

Michael Walton

London Transport Museum

Good afternoon, welcome, and particular thanks to Nicky Gavron for asking me to contribute. This is one of many maps you will have seen today of the green belt. There is nothing particularly marvellous about it but I thought it was quite dramatic and I like a bit of drama, therefore, there we go.

A short history of transport, very short - it is immensely long; I could bore you forever but I do not propose to do that - first railway in London, just round the corner from here, London Bridge to Greenwich 1835 or 1836 - I cannot remember; I am not a date freak. The growth of suburban railways was exponential until the late 1890s but in general terms they did not really bother very much with the Londoner visiting its immediate countryside because far more money was to be gained by the carriage of people long distances to the seaside and, of course, the biggest money earner of all, freight. They are a little bit out of the scope that I am talking about.

As we move on a number of coach companies developed into a single system called Green Line. Now, we like Green Line because it is quite indicative of a name and a brand that has distinct resonance today. The idea of Green Line was not so much to really get Londoners out into the countryside, originally it was to get the out-of-towners into London to do their business and for culture, etc. However, it was soon realised that money could be made by Londoners going out to various places outside on a day out. Please also remember that days of leisure for the average Londoner who was generally very poor indeed were only Sundays and bank holidays. Therefore, those were the days of the week and of the year where there was marginal use available for transport systems to capitalise on their very expensive assets in order to raise revenue. This is a constant theme in transport history. Transport by its very nature is very expensive to do, it is very expensive to run and it is only much more recently that it has been understood that there is a social element within it. It was never historically the case at all. Here we have some examples of an organised system trying to show and promote its services to make money for Londoners to get out for quite often very short periods of their lives in order to breathe in what was a very, much more so than now, polluted city.

The same applies by tram. London had the biggest tramway system in the world at one point. It collapsed and died by 1952 - we will ignore the modern Croydon one - but some of it reached out to what was then the countryside and it was actively promoted. Exactly the same business rationale, Sundays and bank holidays, cheap tickets from disadvantaged areas to the fringes of London where fresh air could be sought and perhaps in the pub. By the way, the transport companies never really promoted the glories of going to pubs on the fringes of London, probably for fear of mass drunkenness, which was a big problem. For all the activities which were advertised it was never drinking, and still the case now.

Bus was the same thing. Buses developed in quite a similar way to tramways except they were far more flexible, which, incidentally, killed the tram because buses could go anywhere but

trams really could not. Again, you will see from that rather gorgeous illustrative map on the left that buses could go out to deep and distant places. Just as a matter of historical record, all of the tramways, the Underground, the bus and the Green Line systems have unified under one essentially nationalised umbrella in 1933 but prior to that it was an amalgam of private companies, some of whom worked together and some actively did not. It is only in 1933 that we get some element here of a semblance of sense and order into a transport system that was chaotic. We might have gone a little bit back to that but not under this Mayor.

Now we have Underground. This is a really interesting one because we were talking about urban sprawl and the interesting thing with the Metropolitan Railway, which became part of the Underground in 1933, is that they were really keen to gobble up as much countryside as they could, build as much housing as they possibly could, attract people to go and live in them who, by the very fact that they were near stations, would be transported into town. The railway company owned the land, they arranged for the houses to be built, they sold them, they sold the season tickets, they probably provided through leasehold the shops and it was win, win, win, win, win. This was a really interesting example of how public transport took a really quite ruthless attack upon London and its countryside.

When it had been reorganised in 1933 - and the Metropolitan Railway, by the way, took desperate umbrage about being nationalised - the Underground then started a much more civilised campaign about how to get people into the suburbs or outer suburbs to enjoy fresh air. Again, not for altruistic motives, it was to earn money. Let us be absolutely clear about that. It was to earn money, but it did it in a very stylish way. You will see, on the right-hand side, employed a beautiful artist. The far right one is Graham Sutherland, therefore, we went to the very top of the artistic pinnacle to attract the best people to do that job. Of course, having got out into the suburbs or the outer suburbs, or what we now call the green belt - and the Metropolitan line, by the way, went significantly further than London - into then even as far as Brill in Oxfordshire and Verney Junction, which is not a million miles from Buckingham. At one time it went out a really long way. What you can see from how the Underground approached it is really the activities which then it wanted people to engage in, which were the civilised activities of the day: picnicking, which was rather glamorous; country walks; rambles; etc. These were actively promoted and they made a huge amount of difference to many Londoners' lives at the time.

That was then. What about now? My little idea was actually to do something rather funky based upon what public transport might be able to do for the green belt of London. We have Congestion Charge, which is like the antithesis of this, therefore, I rather like the idea of a green belt Green line - whatever you want to call it - and, more importantly, the Green M25. M25 is in everybody's heads because it is both the bane of everybody's lives, it is both the connector to a hell of a lot of people's lives, it is part of London's economic heart and it is also part of its economic destruction. You can pick and choose what the hell you want out of this. However, the idea of actually focusing in on what is amazing about the green belt and giving it some prominence and some real thought about how it is to be part of London's culture and London's life I think needs to be taken seriously, particularly with the great contributions for so

many people from today. It does not really stop there because I am talking about transport and transport still is the great provider. It is still the great leveller in how people access everything.

We have talked about cars and they are beginning to be on the way out. The railway system is radial by its very history and its very nature and, please do not forget, however much you complain about London's railway system it is still essentially one of the best in the world. It is just massively, massively under stress because our road system is so weak and so poor that actually railways take the brunt of the demand. However, what is there to stop us thinking about how we make amazing hubs on green belt beautiful, sexy, relevant and exciting? I loved your contribution about landscape design, because this is the very heart of what people want to see. I am absolutely enthralled by this idea of fantastic design. Why has everything got to be dull if we are talking about green issues? Make it amazing, make it brilliant.

There is a list of hub stations. Forget about that because anybody can look at a map and make that. Some are owned by TfL, some are not, but the whole idea is you make it sexy, you make it exciting. To do what? It is to make sure you make it really, really exciting. What do you actually do with them? Clearly, my vision would be a beautiful path around all of London. A lovely, lovely path meandering through wonderful areas, intercepted by hubs at important points where you could hire a bike, where you could have sports facilities. I love the idea of sports fields but I look at the average sports field and, I am really sorry, there are no facilities whatsoever. Try to make something usable, sexy, exciting and relevant. Cycling. What is there to stop us maybe at weekends taking cycle hire scheme bikes out to the paths and just wondering around on the paths on those? Somebody said earlier, "Points equals prizes." If you do that you get more points, you get more money off and you get more incentive to do it. You can use the railway systems when they are at their weakest point of demand. Therefore, it becomes really quite an exciting idea.

We talked about ramblers. Rambling has a nice connotation but walking is a lot worse in people's psyche. Picnics. Now, much more importantly for me is green architecture. What is it about? What are we going to do? What do we want to do to actually make the very best architectural standards to fit this beautiful environment that we have? A lot of it is indifferent only because nobody takes much care about it. Landscape architecture. Wow, you can make the most boring spaces breathtakingly beautiful. It does not necessarily need to be public money but it does need to be by the excitement and the ingenuity of the amazing talent that London actually has within its borders and within its land. Of course, neighbouring councils, because this is a collaborative effort. This is not just London, it is everyone.

I am finishing. Green hubs. We talked about all these things, you can read the list. Finally, I am going to say thank you with a goodbye thing. The G and the thank you is thank you to London because it is about the gateway to London. Do not forget it is about looking from the outside into London, not just in London out. It is the other way round. Being a guardian of London. Being a guarantor of London's health and future. This is a little bit I would to push, just about being a bit glamorous. Thank you