts of transport expenditure for London set out in *Transport 2010 - The 10 Year Plan*.*

- 6.5 It is vital that this Strategy, which will have obtained legitimacy through consultation, makes clear to the Government, and the Treasury in particular, what is needed to bring London's transport system to World Class status reasonably quickly.
- 6.6 We advised that *in revising the Transport Strategy for public consultation, and in preparing guidelines for LIPs, a four year horizon should be adopted in place of the current three years. That horizon should also apply to the TfL Business Plan, helping to ensure proper co-ordination between TfL and the Boroughs (Part A, para 5.6).*
- 6.7 We recognise that the process of preparing, reviewing and approving LIPs is complex and time consuming, for both the Boroughs and TfL. However, we do not see that this prevents the adoption of a planning period which matches that of a Mayoral term of office, and thus reasonable expectations on the frequency with which London wide policy will be subject to review, and a new Transport Strategy prepared. We therefore regret that this advice has not yet been heeded.

## **7 Integration within London's Transport**

- 7.1 We were concerned that the initial draft implied that *integration is an afterthought (Part A, para 6.1), and the document created the impression that the old London modal fiefdoms are reappearing within TfL, noting that would be most undesirable, and must be resisted. (Part A, para 6.5).*
- 7.2 The current version creates a much stronger impression of a commitment to integration. We note para 2.70:  
*this Strategy provides an integrated approach to London's transport system across all the different means of travel. The creation of Transport for London makes implementation of such an integrated approach feasible. This allows more efficient use of the existing system, and better planning of future developments*  
as well as para 4A.11:  
*a 'whole journey' approach to transport is needed. Integration will be promoted..*
- 7.3 However, the structure of the series of Chapters 4, which are very similar to the initial draft, still does nothing to allay our very real fears about the reappearance of modal fiefdoms within TfL.

## **8 Integration with other Mayoral Strategies**

- 8.1 Given that the Mayoral Strategies are being published over several months, we were very concerned about the possibility for *inconsistencies and conflicts between Strategies* (Part A, para 7.2).
- 8.2 We note that there is a considerable strengthening of the principle of integration of the various Mayoral Strategies. In particular, para 3.7 defines:  
*the strong link between the Transport, and the Spatial and Economic Development Strategies, which need to work in concert towards the same goals, developing positive relationships between development, transport and regeneration;*  
and para 3.8 refers to the interactions with the five environment strategies, particularly the Air Quality and Noise Strategies, as well as *the important link with the Energy Strategy*. In addition, Policy 3.5 is directed to the integration of spatial development and transport policies.
- 8.3 However, the reality, at present, is very different. Our comparisons of the stakeholder drafts of the Economic Development and Air Quality Strategies with this version of the Transport Strategy have revealed some very fundamental inconsistencies, which we consider could, and should, have been avoided. There are differences of vision, of policy, of presentation and of fact.
- 8.4 While the draft Economic Development Strategy pays little attention to the effects of transport on regeneration, indeed on the London economy in general, the Transport Strategy presents a very different view.
- 8.5 The draft Air Quality Strategy can be read to imply that measures to be taken through the Transport Strategy will have a much greater impact on air quality than might be implied from the Transport Strategy.
- 8.6 Text that could, and in our view should, be common across strategies varies. Thus, while the basic content of Chapter 1 of the draft Air Quality Strategy is the same as Chapter 1 of the draft Transport Strategy, the text differs to an extent which appears unnecessary.
- 8.7 While para 3.17 of the draft Air Quality Strategy states *the policies of the draft Transport Strategy are expected to ... halve the growth in traffic in outer London*, para 4G.56 of the draft Transport Strategy states: *preliminary indications are that the policies and proposals set out in the Strategy could, over the next ten years or so, halve the growth in traffic across Greater London that would occur if present trends were to continue*. It seems improbable that they are both correct.
- 8.8 Para 3.8 of the draft Air Quality Strategy refers to a population increase from 7.1 million, but para 2.10 of the draft Transport Strategy sets the base at 7.3 million. And the draft Transport Strategy attributes 22% of Sulphur Dioxide emissions to road transport, compared with 23% in the draft Air Quality Strategy.



## Review of Public Consultation Draft of the Transport Strategy

---

- 8.9 The foregoing is a sample. We have recorded the inconsistencies identified in reports on the draft Economic Development and Air Quality Strategies.
- 8.10 It is clearly stated that the Transport Strategy provides the framework for the TfL Business Plan and the Boroughs' LIPs. We therefore consider it necessary that the Policies and Proposals of any Mayoral Strategy which directly relate to transport - and would necessarily be implemented by TfL or the Boroughs - should have a matching Policy or Proposal in the Transport Strategy. We think it inappropriate for any other Mayoral Strategy to include more detail for such Policies or Proposals than the Transport Strategy. But that is the case with the current draft of the Air Quality Strategy.
- 8.11 The Mayor must take full and direct responsibility for ensuring total consistency across all his Strategies, in every respect. To fail to do so could give rise to later, potentially damaging, difficulties.

## 9 Integration with National and Regional Agencies, Strategies and Policies

- 9.1 In our Review of the previous draft, we stated that *close cooperation with the SRA, Railtrack and the TOCs must be achieved* (Part A, para 8.1), and that *the Mayor should be willing to use his statutory powers to ensure that railways within London meet the reasonable needs of Londoners* (Part A, para 8.2).
- 9.2 We also noted that *while there is a Policy relating to partnership with Government, there is no parallel for partnership with any other agencies* (Part A, para 8.5), and we expressed concern that *the relationship between London and its hinterland is not well addressed* (Part A, para 8.6).
- 9.3 We are pleased to note that the previous narrow Policy commitment to working with Government has been broadened to also include:
- *the Boroughs;*
  - *sub-regional partnerships;*
  - *the Strategic Rail Authority, Railtrack and the train operating companies;*
  - *the South East and East of England Regional Assemblies and local authorities adjacent to London; and*
  - *businesses, organisations, trade unions and individuals across London* (Policy 3.1)
- 9.4 Thus, in relation to our previous Review (Part A, para 8.1), the only omission is BAA. Given BAA's central role, and the Mayor's proposed Policies which relate to BAA as airport operator as well as BAA's ability to influence the transport policies of many employers and freight operators, this omission is unfortunate.

## **10 The Boroughs**

- 10.1 We have been very concerned about the relationship between the Mayor, and TfL, and the Boroughs. In the initial draft Transport Strategy this appeared to be based more on direction than partnership (Part A, paras 9.1 to 9.4). While we recognise the powers the GLA Act gives him, we are convinced that efficient progress in implementing the Strategy requires a commitment to partnership, on both sides.
- 10.2 We have also been concerned about the Mayor's failure to recognise the Boroughs' obligations under the Road Traffic Reduction Act, and in achieving the Air Quality Standards set by Government (Part A, para 9.4).
- 10.3 Failure to recognise many of the initiatives undertaken by individual Boroughs and by sub-regional partnerships which are of direct relevance to the Strategy was another of our concerns (Part A, para 9.5).
- 10.4 The approach now taken to the Boroughs, and sub-regional partnerships, in the current draft, appears to be very much more constructive. However, we use the word "appears" advisedly.
- 10.5 We note that para 3.11 states:  
*the boroughs have a very significant role. They are responsible for much of the street network, so can have an impact on everyone's travelling environment. Boroughs are involved in many transport initiatives and are the key players for implementing the Strategy at the sub-regional and local levels. There are a number of sub-regional partnerships that are instrumental in delivering transport improvements,*  
and that Policy 5.3 states:  
*partnership will be sought with the London boroughs in developing and implementing transport policies and plans. Borough Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) will be required to reflect the Strategy's objectives, policies, proposals and priorities. The Mayor and TfL will issue guidance from time to time to the London boroughs setting out detailed requirements for their LIPs and for related bidding documents. Guidance will ensure the LIPs support achievement of the Strategy's objectives, priorities, policies and proposals are co-ordinated with each other and with the plans of other implementation agencies, and are effectively implemented and monitored. If necessary, the Mayor will issue directions to ensure the Strategy's aims are implemented.*
- These statements include some significant changes relative to their complements in the initial draft (Policy F2).
- 10.6 Thus, while now clearly stating that he is seeking a partnership approach, it is also clear that the Mayor will be prescriptive if that is necessary to achieve his strategic intentions. That is consistent with his powers under the GLA Act.

- 10.7 However, the tenor of a number of the Proposals in Chapter 4 Section G (Streets for All) might suggest that there remains an intent for TfL (recognising the difference in functions between the Mayor and the Chairman of TfL) to direct, rather than work in partnership with, the Boroughs. For instance, Proposal 4G.14 states:

*Transport for London will develop London's first Road Safety Plan. The boroughs will be expected to adopt the approach set out in the plan and to publish their own Road Safety Plans outlining how the target reductions are to be achieved locally.*

And Proposals 4K1 and 4K.2, which are concerned with the creation of a Sustainable Distribution Forum and the early development of freight quality partnerships, allocate responsibility solely to TfL, even though most of the roads in London are under the control of the Boroughs, who also have other key local responsibilities of relevance to both these initiatives.

- 10.8 These examples, coupled with our concerns about funding levels for Borough transport plans relative to TfL activities, cause us some disquiet lest the changes between the two documents are more presentational than representing a real recognition of the key roles of the Boroughs, and the need for true partnership. Hence our use of the word "advisedly". We shall need to monitor this carefully.
- 10.9 We are pleased to note that there is now a commitment to work with the Boroughs in satisfying their obligations under the Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997 (Para 4G.57). However, we continue to be concerned that there is no comparable statement with regard to Boroughs' responsibilities with regard to Air quality Standards. We recognise, however, that the need for Borough Air Quality Management Areas is now acknowledged (para 5.28).

## 11 Targets

- 11.1 We considered a very serious weakness of the previous draft was the shortage of targets. We were convinced that *the next version of the Transport Strategy must be greatly strengthened by the provision of information on targets for both content and delivery for almost all Proposals, and for content on most Policies* (Part A, para 10.12).
- 11.2 In saying this, we recognised that *the Mayor has concerns about the legal implications, or consequences, of publishing targets*. However, we did not consider *these to be well founded* and we noted that *they do not seem to apply to other local Government policy documents, such as UDPs* (Part A, para 10.9).
- 11.3 We think it relevant to note that, in its guidance to English local authorities outside London on the preparation of LTPs, DETR states:
- LTPs must include a set of indicators for measuring performance against targets and other outputs which can be used to assess whether the LTP is delivering the stated objectives ... the development of an appropriate set of indicators requires authorities to balance a number of considerations:*

## Review of Public Consultation Draft of the Transport Strategy

- *the need to collect sufficient data to understand the performance and delivery of the strategy (against all the important objectives);*
- *the costs associated with a robust monitoring regime and the need to make maximum use of existing data;*
- *the need to include indicators readily understood by local people; and*
- *the need for indicators to reflect the investment that is being made (separating, as far as possible, changes tied to factors outside the influence of the plan).*

*The development of performance indicators, targets and the overall monitoring regime needs to demonstrate a comprehensive but focused approach (paras 45 and 48).*

11.4 Although this is a Strategy and not an LTP, we can see no reason why the principles which apply to LTPs should not also apply to the Mayor's Transport Strategy. Indeed, the targets in an LTP are closely related to the Best Value regime, to which TfL is also subject. Thus, TfL is required to establish performance indicators, ie targets, just like any Authority preparing an LTP. Best Value also applies to and the London Boroughs, who are also required to set appropriate targets against which performance can be monitored.

11.5 In Scotland, Local Authorities are required to prepare Local Transport Strategies, and we find that for Edinburgh of particular interest and relevance. We think it has many merits in comparison with the current draft for London. We bring to the Mayor's attention the way in which change in travel by the main modes is targeted.

### Encouraging Walking, Cycling and Use of Public Transport Targets for increased use of alternative travel methods for Edinburgh residents by 2010

	Cycle	Walk	Public transport	Motorcycle	Car
All Trips (Over 16s)	6%	26%	23%	b	45%
Work <sup>1</sup>	10%	18%	38%	B	34%
Shopping	5%	32%	18%	B	45%
Children's' Travel to School	6%	60%	25%	-	9%

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Excludes work from home  
b Travel to be facilitated, but no specific target set

### Reducing the Amount of Car Use Targets for total motor traffic levels

	By 2005	By 2010
Over the whole city	Stabilise at 1996 levels	Reduce by 10% compared to 1996 levels
City Centre Traffic	Reduce by 10% compared to 1996 levels	Reduce by 30% compared to 1996 levels

## Review of Public Consultation Draft of the Transport Strategy

---

- 11.6 Targets should not only be associated with Proposals. They should also be related to Policies, since a Policy may have to be delivered through a number of complementary actions - Proposals.
- 11.7 We recognise that not all targets can commit to delivery, that some might need to be aspirational, as we suggested in our Review of the previous:., we suggested a differentiation between:
- **delivery targets**, such as "smart card ticketing will installed on all buses by December 2002", where control is fully within the authority of the Mayor, or
  - **aspirational targets**, such as "to reduce fatal and serious injury road accidents by 15% by 2010", where the Mayor can seek to influence but does not have ultimate control.
- 11.8 We recognise that this draft contains some additional targets relative to the initial draft (eg, Road Safety, Proposal 4G14). However, many of the targets relate to the delivery of plans, not to real improvements in the transport system. Further, the targets which are included relate to Proposals. There is nothing to compare with the targets set by the City of Edinburgh quoted above. We are convinced there should be, there must be.
- 11.9 Thus, we continue to be very concerned by the shortage of real targets which define *what* is to be delivered *when*, by way of transport improvements, not plans; they should be specific, measurable, assessable, realistic and time limited.
- 11.10 Given the need for TfL to have targets for Best Value, and the Mayor's apparent willingness to set targets for others, we see no sound reason why the Transport Strategy for London should not conform to the guidance for LTPs.
- 11.11 There is also very real need for a target dates and milestones, so that performance can be assessed during implementation. We recognise that more Proposals in this version have a delivery date, but by no means all. Without published targets, and intermediate milestones, it is not possible for the Assembly, or others, to properly monitor whether the Strategy's objectives are being achieved. Without targets, the Strategy has little credibility.
- 11.12 We find it difficult to draw any conclusion other than that the Mayor is unwilling to accept ultimate responsibility for the delivery of measurable improvements. We consider that unacceptable.
- 11.13 A table of all the Proposals in the current Strategy is Appendix 1. This indicates those which we consider include a real delivery target, other than for plans and policies.. It is very revealing. Of the 150 Proposals, only 23 relate to actions which are intended to lead directly to change in London's transport system or services. Of the remainder, 77 relate to the preparation of plans or programmes, which might in due course, lead to a commitment to an action to transport or

environment improvements. 43 relate to principles, informing plans and actions, and 7 concern a combination of plan and principle.

11.14 We do not think this analysis portrays a Strategy committed to driving forward the change the Mayor recognises as essential. It is evident to us, that much yet needs to be done to provide a Strategy which is committed to action, and which is clear on what is to be done, why and by when (subject, we recognise, to funding, a matter we address in the next section),

## 12 Costs and Funding

12.1 In our Review of the initial draft, we noted that *as well as being short on targets, the Transport Strategy is exceptionally short on financial information. This is a very serious deficiency which must be corrected prior to release of the version for public consultation, due for publication in January 2001. The Mayor's purse is finite. Trade-offs must be made. Stakeholders cannot, must not, be required to make uninformed judgements on priorities* (Part A, para 11.1).

12.2 We also stated *we cannot accept that cost information cannot be provided, certainly not for the version due out in January 2001* (Part A, para 11.7). We are strongly of the opinion that this consultative draft would have been better had it offered alternatives, rather than a single, largely uncosted, list of Proposals.

12.3 This new draft provides more information on costs, but too many Proposals are still not costed, and no costs are given in Annex 6 Outline of Key Proposals. Of the 23 Proposals we have identified as "Actions" only 15 have any cost information, and for some of those the costs are only indicative, or are *pro rata*, giving no indication of the anticipated level of expenditure (Appendix 1).

12.4 It has been suggested that Proposals for preparing plans or programmes do not necessarily require costs, since they are included in TfL's, or other agencies', establishment costs. We do not accept that argument. The resource cost implications of all these planning measures must be understood, and prioritised. We see that argument as a sign of weak management and poor cost control.

12.5 In our review of the initial draft, we *noted for a Transport Strategy, with Proposals which can take up to 15 years (or more) to realise, a three year budgeting horizon is inadequate. The Government has set out its plans, with funding, for a ten year period. The Mayor should do likewise* (Part A, para 11.11)

12.6 There is still no indication of the likely total costs of implementing the Strategy, nor of options depending on funding levels.

12.7 Indeed, as a public consultation document, the Strategy we are strongly of the view that the consultees should have been presented with information on the likely costs and impacts, or effects, of the measures proposed, so that interested parties could assess choices or priorities.

- 12.8 Much is made of the uncertainty in funding levels beyond 2003/4, and the need to obtain greater certainty to *provide stability of funding to allow long term planning and efficient use of resources* (para 5.17).
- 12.9 While we understand that there is greater uncertainty beyond the end of the current Comprehensive Spending Review, we think it would be more constructive if the Mayor were to set out his desired, or preferred, spending plans, based on reasonable assumptions from the Government's Ten Year Plan. We consider that would provide a much stronger basis for seeking future funding, than the approach currently adopted.
- 12.10 London is competing with many other calls on the Treasury. This should be a bidding document, setting out the needs for Transport in London over the next ten years.
- 12.11 At the very least, as we have recorded in Section 6, the Strategy should lay firm claim to the annual forecasts of transport expenditure in London set out in *Transport 2010 - The 10 Year Plan*
- 12.12 Given that there is uncertainty about levels of funding, and also of need, and that it is possible that funding will not enable all elements of the Strategy to be implemented within the desired time frames. If the Mayor thinks there is sufficient uncertainty about funding levels, he should consider the approach adopted by Edinburgh City Council. In their Local Transport Strategy, they have set out a series of options, associated with different funding levels (and assumptions).
- 12.13 We have noticed that the Forecast TfL trading income (excluding Underground) (Table 5.1) has been reduced for the last two years of the period, 2001/4, and the expenditure to maintain current services and programmes (including cost pressures) has been reduced for all three years. The result is an increase in the total available for enhancements. While we trust that the new figures are correct, we are concerned by the apparent volatility, and the possible management implications. We therefore request an explanation of these changes.
- 12.14 We were concerned about the assumption that funds from congestion charging would be available from 2003/4, noting that *this cannot be assured, yet without them the scope for new initiatives would be severely limited* (Part A, para 11.10).
- 12.15 However, we note that £190 million is still included in the total available for enhancements in Table 5.1 for 2003/4, and that para 5.12 states:  
*the proposed introduction of congestion charging in central London in early 2003 would significantly increase the funding available for public transport. To illustrate the potential value of this additional revenue, it could fund an additional tram scheme similar to Croydon Tramlink every year or so, though this would not be a balanced programme for its use. .*

### 13 Programming

- 13.1 We considered that programming *was another critical weakness of the* (initial draft) *Transport Strategy* (part A, para 12.1).
- 13.2 Other than the addition of completion date for a number of Proposals, and the title of Chapter 5, *Making it Happen – A Programme of Action*, there is still no clear programme of work. However, we note that para 5.13 sets out criteria for determining priorities where further choices have to be made as budgets are developed. But there is nothing about risks, and their management in seeking to ensure the delivery of the Strategy.
- 13.3 While these are improvements, albeit small, there is much to be done before this is a true transport strategy. The Final Strategy must include a proper programme, showing what will be done, and delivered, when. This should be complemented by an analysis, and proposals for managing, the key risks associated with delivery of the Strategy.

### 14 Policies and Proposals

- 14.1 We noted that the initial draft contained no definition of Policies and Proposals, and found this to a deficiency requiring correction (Part A, para 13.1). We also noted that *some Proposals appear to be more like Policies* (Part A, para 13.3), and considered that *a table must be prepared which relates each Proposal to all at least one Policy, and each Policy to at least one Objective* (Part A, para 13.6).
- 14.2 We are pleased to note that para 1.9 of the current draft contains the following:  
*the policies address the GLA's general transport duty and set the objectives and framework that the Mayor is seeking to achieve over the longer term, that is within the broad ten year time scale of the Strategy. The proposals set out key actions, initiatives and projects that the Mayor intends to take place to deliver the policies and have a timescale generally within the next five years.*
- 14.3 We are also pleased to note that there is now a much clearer distinction between Policies and Proposals, although a few Proposals still appear to be more like Policies, given the definition provided. However, it is unfortunate that Annex 6, which purports to contain *an Outline of Key Proposals*, also contains many Policies. It is therefore difficult to avoid the impression that the authors of the Strategy also have some difficulty in discriminating between the two.
- 14.4 We regret there is still no table linking Objectives, Policies and Proposals. We remain convinced that this would provide an invaluable check on both coherence and consistency, as well as assisting readers understand the interrelationships. We trust that our advice will be heeded in the final version.
- 14.5 As already noted, Appendix 1 is a table of all 150 Proposals, describing them by whether they can be defined as "action", "plan" or "principle". Over half are



concerned with the preparation of plans or programmes, and a quarter are concerned with principles. Only 23 are for the direct delivery of change.

### 15 The Spatial Dimension

- 15.1 In our Review, we concluded that there was *a need for a much fuller recognition of the need for flexibility, for variation, by location* (Part A, para 14.5). In paragraph 16 of our Executive Summary we noted that *there is a serious lack of a spatial dimension, with the notable exception of central London, and a tendency to a "one size fits all" approach. This fails to recognise the great variations in need and circumstance across London, and must be addressed by more sensitive treatment of these differences.*
- 15.2 Despite a discussion in Chapter 2 on the different circumstances and needs of central, inner and outer London (paras 2.86 to 2.95) and a statement that *the challenges outlined in this Chapter highlight the need for the targeted approach taken in this Strategy to prioritising improvements to the transport system in different parts of London and for the different means of transport* (para 2.97), we note that para 4A.15 states *many of the policies and proposals contained in the Strategy apply to all areas of London.*
- 15.3 Thus, there appears to be no specific response to our advice in the Strategy. Indeed, some Proposals (such as 4G.23 on parking and 4G26 on traffic management, among others) still appear to be based on common standards across London. We find this most disappointing, and not satisfactory.
- 15.4 London is a very diverse city, with widely varying needs. The Strategy must recognise and build on that diversity, rather than promote the establishment of standardised straitjackets, which could be very damaging. The final version should demonstrate an explicit recognition that policies and standards need to recognise differing needs, that London wide, "one size fits all", standards are rarely appropriate.

### 16 Air Quality, the Environment, Road Safety and Health

- 16.1 We were concerned that the Objectives in the initial draft, which are the equivalent to T15-18 in the draft for Public Consultation, *had been relegated to a lower set of priorities than the other topics* (Part A, para 15.1).
- 16.2 We are therefore pleased to note that in the current draft there is an expanded section of Chapter 2, *Challenges - the context*, on road safety, air quality, the environment and health (paras 2.42 to 2.50). We are also pleased to note that this is complemented by a strengthened section in Chapter 3, *The Linkages*, including a more focused Policy (3.8):  
*To support environmental improvement, transport initiatives and plans will take account of the need to minimise:*

## Review of Public Consultation Draft of the Transport Strategy

---

- *local air quality impacts;*
- *greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption;*
- *noise impacts;*
- *negative impacts on visual amenity;*
- *negative impacts on community integration; and*
- *negative impacts on the built and natural environment.*

And we note that Proposal 3.4 has been strengthened and expanded relative to its initial draft complement, D.5.

- 16.3 It is clearly right that the Government's national road casualty targets have now adopted as part of the Strategy, together with specific London targets for pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists (para 4G.43).
- 16.4 However, we are concerned that none of these topics feature in Chapter 4A, *A Balanced Transport System*, which defines *the Core Principles*, other than as a requirement in respect of new and enhanced infrastructure, which must *satisfy the environmental objectives of the Greater London Authority* (para 4A.13). We regard that to be a serious omission which requires correction, if the Transport Strategy is to be properly supportive of the Mayor's environmental strategies.
- 16.5 We note that para 3.13 of the draft Air Quality Strategy refers to the GLA's sustainability objectives. Given the importance of "sustainability" and apparent inconsistencies between Mayoral Strategies in the use of, as well as the meaning given to, the term "sustainable", a common definition for use in all relevant Strategies would be useful. This would be strengthened by inclusion of the full set of the GLA sustainability objectives in the Transport Strategy.
- 16.6 We are concerned that the draft Transport Strategy does not reflect many of the transport related Policies and Proposals of the draft Air Quality Strategy. As we have noted in Section 8, there is a clear lack of effective co-ordination between these two Mayoral Strategies.
- 16.7 The draft Air Quality Strategy objectives set out in para 2.27 are:
- *To meet the National Air Quality Objectives.*
  - *To meet the EU air quality limit values.*
- To achieve these Objectives, the Mayor will aim to:*
- *Reduce the impact of activities, including transport on air quality, consistent with promoting economic growth.*
  - *Promote good quality, practical, pleasant and clean methods for transport of people and goods.*
  - *Promote good environmental quality throughout London.*
  - *Reduce emissions of air pollution.*
- 16.8 These can be compared with Transport Objectives T15, T16 and T17:
- *Promote transport services and patterns of movement that will contribute to improvements in air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, visual amenity and community integration.*

## Review of Public Consultation Draft of the Transport Strategy

---

- *Promote the health of Londoners by encouraging more walking and cycling.*
- *Ensure that the development of the transport system contributes to the protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment.*

16.9 Although there is much overlap in intent between the draft Air Quality Strategy Objectives and the relevant Transport Strategy Objective, we find it unfortunate that the wording is not consistent.

16.10 The draft Air Quality Strategy refers to the DETR/Energy Saving Trust Powershift and CleanUp initiatives, which are not referred to in the draft Transport Strategy. There would seem to be merit in the Transport Strategy recognising these as ways of helping achieve Policy 3.8 and Proposal 3.4.

16.11 Indeed, since transport is the primary source of NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>s in London, we are surprised that there is not a chapter in the 4 series which specifically addresses the ways in which transport related measures could be used to contribute to the achievement of the National Air Quality Standards.

16.12 Para 3.7 of the draft Air Quality Strategy refers to the role of traffic reduction in reducing polluting emissions. Yet, as we note in Section 18, the draft Transport Strategy still contains too little (in our judgement) in the way of a commitment to traffic reduction.

16.13 The draft Air Quality Strategy (Policy 2 and Proposal 1) suggests that the draft Transport Strategy encourages and promotes reductions in unnecessary car use. While there is no explicit Transport Strategy Policy or Proposal to that effect, we consider that it is desirable that there should be.

16.14 We note that para 3.16 of the draft Air Quality Strategy suggests the Mayor's draft Transport Strategy sets out priorities for the various modes. Although priorities are implied (eg, para 3.20 and para 4A.6), the draft Transport Strategy does not include a specific statement, as might be implied by the draft Air Quality Strategy reference.

16.15 Para 3.18 of the draft Air Quality Strategy states that the draft Transport Strategy *seeks to reduce the number of unnecessary short car journeys*. While this might be implied, there appears to be no statement in the draft Transport Strategy to this effect. We think there should be.

16.16 The draft Air Quality Strategy proposes the introduction of an *Environmental Business Marque* (para 4.24 and draft Air Quality Strategy Proposal 6). While we believe this proposal has merit, and has clear relevance to transport, there is no reference to it in the draft Transport Strategy. If it is to be adopted as a Mayoral policy, there should be, together with a listing of the transport related initiatives which would form part of the Marque.

- 16.17 We are concerned that Proposal 3.4 of the draft Transport Strategy and Proposal 7 of the draft Air Quality Strategy both refer to "a" Low Emission Zone (LEZ). By implication, this is assumed to cover central London, although there is nothing to corroborate this. Yet para 4.32 of the draft Air Quality Strategy records that *there is widespread support amongst London boroughs to investigate this approach further*. We believe this reasonably implies that there is potential for more than one LEZ within London, given that declaring the whole of London a LEZ may not be feasible in the short to medium term. We are strongly of the view that the potential for the creation of more than one LEZ over the ten years of the Strategy should be recognised in both Strategies.
- 16.18 Proposal 16 of the draft Air Quality Strategy states that *Transport for London will, in partnership with the CleanUp programme, investigate methods for further reducing nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions from buses, and implement any measures as soon as these become available and practicable*. There is no complement in the draft Transport Strategy. It would display greater consistency across Mayoral Strategies if there was.
- 16.19 Proposal 20 of the draft Air Quality Strategy states:  
*Transport for London will set up a forum to work with all sections of the taxi and minicab trade and attempt to build consensus around taxi issues, and work with the taxi trade to improve taxi emissions.*  
This differs from, and appears to be rather weaker than, its Transport Strategy counterpart, Proposal 4N.4:  
*taxi and minicab operators will be encouraged to reduce the emissions of their vehicles, and the Mayor and Transport for London will review the scope for improvements to be implemented via regulations.*  
A common wording could usefully be used in both Strategies.
- 16.20 It is relevant to note that, other than Proposal 4N.4, there is no other material in the draft Transport Strategy on the environmental impacts of taxis and minicabs.
- 16.21 We note that Proposal 26 of the draft Air Quality Strategy refers to the preparation of a Freight Action Plan. Although an Action Plan was referred to in the initial draft, it is not in the current draft Transport Strategy. The initiatives to be taken by the Sustainable Distribution Forum for London, set out in Transport Strategy Proposals 4K.3 and 4K.4, could be considered to amount to an Action Plan. The Transport Strategy might be usefully amended to adopt this term.
- 16.22 Proposal 27 of the draft Air Quality Strategy (*Transport for London will encourage the development of sub-regional freight quality partnerships*) and Proposal 4K.2 of the draft Transport Strategy (*Transport for London will encourage the early development of freight quality partnerships, particularly at the sub-regional level, to complement similar, borough-led initiatives at the more local scale*), seem to be needlessly different.

## Review of Public Consultation Draft of the Transport Strategy

---

- 16.23 Proposal 33 of the draft Air Quality Strategy, which states:  
*the Mayor will investigate a programme of encouraging motorcyclists to invest in improved emissions technology, and drive more safely and smoothly,*  
appears to have no counterpart in the draft Transport Strategy. If the Mayor considers this important, then it seems that it should be reflected in the Transport Strategy.
- 16.24 Policy 7 of the draft Air Quality Strategy, which states:  
*reductions in emissions on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) will be sought, where these are compatible with other priorities such as increased pedestrian priority, and London boroughs will be encouraged to undertake similar measures where appropriate on their roads,*  
appears to have no equivalent in the draft Transport Strategy.
- 16.25 Indeed, several of the associated draft Air Quality Strategy Proposals have no counterpart in the draft Transport Strategy. These include:  
Proposal 34 *Transport for London will investigate what measures can be undertaken on the Transport for London Road Network to reduce emissions. This will include an audit of the network to assess the scope for introducing 'green phase' traffic lights, optimising bus priority to increase bus speed and reduce vehicle emissions, and bring in other measures to reduce stop-start driving.*  
Proposal 35: *Transport for London investigate (sic) reducing speed limits on the Transport for London Road Network on roads that have 70 mph limits at present, for road traffic accident and emissions benefits.*  
Proposal 36: *the Mayor will encourage pedestrianisation, in conjunction with the London boroughs, where this is shown to be both practical and effective, and*  
Proposal 40: *the Mayor will work with the Metropolitan Police Authority to improve traffic enforcement of illegal parking especially at congestion hotspots, such as town centres in the rush hour, to improve traffic flow and thereby reduce emissions.*
- 16.26 Given that each of these Proposals is considered sufficiently important for inclusion in the draft Air Quality Strategy, we consider that they should have a complement in the Transport Strategy.
- 16.27 Proposal 38 of the draft Air Quality Strategy states:  
*the Mayor will encourage implementation of Clear Zones and Home Zones by the London boroughs through the transport Local Implementation Plans. The Mayor will encourage 20 mph speed limits where appropriate in residential areas. Traffic calming should be implemented to avoid measures that increase acceleration and deceleration.*  
This is different to its equivalent in the draft Transport Strategy:  
*the London boroughs should make greater use of their increased powers*

*to introduce 20mph zones and speed limits in residential areas, where appropriate. This should be a priority in areas where there is a large number of children, such as at schools. Transport for London will co-operate with these initiatives where they impact on the TLRN.*

Here again, consistency in common elements across Strategies is called for.

- 16.28 The same applies to Proposal 40 of the draft Air Quality Strategy which states:  
*Transport for London will investigate whether different, smoother road surfaces could be used to reduce emissions, whilst retaining good traction for road safety. Surfacing materials found to be beneficial will be used when resurfacing is required.*

The nearest equivalent in the draft Transport Strategy is part of Proposal 3.5:  
*transport initiatives and plans should seek to reduce traffic and transport noise by making cost-effective use of low noise road surfaces and designing traffic management and other transport infrastructure measures to minimise noise.*

We note, however, that reasonably refers forwards to the Ambient Noise Strategy, not the draft Air Quality Strategy, to which it seems to have little relevance.

- 16.29 Proposal 51 of the draft Air Quality Strategy, which states:  
*the Mayor will work with train operators and Railtrack to promote best practice in terms of train operation at stations. The Mayor will encourage the train operating companies to investigate methods of reducing emissions from trains,*

lacks a draft Transport Strategy complement, yet such a complement seems appropriate, to the extent that diesel-engined trains are used within London.

## 17 Traffic Reduction

- 17.1 We were very concerned that the initial draft *did not seem to reflect the Mayor's manifesto commitment to traffic reduction, the work of the Boroughs, or the statement in E6.1 that "it simply would not be financially or physically possible to build enough roads to cope with the volume of traffic generated by a city with a population of over 7 million"* (part A, para 16.4). We were *convinced that the Strategy must address the issues of traffic reduction, and demand management, in a much more direct manner* (Part A, para 16.6).

- 17.2 Although, according to Chapter 2 of the current draft, the particular transport concerns of young people include the need for traffic reduction (para 2.38), the term "traffic reduction" does not appear to feature elsewhere in Chapter 2, nor in either Chapter 3 or Chapter 4A, *A Balanced Transport Network*. We consider this to be a serious omission, which requires correction in the final version. But that will only be of value if it involves a real change to the strategy. It is real content that matters, presentation alone will not suffice.

- 17.3 We note that it is not until Chapter 4G, Streets for All, that traffic reduction, *per se*, is discussed. Paragraphs 4G.55 to 4 G57 state:
- although overall traffic levels in Greater London were relatively static throughout the 1990s, delays and congestion increased ...preliminary indications are that the policies and proposals set out in the Strategy could, over the next ten years or so, halve the growth in traffic across Greater London that would occur if present trends were to continue. In central London, absolute reductions in weekday traffic levels of 10% or more would be achieved. Across inner London absolute reductions of 3% or more are likely. Appropriate traffic management can convert these overall reductions into more significant reductions on particular streets. In outer London, the net effect will be to moderate the growth in traffic. The Mayor is keen to go further than this and – through Transport for London – will work with the London boroughs in support of local initiatives to reduce traffic, especially in town centres and through traffic in unsuitable areas, and to assist them in meeting their obligations under the Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997.*
- 17.4 We must question the reference to absolute reductions in traffic across inner London of 3%. While the ROCOL report forecast a 3% reduction as a result of a £5 central London congestion charge, this was for a "base year". Regrettably, we would expect that 3% to be offset, at least, by the underlying growth in traffic. This needs to be checked and, if necessary, changed.
- 17.5 We are pleased to note the inclusion of Proposal 4G.18:
- the Mayor will develop, in consultation with the London boroughs, formal guidance on the application within Greater London of the Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997, and will issue this guidance by early 2002,*
- as well as Policy 4H.1:
- within the context of the boroughs' road traffic reduction targets, to make car journeys safer and journey times more reliable whilst minimising their environmental impact.*
- These recognise the Boroughs' particular responsibilities, and policies.
- 17.6 We acknowledge that it can be argued that a number of the Policies and Proposals set out in Chapter 3 are directed to reducing the need to use cars, and that these are supported by para 4G.19. Yet, as noted in the foregoing Section, the draft Air Quality Strategy is much stronger on these matters. We consider that the Transport Strategy should be revised to reflect the stronger commitment of draft Air Quality Strategy to reducing traffic as well as to changing travel behaviour.
- 17.7 We trust that the final Transport Strategy will contain a greater commitment to the range of measures directed to changing travel behaviour and reducing car use.

## **18 Transport, Economic Development and Regeneration**

18.1 In our Review of the initial draft, we recommended that *the Strategy should recognise that transport is, at best, only a contributory factor in regeneration. We also noted that major commitments to transport investments and services should not be made before a thorough assessment of impacts and alternatives, and not just transport alternatives, has been undertaken* (Part A, para 17.4).

18.2 In addition, we stated that we needed to be *satisfied on:*

- *the priorities within the Transport Strategy for addressing regeneration needs.*
- *the suitability and cost effectiveness of the Policies and Proposals intended to support regeneration.*
- *the appropriateness of the areas identified in Chapter D (D36-44) for the focus of regeneration policies.*

We also recorded that we *are not satisfied that the current draft deals with these issues adequately* (Part A, para 17.7).

18.3 We note that Policy 3.5, the complement of D5, includes a subtle change from *enabling regeneration to facilitating regeneration*. We also note the fuller discussion on ensuring that transport plays its full part in supporting economic development and regeneration (paras 3.20 to 3.25), culminating with a list of priorities developed in the Mayor's Economic Development Strategy (para 3.26). Further, we note that Policy 3.4 states:

*Transport for London and the London Development Agency will work together with other relevant agencies to identify and deliver transport improvements required to facilitate the economic regeneration of key areas, and also to ensure sustainable transport access is considered in the determination of regeneration priorities.*

18.4 We note that Proposal 4G.28 (which we consider reads more like a Policy) is a revised version of Proposal E7.20, with the addition of a new criterion that any inherited and new road proposal must contribute to London's economic regeneration and development.

18.5 None of the new material properly either addresses our concerns or heeds our recommendations. We regret that, and call on the Mayor to give further consideration to them.

18.6 As we have recorded in Section 8, we were concerned by the sharp differences on the role of transport in economic regeneration, as well as in addressing social deprivation, between the initial draft Economic Development Strategy and the Transport Strategy. There also appears to be a sharp difference of view between the two drafts on the impact of London's local transport system and services on the economic prosperity of London, and its ability to compete with other World Cities. These differences must be resolved, and a common approach adopted.



18.7 While we have the concerns discussed above, on balance we find the approach of the Transport Strategy very much more plausible than that of the Economic Development Strategy.

### 19 Transport and Social Needs

19.1 In our Review of the Initial draft, we noted that there are *tensions, between reducing deprivation and social exclusion and using the available resources to best effect, returns to the need to determine priorities within a finite budget, and the inability of consultees to provide informed comment if they have no idea of the costs, and benefits, of possible options* (Part A, para 18.6).

19.2 In particular, we expressed reservations about the efficiency of addressing the very real problems of social exclusion and deprivation by reducing public transport fares for all users (Part A, para 17.4).

19.3 We note that Policy 3.7 now focuses on transport provision, rather than fares: *transport initiatives and plans should support social inclusion by taking account of the needs of all Londoners to access jobs, facilities and services through:*

- *taking account of the particular needs of deprived areas when determining programmes for transport improvements;*
- *addressing the needs of groups with specific travel requirements; and introducing equality policies to ensure that transport organisations 'workforces at every level fully reflect London, particularly by increasing the employment of women, disabled people, and black and ethnic minority people at every level.*

We also note that the associated Proposal, 3.3, includes no reference to fares.

19.4 We trust that these modifications reflect a real change of approach, rather than the simple deletion of a contentious phrase without an associated change of intention.

19.5 Without the provisions of information on costs, it is not possible to have a meaningful discussion of possible options. But that such a discussion is necessary, given budget constraints.

### 20 Outer, and Inner, London

20.1 We were very concerned with the treatment of outer London in the initial draft, and stated that this *requires substantial strengthening. And in doing that the particular needs of inner London must not be overlooked. They are not the same as either central London or outer London* (Part A, para 19.11).

20.2 Reflecting this view, we recorded in our Executive Summary that *we are very concerned that the Strategy offers little for outer London, other than continued dependence on the car for most journeys, despite rapid growth in both traffic and*

## Review of Public Consultation Draft of the Transport Strategy

---

*congestion, and the environmental consequences. We are sure that this requires further attention. We are also not convinced that the needs of large parts of inner London are properly recognised (para 19).*

- 20.3 We are pleased to note the new sections in Chapter 2 (paras 2.86 to 2.95), which provide descriptions of what are considered to be the key issues in each of inner and outer London. However, we fear that this is little more than presentational. We can find no substantive change in the Strategy for outer, or inner, London
- 20.4 We are concerned, and deeply disappointed, that the only reference to inner or outer London in Chapter 3 is in the Section headed *Ensuring transport plays its full part in supporting economic development and regeneration*, with the following text:
- in the longer term additional high quality public transport capacity will be introduced by modernising the Underground system and through new cross-London rail links and enhanced orbital links in inner and outer London (para 3.20).*
- 20.5 Since most of these proposals will take many years to be implemented, and will then principally only benefit specific corridors, this statement fails, almost totally, to either recognise or satisfy our concerns.
- 20.6 We are also concerned that the references to inner and outer London in Chapter 4A, *A Balanced Transport Network* are, again, limited to the section on *Providing regeneration and urban renaissance* (paras 4A.23 to 4A.27). The needs of outer London are not limited to regeneration areas. Indeed, many of the most serious transport issues (and this is the Transport Strategy) relate to those areas which are the most economically buoyant.
- 20.7 In the remainder of the series of Chapters 4, inner and outer London get a few mentions, but their particular needs are not addressed specifically.
- 20.8 We are particularly concerned with one of the list of ten key priorities in para 10 of the Executive Summary, namely: *facilitating car travel in outer London, whilst developing and promoting the alternatives of public transport, walking and cycling so that the proportion of trips made by car is reduced.* While there is a need to better accommodate the car, the choice of the word "facilitating" is particularly unfortunate, given the need to reduce its use, the traffic reduction policies being pursued by some outer London Boroughs, and the general principles of the Mayor's Strategy. This must be changed, and that must be backed by strategies which properly address the needs of outer London, allowing for its diversity.
- 20.9 Given our concerns, and the almost total failure to respond to them in this draft of the Transport Strategy, through a strengthening of the Strategy, we have agreed to pursue a Scrutiny of ways in which the transport, and the associated environmental, economic and social, needs of outer London may be better satisfied than appears to be the Mayor's present intention.

- 20.10 We recognise that this Scrutiny cannot contribute to the final Transport Strategy, given its scheduled publication in June 2001. However, we are aware that the Mayor is able to publish supplementary daughter documents. Further, it is possible that much of the responsibility for action will lie with the Boroughs, rather than TfL, and the Mayor is unlikely to finalise his guidance to the Boroughs on the preparation of their Local Implementation Plans until late 2001. It is our intention that the Scrutiny should contribute to that guidance.
- 20.11 We also continue to be concerned that the Strategy fails to properly address the transport needs of inner London. The must be also be improved.
- 20.12 Our overall impression remains that this Strategy is too strongly focused on central London, Zone 1, and that its approach remains very much that of "one size fits all", failing to recognise the diversity within London, and the crucial differences between parts of outer London, as well inner London.
- 20.13 We consider it essential that the final Strategy properly accommodates the widely varying needs of outer and inner London. It should be neither a "zone 1" strategy nor one committed to a "one size fits all" approach.

## 21 Freight and Servicing Business

- 21.1 In our Review of the initial draft, we noted that *in its current form, the Strategy seems to offer very little, other than plans and studies and the possible benefits of congestion charging within the inner ring road, to the servicing of businesses, and can be interpreted as putting bus priority well ahead of business needs. We consider this quite inadequate* (Part A, para 20.3).
- 21.2 We therefore welcome the inclusion of: *making the distribution of goods and services in London more reliable and efficient, whilst minimising environmental impacts* as one of the ten key priorities listed in the Executive Summary:
- 21.3 We also agree with the opening statement in the Chapter on Freight, Delivery and Servicing (4K) that *achieving an efficient and sustainable distribution system for goods and services is one of the greatest challenges facing London* (para 4K.1).
- 21.4 However, we are concerned that there is no mention of freight in either of the key Chapters 3, *Linkages*, or 4A, *A Balanced Transport Network*. We would have thought that if freight and servicing really were as important as the Mayor has stated, and as we believe it to be, this would have been recognised in each of these two overarching chapters.
- 21.5 We note that Policy 4K.1 has been extended relative to E12.1, its complement in the initial draft. However, it seems to us that the additional material primarily provides clarification, rather than a strengthening. The only new principle is *to*

## Review of Public Consultation Draft of the Transport Strategy

---

*foster a progressive shift of freight from road to more sustainable modes such as rail and river, where this is economical and practicable.*

- 21.6 We are concerned that the relevant Proposals are still focused on plans and studies, rather than hard actions. However, we are pleased that the text describing possible initiatives in the initial draft is now presented as two Proposals, 4K.3 and 4K.4:

*Transport for London and the Sustainable Distribution Forum for London will consider initiatives to:*

- *assess the scope for increasing dedicated road capacity for freight (e.g. goods-vehicle-only and no car lanes) for all or part of the working day;*
- *increase the efficiency of distribution operations in terms of minimising the substantial amount of empty or partially loaded running;*
- *revise parking, waiting and loading controls, and enforcement, both to free-up road capacity and provide facilities for business activities and service vehicles;*
- *minimise the impact of road works on delivery and servicing activities; and,*
- *investigate the opportunities for using smaller goods vehicles.*

*Transport for London and the will consider the opportunities for:*

- *consolidation of loads and numbers of deliveries;*
- *deliveries to intermediate points between supplier and recipient, such as staging depots for bulk deliveries on the outskirts of town centres or for retail deliveries to consumers at corner shops or office complexes;*
- *changes to delivery hours; and,*
- *use of vehicles better suited to operation in dense urban environments.*

- 21.7 We have already noted the draft Air Quality Strategy describes these as an Action Plan. The initial draft of the Transport Strategy also referred to an Action Plan (Policy E12.1 and Proposals E12.1). We see much merit in the Sustainable Distribution Forum for London being required to prepare an Action Plan.

- 21.8 Given that *progress* (not, we note, recommendations for action) on the items set out in paras 4K.3 and 4K.4 is not expected until a year after the Sustainable Distribution Forum for London has been set up, it would appear that the implication of the approach adopted in the Strategy is that effective actions is unlikely to be taken for a considerable time.

- 21.9 While we recognise that there is little factual information on freight and servicing traffic within London, and much work is required to improve our knowledge, we remain very concerned that the Strategy offers little more than plans.

- 21.10 Much greater urgency is required. The Sustainable Distribution Forum for London should be asked to provide an initial report on recommendations for immediate actions by the end of December 2001, at the very latest, as the first

phase of its Action Plan (unless the full Action Plan can be completed by then), and a full Action Plan no later than June 2002.

- 21.11 Hard actions to achieve real change must be identified and pursued as a high priority.

## 22 The Reallocation of Roadspace, and Managing Demand

- 22.1 In the Executive Summary of our Review of the initial draft, we stated: *central to the needs of business is the allocation of space within London's road network. This cannot efficiently, and safely, accommodate all the various demands placed on it. Throughout the document, various commitments are made to buses, to pedestrians, to cyclists, to freight. Yet it is clear that they cannot all be honoured. However, there are no clear policies on the resolution of these conflicts. That is a very serious omission, which must be corrected (para 21).*

- 22.2 We note that in the current version, under the heading *Optimising the use of the road network to move people and goods*, para 4A.10 states *given London's limited road space, policies need to optimise the use of the road network to move people and goods, rather than vehicle throughput, and to make journeys more reliable. Where necessary, priority will be given to emergency vehicles, buses, pedestrians, and cyclists, and making deliveries of goods and services and essential servicing easier. In the short and medium term the aim will be to make buses more attractive so they carry more passengers. Immediate priority will be given to reducing journey times and delays on buses, and investment in new and expanded bus services.*

- 22.3 We also note that this is supported by Policy 4G.2: *in balancing the use of street space, account should be taken of the objectives of the Transport Strategy and the road and street hierarchy. On the TLRN and other 'A Roads' there is a general presumption in favour of distribution, particularly for those making business journeys, bus passengers and commercial vehicle operators. On other London roads there is a presumption in favour of access and amenity, particularly for residents, buses, pedestrians and cyclists.*

- 22.4 We acknowledge that paragraphs 4G.17 and 4G.18 discuss how, in the Mayor's view, this might be achieved. However, we continue to find it difficult to understand how all the competing demands recognised in the Strategy, and which the Mayor appears to be seeking to accommodate, can be balanced without seriously disadvantaging some of them.

- 22.5 We believe the Strategy should be more explicit in acknowledging that some user groups that might be expecting to benefit through the Strategy are more likely to disbenefit. We also think it necessary to state that the Mayor will be the final arbiter.

### 23 Traffic Enforcement

- 23.1 In the Executive Summary of our Review of the initial draft, we stated that *we wanted highly effective enforcement of traffic regulations since we see this as crucial to increasing the efficiency, and safety, with which London's overloaded network is used* (para 22). However, we had concerns that some of the proposals for decriminalisation might be flawed in respect of both the range of offences and the application to a specific part of the highway network (Part B, para 12.8).
- 23.2 We note that Proposal 4G.11 now refers specifically to non-endorsable traffic offences and understand that the issue of jurisdiction has been addressed. We also note that an Enforcement Action Plan has been prepared (para 4G.10) and that Proposal 4G.10 is a commitment to its implementation.
- 23.3 We trust that these actions will be pursued by TfL and other agencies, with vigour and to real effect. We will be looking for progress reports.

### 24 Bus Costs and Revenues

- 24.1 We had two main concerns with the initial draft:
- *the rapidly widening gap between bus operating costs and revenues, and the lack of financial information to assess the effects on this gap of the various bus policies, all of which seemed likely to either increase costs or reduce revenues* (Part A, paras 23.1 to 23.3),
- and
- *the justification for the increased use of conductors when other policies were directed to reducing the need for on-bus fare collection* (Part A, para 23.5).
- 24.2 We are very pleased to note that most of the Proposals in Chapter 4F, *A Better Bus Network*, are now costed. However, the one, crucial, exception is that of improving pay and conditions (Proposal 4F.3). Further, the cumulative effect on the funding gap over the next three years, and longer, is still not identified.
- 24.3 We note that the annual cost of doubling the number of conductors on double deck buses serving central London is estimated to be £30 million (Proposal 4F.4). The use of conductors is supported in para 4F.16 thus:
- only one-third of routes in central London now have conductors, despite the fact that buses with conductors move faster. Conductors not only reduce time spent waiting at bus stops, they can also give assistance to passengers and increase a sense of security. There is strong public support for increasing the number of conductors. In particular, in surveys of women, young people, older people and disabled people, the re-introduction of conductors is strongly supported. Although currently conductors work only on Routemasters, studies indicate that even on*

*doored buses improvements of up to 10% in journey time are possible with conductors.*

- 24.4 We remain concerned with the widening gap between bus revenues and costs, and the lack of a clear statement about the combined effect of the policies set out in the Strategy on TfL's, and thus the GLA's, finances. Given that funds are limited, we think it essential that the advantages of the proposed policies are carefully assessed against other possible uses of the available funds. This information must be placed in the public domain, to give Londoners an opportunity to comment on priorities.
- 24.5 This serves to underline our overall concern that this Strategy presents a set of policies without adequate information on costs, preventing a sensible, well informed, discussion on alternatives. In our view, that seriously devalues the Public Consultation on this draft.

## 25 The Underground

- 25.1 In our Review of the initial draft, we were particularly concerned about the section on the Underground. We saw it being a missed opportunity for the Mayor *to set out his vision for the Underground, to make it clear what type of service he believes it should provide.*
- 25.2 We considered *the lack of vision, of requirement, in the current version very seriously weakens the Mayor's position, and thus that of Londoners, in making it clear what is expected of the Underground, and thus the PPP (if that is what happens), rather than leaving it to LUL managers, senior civil servants in DETR and Ministers - who do not represent London - to determine what London will have (Part A, para 24.3).*
- 25.3 We were also concerned that there was too much attention to the political issues of today, on funding, and noted that:
- *this is a ten year Strategy and*
  - *there is a need to look beyond that, and set out what is required of the current system (Part A, para 24.1).*
- We also noted that *the section on the existing Underground is decidedly thin on the crucial issue of performance (Part A, para 24.2).*
- 25.4 We note that Chapter 4C has been extensively revised, relative to its complement in the initial draft, with much of the old material deleted and much new material. While we find this version a better structured and more comprehensive document, it is still strongly focussed on the arrangements for future funding, albeit in a more balanced manner.
- 25.5 We understand that there may be good grounds, in the current situation, for setting out the Mayor's Strategy for funding (and thus managing) the Underground. However, once the PPP issue is resolved, much of the Chapter

will become history and, as we have noted above, this is a Strategy for ten years, not the next few weeks, or months.

- 25.6 The Strategy should therefore provide much clearer view of what the Mayor expects of the Underground, in a strategic context. Indeed, the evidence suggests that Londoners are very much more concerned with the service provided by the Underground than by how it is funded or who is managing it.
- 25.7 We note that para 4C.45 sets out what passengers want from the Underground:
- *they want to experience the minimum delay in waiting for trains. This involves a higher proportion of the scheduled service being operated, and the service that is operated running more regularly and reliably;*
  - *they want to experience the minimum delay on trains. Far too many hold ups occur to passenger journeys caused by failure of stock, signalling and other equipment, and through the unavailability of staff or poor staff management;*
  - *they want reliable escalators, lifts and other assets. In 1999/00 one in twelve escalators were out of service at any one time;*
  - *they want less crowded trains and to travel in reasonable comfort. Far too much of the network is 'very crowded' or 'crowded' and forecast to get worse without action;*
  - *they want less crowded, more attractive and easy to use stations. This includes ease of movement within stations, especially interchange stations and the availability and quality of facilities at stations;*
  - *they want to feel secure when using stations and trains. Surveys show passengers, and particularly women, value security highly and particularly welcome CCTV, staff and British Transport Police presence and help/alarm buttons. Attention must also be paid to access journeys, as it is often the journey to and from the station and the areas around stations that passengers fear most;*
  - *they want easy to understand information to hand on services, fares and local amenities; and*
  - *they want better all round access. All passengers benefit from the removal of barriers that preclude independent access for wheelchair users – the provision of step free access to stations and trains.*
- 25.8 While we agree that these are very necessary attributes of a World Class metro, we note that they are qualitative, rather than the quantitative targets we sought.
- 25.9 Londoners need to know what they can reasonably expect: the frequency of trains, the reliability of the trains, lifts and escalators, the degree of overcrowding, the time taken to buy a ticket or get information from a station ticket office, etc.
- 25.10 We restate our view that the Mayor should be setting sensible standards; that the draft Strategy provided him with the opportunity to set out his vision for the Underground. This should not be determined by the funding, and management, arrangements. Rather, those arrangements should be designed to deliver what London needs, a decent, modern metro.



- 25.11 In the context of the PPP, we continue to believe that setting out the Mayor's vision would have best been done in the initial draft, or least in this draft. We seriously regret that the Mayor chose not to heed our advice. We fear that this may not have been in London's best interests.
- 25.12 We note that a new Proposal, 4C.1, requires London Underground *to produce costed proposals to return the percentage of Underground services operated to the levels achieved between 1991 and 1996, with particular and immediate attention to the worst performing lines* while Proposal 4C.2 requires London Underground to: *produce costed proposals, by the end of 2001, to safely increase the total amount of train kilometres operated over the existing network* (the same as Proposal E4.2 in the initial draft).
- 25.13 A further new Proposal, 4C.6, is concerned with TfL setting targets to: *improve Underground performance to reach the benchmark of comparable World City metros.*
- 25.14 However, Proposal E4.3 in the initial draft, which is retained as 4C.3, suggests that achieving this will take very many years, as 2008 remains the target year for halving the delays caused by equipment failures. We find this unacceptable.
- 25.15 Although these Proposals would lead to the development of some targets, together with costs, we consider them an inadequate response to our Review of the initial draft. Our position remains that the Mayor should be setting a vision, with targets, now.
- 25.16 Given the importance of the Underground to London, and the failure of the Mayor to respond to the key principles of our Review in this revised draft, we have agreed to pursue a Scrutiny of the Underground.
- 25.17 As with our planned Scrutiny of outer London, we recognise that the findings of this Scrutiny will not be available in time to contribute to the final Transport Strategy. However, the Mayor has said that he might publish a daughter document on the Underground, once the Commissioner of Transport has obtained a full understanding of needs and opportunities, and the Underground is under the control of the Mayor. Our Scrutiny will contribute to that process.

## 26 National Rail

- 26.1 We were not convinced that the initial draft *was sufficiently pro-active in seeking to obtain the very necessary improvements in National Rail services for London* (Part A, para 25.2). We noted that, *given the serious capacity limitations on much of the rail network serving London, we are particularly concerned by the possible consequences of the tension between the Mayor's primary responsibility*

## Review of Public Consultation Draft of the Transport Strategy

---

*for rail services for Londoners and the wider SRA responsibilities in determining priorities. The Strategy should address this (Part A, para 25.3).*

- 26.2 We are pleased that one of the ten key priorities identified in the Executive Summary (para 11) is:  
*better integration of the National Rail system with London's other transport systems to facilitate commuting, reduce overcrowding and move towards a London-wide, high frequency 'turn-up-and-go' metro service,*  
and that co-operation with the Strategic Rail Authority, Railtrack and the train operating companies is one of the objects of Policy 3.1.
- 26.3 We note that Policies 4E.1 and 4E.2, both new, state:  
*the Mayor and Transport for London using their full range of powers will work with the Strategic Rail Authority, Railtrack, the Rail Regulator and train operating companies to secure an increased contribution from National Rail services to the transport and travel needs of London and Londoners, including facilitating regeneration,*  
and:  
*London's National Rail services' key problems of safety, unreliability and over-crowding should be addressed urgently so that they become consistently reliable, comfortable and easy to use, as well as safe and secure. A network of high frequency, 'turn-up-and-go' metro services (the London Metro) should be introduced.*
- 26.4 Further, para 4E9 states that the:  
*Mayor and Transport for London (TfL) will work jointly with the SRA and Government to ensure the better use of existing rail services for the benefit of London. The Greater London Authority Act empowers the Mayor to issue instructions or guidance to the SRA regarding rail services to, from and within London. Together with the duties of co-operation and co-ordination this will set the framework for that partnership. The SRA is producing a National Rail Plan in early 2001. This Strategy and the SRA's plan will together inform the development of a rail plan for London, including a phased programme of implementation.*
- 26.5 However, despite Policy 4E.1, the issuance of guidance and instructions by the Mayor to the Strategic Rail Authority on the role of National Rail in London, remains a Proposal (4E.3) rather than becoming a Policy. It should be a Policy.
- 26.6 We were surprised at the lack of reference to the schemes being pursued by Boroughs, such as SWELTRAC, and the BAA interests in extending rail access to Heathrow (Part A, para 25.4). We are therefore pleased to note that the SWELTRAC proposals together with BAA's Airtrack scheme are now recognised in para 4E.18, in the context of the development of National Rail access to London's airports.

## 27 Public Transport Ticketing

- 27.1 We found the initial draft lacking in information on the role of Prestige as the common smart card ticket for all London's public transport (Part A, paras 26.1 and 26.2). We noted that there was no mention of *either TfL's plans for providing for off-bus ticketing, nor of the possibility of introducing "exact cash" only fares* (Part A, para 26.3), and we found *some muddled thinking, between adding complexity through, for example, varying fares depending on time of day and direction of travel, and the need for simplification* (Part A, para 26.4).
- 27.2 We note that para 4B.12 clarifies the position on PRESTIGE, stating:  
*from the second half of 2002 Smartcard ticketing will be available on buses and the Underground through TfL's PRESTIGE (Private Finance Initiative) project, and will play a central role in the development of TfL's ticketing strategy.*
- 27.3 Further, although DLR and Croydon Tramlink are not included in this paragraph, we note that para 4B.15 explains that once Prestige goes live, it is planned to also be valid on these two systems
- 27.4 We also note that para 4B.14 states that  
*the SRA and the train operating companies will be expected to deliver the maximum compatibility between Transport for London's smartcard system and the National Rail ticketing system; this issue will be covered in more detail in guidance to the SRA,*  
and that para 4B.20 states that:  
*proposals will be developed to increase the attractiveness of off-bus tickets. This could include simplified and cheaper bus passes, increasing the number of 'off system' outlets where bus tickets can be bought, and a new bus 'carnet' bundle of discounted tickets. These could pave the way for the introduction of the 'cashless' bus.*
- 27.5 While para 4B.12 states:  
*making the ticketing structure simpler and easier for passengers to use and understand will be a theme of fares policy. A simpler structure has the potential to produce efficiency and quality benefits; to encourage modal shift; and to improve transport integration,*  
we note that para 4B.10 states.  
*further targeted fares initiatives and reductions will focus particularly on buses and will be developed as resources allow. The criteria for assessing these initiatives will include:*
- *encouraging a shift from car to public transport, and complementing congestion charging;*
  - *promoting the more effective use of public transport's capacity by encouraging travel when demand is relatively slack or where additional service capacity can be provided at reasonable cost, notably on buses*
  - *promoting social inclusion, by making access to public transport more affordable for less well off groups;*

- *improving transport integration, by making complex public transport trips easier and less expensive; and*
- *making public transport more efficient, for example by simplifying fares to speed up boarding times on buses.*

27.6 We recorded that *the costs and benefits for a flat bus fare across London of 70p of this are not identified* (Part A, para 26.5).

27.7 We note that para 4B.17 now explains that *in late 2002, bus fares will be reduced for central and radial journeys ahead of the proposed introduction of a congestion charging scheme (with the continuing costs of £20 million per year being potentially funded by congestion charging revenues), to give a single flat fare across London of 70p. This will make buses more attractive for short distance trips in, to and from the centre,*  
and that para 4B.16 explains that this *strategy will complement the proposed introduction of a congestion charging scheme in central London in early 2003.*

27.8 While the costs are now identified, there is no still quantification of the expected benefits. Given the level of the costs, that is a significant omission.

## 28 Congestion Charging

28.1 We stated that this version of the Strategy *must provide total clarity on those elements of the scheme which will be:*

- *deemed to be fixed once the final Transport Strategy is published.*
- *subject to further consultation under the Congestion Charge Scheme Order.*

We also said that the Strategy should *include a full explanation of the consultation processes relating to congestion charging, including related traffic orders for local traffic schemes* (Part A, para 27.2).

28.2 We do not consider that Proposal 4G.19, which includes the statement:  
*Transport for London will develop the scheme and proposals for a Scheme Order setting out the detailed operation and configuration of the scheme,*  
taken together with para 4G.68:  
*the publication of the draft Scheme Order will provide an opportunity for further consultation, particularly on the detailed operation and configuration of the scheme. The exact nature and scope of the consultation will be determined by the results of the consultation exercise on the Transport Strategy.*  
provides the clarification we sought.

- 28.3 Neither does para 17 of Annex 4:  
*if, after considering the responses to consultation on the Strategy, the Mayor decides to include a central London congestion charging scheme in the final Transport Strategy, then TfL would prepare the 'Scheme Order' to bring the scheme into operation. This would set out in detail how the scheme would operate, for example giving a precise definition of the charging area, street by street.*
- 28.4 We also note the relevant question on the Consultation Response Form in the Highlights document. This asks respondents to score *the Strategy's approach to tackling congestion including the proposal for a central London congestion charging scheme*. There are no questions on particular aspects, such as the area, the level of charge, the charged period and days, or exemptions and discounts.
- 28.5 Thus, from the evidence we received in our Scrutiny of the congestion charging proposals, it seems to us that the consultation on the Scheme Order will necessarily involve all aspects of the proposed scheme, other than the very basic principle of there being a charging scheme in central London. That must increase the possibility of the need for some form of public inquiry, or of legal challenge, either of which threatens the Mayor's current implementation programme.
- 28.6 We were concerned about the implications of the proposal to give a 90% discount to residents of the charged area (Part A, para 27.3), but note that the proposed discount for residents is retained (Annex 4, page 311).

## 29 Major Infrastructure Projects

- 29.1 Noting that many of the major projects had been on the "drawing board" for some time, we questioned whether there should be a thorough review of demand and all reasonable opportunities and options before committing to these particular schemes. (Part A, paras 26.1 and 26.2)
- 29.2 We also recorded that evidence suggests *that better value for money can be obtained by investing in many small measures than in a very few major schemes the Assembly regretted there was no evidence that such an approach had been considered* (Part A, para 28.4). This possibility is of particular importance, given our concerns about the treatment accorded outer London.
- 29.3 We note that the major schemes presented in Chapter 4Q are essentially those presented in the initial draft. We also note that para 4Q.6 acknowledges that the major scheme proposals have, in many areas, their roots in previous schemes. That paragraph continues with the explanation:  
*these new proposals have been thoroughly reviewed to ensure they support the objectives of the strategy and meet London's current and forecast needs.*

- 29.4 Given the time available, and the work involved, we are surprised that it has been possible to complete a sufficiently thorough review not only of the existing "off the drawing board" schemes, but also of other possibilities and opportunities to enable the Mayor to be so committed to the schemes he has selected.
- 29.5 We also note that para 4Q.28 states:  
*London Transport studied many proposals to extend the benefits of intermediate mode schemes throughout London, but with particular emphasis on outer London and regeneration areas. This work has resulted in four new intermediate mode schemes that are now proposed.*
- 29.6 We recognise that a merit of the CrossRail and Hackney to the South West schemes is that much of their costs might be met by the SRA. But a likely consequence is that they would also, possibly primarily, serve those travelling from outside London. Thus, there must be legitimate concerns about the extent to which they would address the transport issues of outer - or inner - London.
- 29.7 We can only conclude that the Mayor prefers to proceed with the major projects already identified, rather than undertake a comprehensive review which would also consider further smaller scale projects as alternatives for the use of the available, relatively scarce, financial resources.
- 29.8 In our Review of the initial draft, we also noted *that nothing is said about the various ideas developed by LUL for radical change to increase capacity on the existing lines, and asked whether they were being progressed* (Part A, para 28.5). We regret that the new draft contains no information the potential for radical changes to increase capacity on existing Underground lines.
- 29.9 We noted that, *in addition to those highway schemes which provide access to regeneration areas, other local schemes might be considered in areas of major growth or in those with serious congestion and where there are real conflicts between the needs of different groups of user, adding that any such scheme would need to be thoroughly evaluated using the DETR's New Approach to Appraisal, as well as subject to a Strategic Environment Assessment* (Part A, para 26.4).
- 29.10 We note para 4Q.32, which states  
*it is not realistic to provide additional road capacity to attempt to cater for this need by car travel. The road network must, however, provide Londoners and business with an acceptable level of accessibility to the people, jobs, goods and services that they need. In most areas of London, it already does so.*
- 29.11 While we do not disagree with that, we find it difficult to reconcile the approach to new roads with the statement in para 10 of the Executive Summary that *facilitating car travel in outer London is one of the ten priorities, admittedly whilst*

*developing and promoting the alternatives of public transport, walking and cycling so that the proportion of trips made by car is reduced.*

### **30 Airports, and International Connections**

30.1 We considered the initial draft to be weak on London's international transport links, which are often reported as being central factors for international location decisions (Part A, paras 29.1 and 29.2).

30.2 We note that para 2.33 now recognises that:

*providing good quality international links and surface access, which help keep pace with forecast growing demand for international travel as being one of the key challenges for transport in supporting London's world city role and economic development,*

and that para 2.85 states

*the need to keep improving international links and their surface access to help keep pace with growing demand and rising expectations is seen as a key issue for transport in, to and from central London.*

30.3 While para 4A.21 states that:

*improved links to national and international markets will be provided by the construction of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link to St. Pancras via Stratford in East London, the Docklands Light Railway extension to City Airport and CrossRail which must provide a fast direct link between the City, West End and Heathrow,*

there is no explicit statement about the importance of efficient air travel links to London's continuing status as a World City, and thus economic success. We would have thought a policy which sought the maintenance, possibly the further development, of air links which directly contribute to London's competitive strength relative to its continental competitors, while at least minimising, ideally reducing, the adverse environmental and social impacts very desirable.

30.4 We question the reference to CrossRail in para 4A.21. It is our understanding that there is a well established view that the needs of an airport access rail link are very different, and not very compatible, with other needs CrossRail is intended to satisfy.

### **Note**

Great care has been taken in cross-checking between this document, the initial draft Transport Strategy, our Review of the initial draft Transport Strategy, and the draft of the Transport Strategy for public consultation. However, the Transport Strategies are long and complex documents, and it is possible that some relevant matters have been overlooked, and that others have been misquoted. Our apologies are offered for any such omissions or errors.

**Appendix**



# The Draft Transport Strategy

## Analysis of Proposals

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
<b>Linkages</b>						
3.1	51	Transport for London will encourage local initiatives and consider providing funding to help them get off the ground.	Principle	N/A	N/A	No
3.2	52	Transport for London, in conjunction with the boroughs and business, will develop programmes to encourage individuals and organisations to adopt more sustainable modes of transport. These will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Workplace travel plans</i>: Boroughs will develop a programme to provide travel advice in partnership with Transport for London, with implementation beginning before the end of 2001. Employers will be encouraged to establish travel plans, to inform employees of the options available, and address issues such as parking provision, location decisions, and lack of facilities for cyclists. Such plans will be an integral part of development applications (see Policy 3.6).</li> <li>• <i>School travel plans</i>: Transport for London will work with boroughs and schools to accelerate the introduction of 'Safer Routes to School ', including issuing best practice guidelines on their development by the end of 2001.</li> </ul>	Principle	N/A	In part  Before end 2001  End 2001	No  No  No

### Notes

1. A "Principle" is a Proposal (as defined in the Strategy) which describes intentions which do not involve the preparation of a plan or programme, and which do not lead directly to a change in transport services or infrastructure
2. A "Plan" is a Proposal which is completed on delivery of a plan or programme, from which actions might emerge.
3. An "Action" is intended to lead directly to a change in transport services or infrastructure.

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
3.3	63	<p>Specific proposals for taking forward Policy 3.7 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• establishing a series of pan-London social group and issue-based forums at the London-wide level (co-ordinated by Transport for London) and at the local level (co-ordinated by the boroughs) by the end of 2001 to provide input into the policy development and implementation process;</li> <li>• requiring Transport for London to prepare a report detailing the travel behaviour and concerns of groups in London with specific travel needs and residents of deprived areas of London, with recommendations for action, by the end of 2002, taking account of inputs from the forums mentioned above;</li> <li>• ensuring that measures to improve the quality of the residential environment such as the Streets for People areas and Home Zones proposed in Chapter 4G – <i>Streets for All</i>, give particular priority to making improvements in areas of high deprivation;</li> <li>• improving safety and security throughout the transport system; through the proposals set out in Chapter 4 – <i>Improving London's Transport System</i>;</li> <li>• encouraging partnership working with a range of organisations and institutions, such as the National Health Service, business and local government, to tackle these complex issues;</li> <li>• requiring Transport for London to set priorities and targets for improving transport for a range of socially excluded groups as part of its business planning process; and</li> <li>• requiring Transport for London to develop an Action Plan to work towards proper representation of all Londoners in its workforce at all levels by the end of 2001, with regular reporting of progress.</li> </ul>	Plan	Yes	End 2001	No
			Plan	Yes	End 2002	No
			Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Principle	N/A	No	N/A
Plan	Yes	End 2001	No			
3.4	65	<p>Transport initiatives and plans will contribute to improving air quality by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensuring good alternatives to use of the car are provided, and encouraging a shift towards the use of more sustainable forms of transport;</li> <li>• encouraging business to reduce the air quality impacts of its transport activities;</li> <li>• examining methods of reducing traffic pollution, including working with the boroughs to consider the viability, costs and benefits of a Low Emission Zone in London;</li> <li>• encouraging the more rapid adoption of cost effective cleaner fuels and zero emission technologies for all road vehicles, with the Greater London Authority and Transport for London taking the lead; and</li> <li>• developing and implementing traffic management measures that reduce emissions as well as encouraging safe, economical and considerate driving.</li> </ul> <p>Further details will be contained in the Air Quality Strategy.</p>	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
3.5	66	<p>Transport initiatives and plans should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• seek to reduce traffic and transport noise by making cost-effective use of low noise road surfaces and designing traffic management and other transport infrastructure measures to minimise noise (further details will be set out in the Ambient Noise Strategy);</li> <li>• strengthen the role for transport infrastructure in both hosting and safeguarding valuable plant and animal communities (further details will be set out in the Bio-diversity Strategy);</li> <li>• seek to minimise the energy used and greenhouse gases emitted by transport and supporting infrastructure in London. This will be achieved through the employment of energy efficient techniques, cleaner technology, zero-emission fuels and renewable energy wherever practicable (further details will be included in the Energy Strategy);and</li> <li>• seek to ensure that the collection and transport of waste and materials for re-use/recycling is as efficient and environmentally responsible as practicable, Including taking particular account of the benefits of bulk transport by rail or water and the desirability of minimising the distance transported (further details will be set out in the Waste Strategy).</li> </ul>	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.6	67	The GLA will continue its work to assess the expected health impacts of the Transport Strategy through a Health Impact Assessment, alongside Equalities and Sustainability Assessments.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Fares and tickets to make public transport more attractive</b>						
4B.1	81	The approach to public transport fares over the next three years will include a bus fare freeze and capping of Underground fares in real terms. Further selective fare initiatives and reductions will be considered, as resources permit. (The bus fare freeze has a cost of around £10m in 2001/2, increasing by around £5m a year in each of the subsequent two years, while holding Underground fares to inflation from 2001 has a net cost of £10m pa compared to London Underground 's previous plan for a real fares increase in 2001.)	Action	Yes	Yes	Yes
4B.2	82	Transport for London will develop targeted fares options using Smartcards to offer benefits to passengers, increase use and reduce delays, as resources permit. The Strategic Rail Authority and train operating companies will be expected to maximise compatibility between National Rail ticketing and the Transport for London Smartcard system.	Plan	No	No	No
4B.3	83	A flat-rate bus single fare of 70p across London will be introduced ahead of the central London congestion charging scheme.	Action	Yes	Yes	No

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4B.4	84	For Bus, Underground, Docklands Light Railway and Tramlink fares, simplification initiatives will be pursued, as Resources permit, together with initiatives aimed at making fares more affordable for those currently excluded from using public transport by cost.	Plan	No	N/A	No
4B.5	84	Transport for London and the Strategic Rail Authority should seek to develop a common ticketing and fare system for rail in London, aiming for simplification, integration and consistent Smartcard ticketing.	Plan	Yes	No	No
<b>London Underground</b>						
4C.1	89	The Mayor and Transport for London will require London Underground to produce costed proposals to return the percentage of Underground services operated to the levels achieved between 1991 and 1996, with particular and immediate attention to the worst performing lines.	Plan	Yes	No	No
4C.2	89	The Mayor and Transport for London will require London Underground to produce costed proposals, by the end of 2001, to safely increase the total amount of train kilometres operated over the existing network.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4C.3	90	The Mayor will set a target of halving the delays caused by equipment failures by 2008 (against a 1999/2000 base).	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4C.4	99	Transport for London will conduct a proper engineering assessment to determine both the cost and the time required to address the deficiencies of the existing Underground infrastructure and to identify immediate as well as short and long-term priorities.	Plan	Yes	No	No
4C.5	101	This Strategy proposes a new partnership between Government, the Mayor and Transport for London to create a long-term, stable financial regime to fund the Underground, along the lines outlined above.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4C.6	102	Targets will be set by Transport for London to improve Underground performance to reach the benchmark of comparable world city metros.	Plan	Yes	No	No
4C.7	102	The Mayor will require London Underground to achieve the core improvements set out above. These will be supplemented by further improvements.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4C.8	104	The Mayor will require London Underground to launch a concentrated programme to solve the problem of out-of-service escalators and lifts.	Plan	Yes	No	No
4C.9	104	The Mayor will require London Underground to develop and implement a prioritised programme to improve conditions at London's most congested stations. (Programme plan to be completed by mid 2002.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4C.10	104	Transport for London and London Underground will agree a costed and time-tabled programme (including both large and smaller scale schemes) of station and interchange improvement. (Programme to be agreed by mid 2002.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4C.11	105	The Mayor will require the Underground to implement a phased programme of improvements to ensure greater levels of access to the Underground and create a core accessible network. (TfL will develop a plan, to be agreed by the end of 2001, for the implementation of a core network of accessible stations on London Underground.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4C.12	106	Transport for London and London Underground will develop a programme of actions to address safety issues and personal security fears on the Underground and on journeys to and from Underground stations.	Plan		No	No
4C.13	107	The Mayor and Transport for London will work with the Strategic Rail Authority to address the long-term need of the Underground for a substantial increase in capacity through the proposed new east-west CrossRail, the Hackney to SouthWest lines, and extensions of the East London Line. (The Government 's Spending Review 2000 ring-fenced funds for the development of CrossRail. However, implementation of the project will require substantive funding outside TfL 's current budget. TfL will agree with the SRA how best to take both the implementation and funding of CrossRail forward together with development of the Hackney – SouthWest proposals. The SRA has funding to take forward East London Line extensions.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Docklands Light Railway and Croydon Tramlink</b>						
4D.1	11	Transport for London and the boroughs will work to ensure that everyone can benefit from the accessibility of the Docklands Light Railway by making the surrounding street environment and supporting services equally accessible. (TfL and borough assessments of all DLR stations and their environs should be completed by the end of 2002.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4D.2	111	The extension of the DLR to London City Airport is supported with the aim of the scheme opening by 2004. Transport for London will explore the potential for additional extensions especially where these will help facilitate regeneration. (TfL 's current budget includes provision for the DLR extension to the City Airport, with a public sector contribution of some £30m.)	Principle and Plan	No	No	Budget
4D.3	113	The integration of Tramlink with other transport services will be pursued by developing interchanges, improving local information and signing, modifying bus routes, maximising access by walking and cycling, and providing facilities for park and ride where appropriate. These will help Tramlink increase its share of the transport market. (Programme for the full integration of Tramlink with other services to be brought forward by the end of 2001.)	Principle and Plan	In general terms	Yes	No
4D.4	114	Transport for London and the relevant boroughs will work to ensure that everyone can benefit from the accessibility of Tramlink by making the surrounding street environment and supporting services equally accessible.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4D.5	115	Transport for London will explore the potential for extending the Tramlink network where doing so could help meet the objectives of this Strategy cost effectively. (The current TfL budget does not include provision for Tramlink extensions. Initial views on their viability should be established by late 2001.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>National Rail</b>						
4E.1	122	The Mayor will issue guidance and instructions to the Strategic Rail Authority regarding the role of National Rail in London, the balance sought between national, regional and local rail services and the overall objectives sought from the franchise replacement process.	Plan	Yes	No	No
4E.2	122	In consultation with the Strategic Rail Authority, and Railtrack and the train operating companies, the Mayor and Transport for London will bring forward a Rail Plan for London taking account of the context provided by the Strategic Rail Authority's National Rail Plan.	Plan	Yes	No	No
4E.3	123	The Mayor, through Transport for London, will work closely with the Strategic Rail Authority to ensure that new franchises operate to an agreed and tightened quality regime, and bring forward specific service and infrastructure initiatives to meet the objectives of the Transport Strategy	Principle and Plan	Policy: N/A Plan: Yes	No	No
4E.4	124	The Mayor and Transport for London will work with all parts of the rail industry to ensure improved reliability and the tackling of overcrowding of rail services in London.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4E.5	124	The Mayor wants safety to be a top priority for National Rail services in London and will therefore press for the best possible train protection system to be introduced to cover all rail services in London.	Principle	(Yes)	No	No
4E.6	137	Transport for London will work with the Strategic Rail Authority, Railtrack, the train operating companies and the London boroughs to identify a phased programme, to be published by the end of 2001 and to be co-ordinated with franchise replacement, for the implementation of the London Metro concept.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4E.7	127	Transport for London will consult with the Strategic Rail Authority, Railtrack, the train operating companies and boroughs to develop and publish an interchange improvement programme by the end of 2001 followed by its implementation.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4E.8	127	Transport for London will develop joint standards with the Strategic Rail Authority, Railtrack and the train operating companies for station facilities by the end of 2001.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4E.9	128	Transport for London will work with the Strategic Rail Authority, the train-operating companies and the London Boroughs to significantly improve the sense of security felt by rail passengers when using rail stations, and to raise more stations in London to the British Transport Police's 'Secure Stations standard.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4E.10	128	Transport for London will work with the Strategic Rail Authority, Railtrack, the train-operating companies and the London boroughs to identify and implement a London-wide Programme of improved access to National Rail stations, including the establishment of a core network of accessible stations.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>A Better Bus Network</b>						
4F.1	134	A more rigorous system of bus contracts will be implemented, following Transport for London 's review of the contracting regime, with the prime aims of ensuring consistently higher quality and reliability, increasing passenger numbers, and demonstrating equality of opportunity for bus staff. (See comment after proposal 4F.3.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4F.2	134	Transport for London will devote greater resources to reviewing and improving the performance and reliability of individual routes, in partnership with the operators, boroughs and enforcement agencies. (See comment after proposal 4F.3.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4F.3	135	Transport for London will work with the operators to ensure pay, conditions and training are adequate to attract sufficient numbers and quality of staff and supervisors, to deliver a high quality operation of services. (Tackling the underlying problems of the bus network and improving bus services requires substantial additional funding as costs are rising rapidly. However, introduction of the new contract regime, together with measures to tackle congestion and improve the efficiency of the bus network, such as increased bus priority, should reduce the pressure on costs and enable revenues to increase.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4F.4	136	Transport for London will work towards the goal of doubling the central London double-deck buses with conductors by the end of 2004 (ie. two-thirds of central London double-deck routes will have conductors), with a view to further expansion of conductors following a review of their benefits and costs. (Doubling the level of conductor services will cost approximately £30 million net in a full year.)	Action	Yes	Yes	Yes
4F.5	137	Transport for London will give priority to the London Bus Initiative (LBI), to meet the target milestones of the completion of Stage One by March 2002 and the central London part of Stage Two by early 2003. Further stages of the LBI will be developed and implemented with the aim of covering all major bus corridors by 2011. (The total cost of LBI Stages One and Two is expected to be £140 million.)	Action	Yes	Yes	Yes

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4F.6	139	The bus network will be expanded with new and extended services, and improved service frequencies, where practicable and cost effective. Consideration will be given to new express services to attract existing car users. (Each 1% increase in bus services, depending upon location and time of day, would cost some £3 million per annum, but requires staffing shortages to be resolved.)	Action	No	No	Yes, pro rata
4F.7	139	There will be an expansion in the frequency and coverage of the 24-hour bus network to meet the growing demands for night-time travel. (For all night bus routes to have at least two buses per hour, seven nights a week, would cost less than £1 million per annum. A 10% overall increase in the provision of night buses would have an annual net cost of £1.2 million per annum.)	Action	No	No	Yes, pro rata
4F.8	141	Transport for London and the boroughs will develop and implement a long-term programme so that all bus stops can be served effectively by low floor buses. (The initial phases will be included in the LBI, so will be delivered within the timetable of that programme. The Mayor wants TfL and the boroughs to develop a further programme and timetable for implementation by the end of 2001. Overall, the cost of comprehensive measures to improve all bus stops could be in the region of £150 million.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	Yes
4F.9	142	Transport for London will improve the reliability of Countdown and extend it to 4,000 locations by 2005. Further expansion will be given high priority in programmes such as the London Bus Initiative. (Countdown has now been installed at 1,500 locations. A further 2,500 stops will be fitted at an additional cost of £20 million, to be completed by April 2005. In addition, provision of electronic signs inside the bus giving the name of the next stop and other information could be implemented during 2003/4 and 2004/5, at a total cost for the bus fleet of £11.5 million.)	Action	Yes	Yes	Yes
4F.10	143	Transport for London will draw up a costed and timed plan for accelerating the introduction of low floor, accessible buses. (The Mayor wants TfL to start drawing up the plan immediately, and would like to see low floor accessible buses across the network (excluding Routemaster routes) as soon as practicable, with the costs largely within existing cost projections.)	Plan	Yes	No	No
4F.11	143	Transport for London will study options for improved bus design, including a common standard for the layout and interior design features of buses, and the use of articulated buses, with the involvement of users and bus operators. (The Mayor wants TfL to identify the appropriate designs by the end of 2001, and set standards for future new vehicles used on London's bus network.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4F.12	143	Transport for London will carry out periodic high-level reviews of risk, and re-examine and strengthen the safety monitoring of bus operations.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A



Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4F.13	144	Transport for London will give high priority to further reductions in bus emissions, with all buses meeting Euro II standard by 2005, and new buses meeting Euro III standards from October 2001. Opportunities for the beneficial use of alternative fuels will be actively reviewed. (Completion of the programme to retrofit particulate traps, with a further 900 buses fitted by end of March 2003, costing £1 million. Trials of zero emission buses operating on fuel cells is planned which would reach conclusions in 2005, and cost £1.5 million over 2 years.)	Action	Yes	Yes	Yes
4F.14	144	Transport for London will develop and introduce standards for providing bus information, including different formats and languages, to meet the wide range of passenger needs.	Plan	Yes	No	No
4F.15	145	Guidance will be issued by the Mayor by the end of 2001, reflecting the objectives of the Strategy, on the criteria by which applications for a London service permit will be considered by Transport for London.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4F.16	147	Transport for London will work with coach operators to review opportunities for extending the role of commuter coach services, taking account of traffic and parking issues. (Commuter coaches are operated on a commercial basis, so the cost to TfL should be minimal.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4F.17	147	Transport for London will establish a partnership by the end of 2001 to review arrangements for coach parking, facilities and terminals. This will build on the work of existing organisations and involve relevant interested parties, including the coach industry, boroughs and the police.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Streets for All</b>						
4G.1	152	Transport for London will prepare a road and street hierarchy for Greater London, consulting all relevant interests and taking account of the development of the Spatial Development Strategy	Plan	Yes	No	No
4G.2	154	Transport for London and the boroughs will promote and implement a package of end-to-end enhanced, intensified and enforced bus priority measures on heavily used bus routes, and in areas such as the West End. Together with other complementary measures, this will provide a high quality, fully accessible bus network on the London Bus Initiative BusPlus Routes. Bus priority and protection against congestion will be vastly increased on all bus routes London-wide, both in the amount of street space allocated and in their time of operation. (LBI Stage One by April 2002, LBI Stage Two by April 2004 at a total cost of £140m, and LBPN by April 2003 with further cost of £30m.)	Action	Yes	Yes	Yes

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4G.3	155	All bus routes will be effectively enforced to protect against illegal stopping and other traffic offences, using cameras wherever possible. All bus stops will have 24-hour bus stop clearways. This should be included in the borough 's Parking and Enforcement Plans. (Camera enforcement by April 2002 (see Proposal 4G.12). Bus stop clearways to be covered in boroughs 'Parking and Enforcement Plans, with completion by the end of 2004.)	Action	Yes	Yes	No
4G.4	155	Transport for London and the boroughs will be required to review all traffic signal junctions to ensure that pedestrian phases are included wherever possible without unduly disrupting priority traffic. (Twenty sites on TLRN to be reviewed each year. Potential cost of £0.5m pa on TLRN and £1m pa on borough roads.)	Action	Yes	Yes	Yes
4G.5	156	Programmes of improvements will be developed by Transport for London and the boroughs to make the street environment more accessible, removing barriers and obstructions that make it difficult or unsafe for pedestrians to use the street. (Indicative cost of £60m over the next 5 to 10 years.)	Plan	No	No	Indicative
4G.6	156	Transport for London will work with the boroughs to look at the problems that cyclists encounter, particularly key accident locations, to see if these can be solved by specific junction treatment or other traffic management solutions. (Part of TfL Road Safety Plan –indicative cost of £10m.)	Plan	No	No	Indicative
4G.7	157	A motorcycle accident analysis and prevention Programme will be part of Transport for London 's Road Safety Plan for London (described in Proposal 4G.14). (Part of TfL Road Safety Plan, indicative cost of £10m.)	Plan	Yes	No	Indicative
4G.8	157	Transport for London will work with the boroughs to enhance and extend the provision of secure parking for motorcycles where appropriate. (Annual monitoring to start in Summer 2002.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4G.9	157	Transport for London will review the evidence and if appropriate consider experiments to allow motorcycles to share bus lanes. (Review to be completed by the end of 2001.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4G.10	156	Transport for London will work with the Police, the Association of London Government, the boroughs, the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency and other relevant parties to implement, by the end of 2002, the Enforcement Action Plan to deliver better traffic enforcement and vehicle registration throughout Greater London.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4G.11	157	Transport for London will introduce a civil Enforcement system on the TLRN for bus lane infringements by April 2001. Transport for London in conjunction with the London Boroughs will aim to have introduced new legislation to allow further non-endorsable traffic offences to be enforced on all streets through the decriminalised system by the end of 2002.	Action	Yes	Yes	No

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4G.12	157	Transport for London, working with the police and the boroughs, will introduce camera enforcement on all 700 bus lanes in Greater London by April 2002. (Cost of £15m funded as part of the London Bus Initiative.)	Action	Yes	Yes	Yes
4G.13	157	Transport for London, working with the police and the boroughs will investigate the potential role of a dedicated enforcement capability and wider use of decriminalised powers of enforcement. (Investigation to be completed by Spring 2002.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4G.14	161	Transport for London will develop London 's first Road Safety Plan. The boroughs will be expected to adopt the approach set out in the plan and to publish their own Road Safety Plans outlining how the target reductions are to be achieved locally (Road Safety Plan to be completed in Summer 2001. Indicative implementation cost of £28m.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	Indicative
4G.15	161	The Police will be expected to work with Transport for London to prepare a strategy to secure compliance with speed limits throughout London. (Strategy to be developed by Spring 2002.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4G.16	162	The London boroughs should make greater use of their increased powers to introduce 20mph zones and speed limits in residential areas, where appropriate. This should be a priority in areas where there is a large number of children, such as at schools. Transport for London will co-operate with these initiatives where they impact on the TLRN. (To be taken forward in boroughs 'Local Implementation Plan. Indicative cost of £25m for a ten year programme.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	Indicative
4G.17	163	Transport for London and the boroughs will work together with the Police to address personal security issues, reducing crime and the fear of crime on London 's streets. (Indicative costs of £10m for a ten-year programme.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	Indicative
4G.18	165	The Mayor will develop, in consultation with the London boroughs, formal guidance on the application within Greater London of the Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997, and will issue this guidance by early 2002.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4G.19	168	Transport for London will introduce a congestion charging scheme in central London as described above and in Annex 4 – <i>The Congestion Charging Scheme for central London</i> Transport for London will develop the scheme and proposals for a Scheme Order setting out the detailed operation and configuration of the scheme. (Scheme to be operational by early 2003 at indicative cost of £250m, with benefits valued at some net revenues of £190m per year.)	Action	Yes	Yes	Yes
4G.20	169	All parking and loading controls should be managed fairly and effectively. Parking charges must be set to reflect the overall objectives of the Transport Strategy and the application of borough policies to individual locations.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4G.21	169	Transport for London and the boroughs will review parking and loading controls along all Transport for London Road Network roads (TLRN), other 'A Roads' and in other key locations to ensure that they protect buses and business traffic whilst ensuring reasonable access to local shops, community facilities and residents. To achieve this, appropriate parking and loading controls, consistent with the Red Route approach, with clear allocations of street space and explicit standards of enforcement, should be introduced on all TLRN streets by the end of 2001 and on all other 'A Roads' and bus routes by the end of 2008. (Indicative total cost of £80m.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	Indicative
4G.22	170	The creation of new or extended Controlled Parking Zones will be supported, particularly in inner London, outer London town centres, and around Underground and rail stations where parking pressures and conflicts are acute.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4G.23	170	Boroughs should review the provision and pricing of public off-street parking to ensure that this conforms with the objectives of the Parking Plan in their Local Implementation Plan and with the Transport Strategy. Boroughs should ensure that charges for off-street car parking give priority to short term users. (Annual monitoring to commence in Summer 2002.)	Principle Plan	N/A Yes	N/A Yes	N/A No
4G.24	171	Boroughs should use their planning powers to limit the amount of parking provided through new and temporary public off-street car parks, so as to meet the objectives of the Parking Plan in their Local Implementation Plan, and those of the Transport Strategy (Annual monitoring to commence in Summer 2002.)	Principle Plan	N/A Yes	N/A Yes	N/A No
4G.25	171	The Mayor requires the boroughs to submit Parking Plans with supporting Enforcement Plans and standards as part of future Local Implementation Plan submissions.	Principle	Yes	Yes	No
4G.26	172	The initiatives introduced on Red Routes (including environmental improvements) should be applied to the whole of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) before the end of 2004; comparable initiatives should be applied to the majority of other 'A Roads' and to selected other London roads before 2008. This complements Proposal 4G.21. (Indicative cost of £105m.)	Action	Yes	Yes	Indicative
4G.27	172	Transport for London will identify before the end of 2002 the major congestion bottlenecks on the TLRN and develop a programme of options for consideration.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4G.28	173	<p>Transport for London will assess each of the inherited schemes and any further proposals against the objectives of the Transport Strategy, to ensure that they broadly meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• contribute to London 's economic regeneration and development;</li> <li>• provide a net benefit to London 's environment;</li> <li>• improve safety for all road users;</li> <li>• improve conditions for bus passengers, pedestrians, cyclists, disabled people and business;</li> <li>• integrate with local and strategic land use planning policies; and</li> <li>• do not increase overall traffic capacity within the corridor</li> </ul> <p>Where schemes worsen conditions against any of these criteria, there will be a presumption that the scheme should not proceed unless benefits in other areas very substantially outweigh any disbenefits. (Review of inherited schemes to be completed by mid 2001.)</p>	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4G.29	174	<p>Transport for London will work with London Boroughs to produce guidance before the end of 2002 on secondary and local signing and street name signing; and will develop an investment programme commencing in 2003/04 to implement new signing initiatives. (Costs and appropriate timescale will be identified in preparing the investment programme.)</p>	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4G.30	175	<p>Transport for London will establish a streetworks taskforce to ensure the effective co-ordination and advance Planning of all streetworks on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). (Streetworks task force to be established by end of 2001.)</p>	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4G.31	175	<p>Subject to the necessary legislation, Transport for London will investigate the introduction of a pilot 'street space rental 'system for works undertaken on or inside the Inner Ring Road, whereby there is a financial incentive to complete streetworks quickly and with minimum disruption.</p>	Plan	Yes	No	No
4G.32.	177	<p>Boroughs will be encouraged to manage and design appropriate local streets as 'Streets-for-People' areas emphasising their amenity function. Priority should be given to areas of high deprivation and regeneration areas. Transport for London will co-operate with these initiatives where they are likely to affect the operation of Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). (Indicative cost of £250m over 10 years.)</p>	Principle	N/A	N/A	Indicative
4G.33	177	<p>The Government will be encouraged to introduce legislation to give pedestrians legal priority over motor traffic in Home Zones.</p>	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4G,34	177	<p>Transport for London will work with boroughs to develop a ten-year programme of environmental street improvement schemes to improve the attractiveness of London 's town centres. (Indicative cost of £150m.)</p>	Plan	Yes	No	Indicative

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4G.35	178	As the first stage in a new approach to street maintenance, Transport for London and the boroughs will produce three-year street maintenance plans reflecting the objectives of the Transport Strategy. (First plan to be produced by Spring 2002.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4G.36	178	Transport for London will work with London Boroughs to develop, before the end of 2002, a long-term approach to the funding and management of street maintenance throughout London.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
<b>The Car User</b>						
4H.1	183	Transport for London working with the boroughs and the Government, will review options for extending real-time information on traffic problems and availability of parking. (Review to be completed by March 2002.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4H.2	184	Transport for London will work towards maintaining London's position as a world leader in Integrated Transport System (ITS) development and prioritise those measures which will increase the attractiveness of public transport, improve safety and security and help vulnerable road users.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4H.3	184	Transport for London will take forward the setting up of a London Traffic Control Centre. (London Traffic Control Centre to be complete by March 2004. Cost of £10 million for a ten year period.)	Action	Yes	Yes	Yes
4H.4	184	Transport for London, working with Railtrack and train operating companies, will review current provision of car parking at Underground and National Rail stations, and upgrade and extend provision where this will result in shortening of car journeys and an overall reduction in car use. (Review to be completed by the end of 2003.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Promoting Walking</b>						
4I.1	188	Transport for London will work with the boroughs and other relevant organisations to ensure the effective promotion and delivery of better conditions for pedestrians. (This will be covered by TfL 's Business Plans and boroughs' Local Implementation Plans.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4I.2	189	Transport for London will progress the World Squares project, with the partial pedestrianisation of Trafalgar Square as the first stage. Transport for London will work in partnership with the boroughs and the Police to ensure that this and other pedestrianised areas are effectively managed. (The first stage of pedestrianisation of Trafalgar Square, outside the National Gallery, has a cost of £22 million and should be completed by the end of 2004.):	Action	Yes	Yes	Yes

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4I.3	189	Transport for London and the boroughs will develop north to south and east to west pedestrian routes across the city, as an initial step towards a network of routes where pedestrians are given priority. (This will be covered by TfL 's Business Plans and boroughs 'Local Implementation Plans.)	Action	No	No	No
4I.4	190	Transport for London, in partnership with the boroughs, will establish streetscape guidelines, and set minimum standards for the maintenance and management of London's streets, including repair of footways, signing, avoiding clutter, removing graffiti and rubbish, keeping streets adequately illuminated and the provision of CCTV. (Guidelines to be developed by Spring 2002.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4I.5	191	Transport for London, in conjunction with the London boroughs, will develop best practice guidance on audits of pedestrian facilities and accessibility, including issues related to safety and the needs of disabled people, for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• all new major highway and traffic management proposals;</li> <li>• local town centres and other major trip generators, including stations and large schools; and,</li> <li>• public buildings and community facilities.</li> </ul> (Guidelines to be developed by the end of 2002.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Promoting Cycling</b>						
4J.1	194	Transport for London will prepare a framework to guide the development of cycling initiatives in consultation with the boroughs. (Framework to be completed by Spring 2002).	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4J.2	194	Transport for London will support completion by the end of 2004 of the London Cycle Network to a consistently high standard. Transport for London will work with the boroughs to develop an extended core high quality cycle network. (Completing the LCN will have a cost of £60m. By the end of 2001 a pilot high quality route will be identified, with the aim of a ten-year programme to develop a London wide network.)	Action	Yes	Yes	Yes
4J.3	195	All new major highway and transport infrastructure schemes should be cycle audited, and Transport for London and all boroughs should have cycle audit procedures and include cycling in safety audit procedures. (Cycle audit procedures to be in place by the end of 2001.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4J.4	195	Transport for London will establish a Cycling Centre of Excellence to provide technical support facilities, lead on the London Cycle Network project management in a similar way to the London Bus Initiative (LBI) partnership, and increase the level of support to the boroughs to ensure delivery. Transport for London will set up an Advisory Group to provide a focus for those who are promoting cycling. (This will be put in place during 2001, with the modest cost recouped in more effective implementation.)	Action	Yes	Yes	No
4J.5	196	Transport for London and the boroughs will increase the provision of secure cycle parking facilities, including at shopping centres and transport interchanges. The Mayor will also encourage the provision of these and other facilities required by cyclists at workplaces and places of education, and will expect the boroughs to require developers to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide good cycle access to the development;</li> <li>• install secure cycle parking; and</li> <li>• provide showers, lockers and changing facilities.</li> </ul> (TfL 's and the boroughs ' costs will be modest, with much of the costs falling to developers and business.)	Action	No	No	No
4J.6	196	Transport for London will work with the boroughs and the Police to support effective training for children and adults for safer cycling. Transport for London will work with the boroughs, the voluntary sector and the Police to increase awareness of the problems caused by cycling on the footway and other offences, and to increase the level of enforcement against these offences. (Indicative costs of £1m pa.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	Indicative
<b>Freight, Delivery and Servicing</b>						
4K.1	201	Transport for London will set up, during 2001, a Sustainable Distribution Forum for London that will assist in the development and implementation of proposals for effective distribution of goods in London.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4K.2	201	Transport for London will encourage the early development of freight quality partnerships, particularly at the sub-regional level, to complement similar, borough-led initiatives at the more local scale. (The initial partnerships should be set up during 2001.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No



Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4K.3	203	<p>Transport for London and the Sustainable Distribution Forum for London will consider initiatives to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assess the scope for increasing dedicated road capacity for freight (e.g. goods-vehicle-only and no car lanes)for all or part of the working day;</li> <li>• increase the efficiency of distribution operations in terms of minimising the substantial amount of empty or partially-loaded running;</li> <li>• revise parking, waiting and loading controls, and enforcement, both to free-up road capacity and provide facilities for business activities and service vehicles;</li> <li>• minimise the impact of road works on delivery and servicing activities; and,</li> <li>• investigate the opportunities for using smaller goods vehicles.</li> </ul> <p>(Progress is expected to be made on these issues within a year of the Forum being set up.)</p>	Plan	Yes In principle	No Only progress"	No
4K.4	203	<p>Transport for London and the Sustainable Distribution Forum for London will consider the opportunities for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consolidation of loads and numbers of deliveries;</li> <li>• deliveries to intermediate points between supplier and recipient, such as staging depots for bulk deliveries on the outskirts of town centres or for retail deliveries to consumers at corner shops or office complexes;</li> <li>• changes to delivery hours; and,</li> <li>• use of vehicles better suited to operation in dense urban environments.</li> </ul> <p>(Progress is expected to be made on these issues within a year of the Forum being set up.)</p>	Plan	Yes In principle	No Only "progress"	No
4K.5	204	<p>Transport for London and the boroughs should reassess the London Lorry Ban, and ensure wider strategic objectives, freight policies and environmental concerns are taken into account in any future revisions. (It is envisaged that an initial review of the boroughs 'London Lorry Ban should take place by mid-2002.)</p>	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4K.6	204	<p>The Mayor 's Transport, Air Quality and Noise Strategies should form the basis of partnerships with business and major fleet operators to encourage the accelerated take-up of cleaner vehicle technologies, and to promote better maintenance and considerate and economical driving.</p>	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4K.7	205	<p>Transport for London will work with the Strategic Rail Authority to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• additional network capacity for freight is provided to tackle existing pinch-points and to ensure that the growth in rail freight does not impose limitations on existing or planned passenger services;</li> <li>• there is a commitment to the development of freight bypass routes around London, removing non-London traffic from dense residential areas and freeing capacity for London-based freight and expanded passenger services; and,</li> <li>• suitable sites and facilities are made available to enable the transfer of freight to rail, both through the development of existing sites and the provision of new ones.</li> </ul> <p>(Discussions with the SRA have already started, and will be ongoing.)</p>	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>London 's International Links</b>						
<i>No Proposals</i>						
<b>River Thames and Other Waterways</b>						
4M.1	215	Transport for London will work with relevant partners to carry out a safety review of passenger services on the river by the end of 2002.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4M.2	216	Options for extending use of the Thames for regular and frequent passenger travel will be explored including extending Transport for London ownership of piers where this provides value for money. (Progress on exploring options will be made by the middle of 2002.)	Plan	No	Yes Only "progress"	No
4M.3	216	Transport for London will explore measures to integrate river services with land based public transport, including fares, ticketing and information. (Measures to improve integration will be identified by the end of 2001.)	Plan	No	Yes	No
4M.4	217	Transport for London will work with relevant partners to identify options for increasing freight use of the River Thames and other waterways, including the transport of waste, with proposals to be made by the end of 2002.	Plan	No	Yes	No
<b>Taxis and Minicabs, Community Transport and Door-to-Door Transport</b>						
4N.1	220	The Mayor will issue policy guidance on the objectives for minicabs.		Yes	No	No
4N.2	220	A forum will be set up by Transport for London to bring together all sections of the taxi and minicab trade, and attempt to build a consensus around the major issues facing the industry in London. (The forum will be set up by the end of 2001.)	Plan	Yes	Yes Only "progress"	No
4N.3	221	Transport for London will carry out a review of taxi ranks and stopping arrangements, with a view to ensuring good provision at major transport termini, thus improving passenger access, and reducing waiting and queuing time. (The review will be carried out and potential measures identified by the middle of 2002.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4N.4	221	Taxi and minicab operators will be encouraged to reduce the emissions of their vehicles, and the Mayor and Transport for London will review the scope for improvements to be implemented via regulations. (Although this will be on-going, progress on identifying improvements is expected by mid-2002.)	Plan	Yes	Yes Only "progress"	No
4N.5	222	Transport for London will work with the community transport sector to seek closer integration of mainstream and community transport services. (This will be on-going but TfL will have initial discussions with the community transport sector by the end of 2001, to identify the way forward.)	Plan	No	Yes Only "progress"	No
4N.6	224	There will be a review of Dial-a-Ride to establish how the organisation and future functions of the Dial-a-Ride service can better meet users' needs. (The Mayor wants to see the review completed by the end of 2001, followed by actions to improve the Dial-a-Ride service soon after the review is completed but recognising the review in Proposal 4N.9.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4N.7	224	Transport for London will work with the boroughs to seek to get better equality of Taxicard service across London in 2001/2. In the longer term, if a method of eliminating current inequalities across London cannot be agreed in partnership with the boroughs, the Mayor will require Transport for London to establish a London-wide scheme to achieve this. (It is important to deal with the inequalities and the Mayor will work with the boroughs immediately to seek to resolve these as soon as possible.)	Action	Yes	Yes	No
4N.8	224	The supply of taxis and minicabs (when licensed) available for subsidised public transport should be increased, and a more even distribution of services provided across London. (The Mayor will work with the boroughs, taxi and minicab companies to identify how more service can be provided, in the shortest practicable time.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4N.9	225	The lessons to be learned from the door-to-door pilot projects will be taken forward by Transport for London and the boroughs and applied across London. (The five pilot projects will be properly assessed in 2002/3. The Mayor wants Transport for London to work with all the partners to implement improvements and apply them across London as soon as is practicable.)	Plan	Yes	Yes Only "progress"	No
4N.10	225	Transport for London will carry out a review with the boroughs of the cost to disabled people of using door-to-door services. (The Mayor wants the review to be carried out by the end of 2001, with outcomes introduced soon after.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Accessible Transport</b>						
4O.1	228	Disability equality and customer care accredited training will be mandatory for staff who provide and plan transport services under Transport for London's control. (Initial programmes will be in place by the end of 2001.)	Principle	Yes	Yes-Initial	No

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4O.2	229	Transport for London will review the accessibility of recently constructed infrastructure, to learn the lessons of design and operation, and ensure accessibility standards are implemented in new infrastructure. (The review should be completed and standards agreed early in 2002.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4O.3	229	Accessibility/Mobility Forums will be developed at the local and London-wide level, enabling users to be involved in the process of developing London 's transport services and ensuring that people 's needs are properly taken into account. (The London-wide forum will be set up and meeting regularly before the end of 2001.)	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
4O. 4	229	Schemes, measures and initiatives that provide and support empowerment for people to travel more easily will be supported by Transport for London. (This will be on-going, but initial schemes should be identified by the end of 2001/2.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4O.5	230	Comprehensive information in a range of formats will be provided by Transport for London on all public transport services, including the full range of accessible services, to enable people to plan and make journeys easily (Progress to be made so that useful information for all major groups will be produced by the end of 2001.)	Plan	Yes	Yes Only "progress"	No
4O.6	231	The Mayor will press the Health Authorities, the boroughs and other agencies for increased provision of powered wheelchairs, mobility aids and services to aid the independent mobility of disabled people. (It is intended for discussions to start, and substantial progress be made, by the end of 2001.)	Plan	No	Yes Only "progress"	No
4O.7	232	Transport for London will work with disability groups, the Government and the boroughs to ensure the effective operation and enforcement of a reputable Orange/Blue Badge system. A new 'Silver Badge 'scheme that will exempt disabled people from the proposed congestion charging scheme will be in place when congestion charging is introduced.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Integration –The Seamless Journey</b>						
4P.1	237	As and when required Transport for London will create and facilitate working groups to bring together key organisations involved in meeting travel needs in London. These groups will look across the transport network including public transport and London 's streets, agree priorities, and develop joint investment plans to improve integration.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4P.2	243	Transport for London will work with others to develop a network-wide travel information plan by the end of 2002.	Plan	Yes	No	No

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
4P.3	244	Transport for London will work with the boroughs, the British Transport Police and the Metropolitan Police to bring forward and implement a plan for reducing transport-related crime and fear of crime, particularly focusing on crimes involving Violence and sexual assault on London 's transport networks. The plan should be published by the end of 2002.	Plan	Yes	yes	No
<b>Major Projects</b>						
4Q.1	250	The Mayor supports the development of Thameslink 2000 and with Transport for London will press the Strategic Rail Authority to ensure that the services fully meet the needs of London. (The costs of Thameslink 2000 fall to the SRA and the commercial rail providers.)	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4Q.2	251	Transport for London will work with the Strategic Rail Authority to facilitate an early start to CrossRail, an agreement on financing and ensure that the design of the scheme is the best possible to meet the needs of London, particularly in relieving central London congestion, facilitating the regeneration of east London and improving access to Heathrow. (Agreement on the way forward should be achieved by mid 2001,with initial funding ring-fenced by Government for TfL.)	Principle	N/A	Yes Only "progress"	N/A
4Q.3	253	The Mayor considers that additional rail capacity on the north-east to south-west axis is vitally needed and will require Transport for London (TfL) to confirm the precise route, character and role of the link. Working with the Strategic Rail Authority, TfL will establish funding/financing and implementation plans for a new line. (A decision on overall objectives should be made by the end of 2001.)	Plan	No	Yes	No
4Q.4	255	The Mayor wants to see the East London Line extension implemented as a very early priority. This should be followed by further development of orbital rail services in inner London.	Action	No	No	No
4Q.5	256	The principle of new river crossings to improve access in east London is supported. Transport for London and the London Development Agency will carry out wide consultation on the river crossings proposals to enable funding/financing plans to be established and decisions to be taken in 2001.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
4Q.6	258	The Mayor supports all of the major proposals set out in this section in principle, and wishes to see them taken forward by Transport for London and the partner boroughs. The Mayor and Transport for London will consult on each of the intermediate mode proposals in 2001 with a view to completing planning, determining funding/financing, and starting the construction of a preferred scheme or schemes at the latest by 2004.	Principle  Plan	N/A  Yes	N/A  Yes	No  No
<b>Making it Happen - A Programme for Action</b>						

Proposal	Page	Description	Principle? Plan? Action?	Quantified Deliverable?	Delivery Date?	Cost?
5.1	265	The Mayor will press central Government to make net congestion charging revenues additional to transport grant and ring-fenced for spending on transport in London permanently.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.2	266	The Mayor and Transport for London will pursue the idea of partly financing transport investments by means of Revenue Securitisation Obligations.	Principle	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.3	269	To develop plans (including for financing), consult on, and deliver the major projects identified in Chapter 4Q – <i>Major Projects</i> , Transport for London will set up project development teams which take an integrated approach, and work in partnership with relevant agencies. These project development teams will make use of relevant external expertise.	Plan	Yes	No	No
5.4	270	Transport for London will draw together a summary annual strategic assessment for transport in London setting out projected income, expenditure, investment and key outputs, updating and extending the information provided in the Strategy, summarising the plans of Transport for London, the boroughs, the Strategic Rail Authority, Railtrack and the train operating companies.	Plan	Yes	No	No
5.5	270	Transport for London will lead an audit of the Strategy 's requirements for staff with particular skills, set against the skills of the staff in the main implementation agencies and their contractors. Transport for London will draw up an action plan with relevant partners to address skills shortages identified in this audit, by mid 2002.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
5.6	272	Transport for London will review, develop and implement overall Transport Strategy performance indicators as a priority, working jointly with the boroughs and the Strategic Rail Authority, Railtrack and train operating companies to incorporate information required from them, with the aim of having a Strategy performance indicator tracking system in place by mid 2002. Results will be made publicly available.	Plan	Yes	Yes	No
5.7	273	The Mayor will set targets for implementation of the Strategy.	Plan	Yes	No	No