

A CITY FOR ALL LONDONERS

Transport Workshop
9th November 2016, 9.30 – 13.00

Strategic Priorities for a Growing City Transport & Health Table 6 Session 1

These notes are a summary of the conversation

Session 1, Table 6

Facilitator, Lucy Saunders, GLA

Tom Bogdanowicz, Cycling Campaign
Rachel Aldred, University of Westminster
Simon Phillips, Lambeth Council
Nick Sanderson, Sustrans
Simon Birkett, Clean Air in London
David Taylor, Enfield Council
Dimitrios Dikmpasanis, London Borough of Sutton

Introduced herself as facilitator and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Bar chart is wrong. Double counts. 112% not 100%. Air pollution cause of high BP. Residual statistical effect. High BP includes air pollution. It is misleading. Air pollution second biggest killer. Smoking, diet also up there. Exposures that have outcomes: heart attacks, strokes etc.

Where would you put air quality?

Top three.

Would you disagree?

I would. No accurate way of measuring. Factors interact. Genetics and quality of life are also factors.

Benefits from physical activity e.g. cycling.

Smoking not really linked to transport.

15% of Londoners smoke. Not enough exercise each day. Transport has potential to affect Londoners' health. Need to improve air quality and physical activity. Anything else?

Mental health, noise.

Messaging people not to eat food that is not conducive to their health or to drive cars, which is also not conducive. We are working with default position where people are told to drive vehicles and eat low-grade foods. There was a ban on advertising smoking, but no move to do this with low-grade foods or cars.

Young people do want transport alternatives.

All over London?

Trend in inner London. Shift away from car use.

We find there is resistance from those who are not used to cycling.

It's a challenge. In Holland, they have high-grade separate facilities, which make cycling more attractive.

Older people are more nervous. Understandably, as they are at greater risk. Many health benefits of cycling.

In Tower Hamlets where doctors encouraged cycling on safe routes, they do it.

Mental well-being also.

If you live in an urban community, you can't walk. Shops are far away from residential. An old person cannot keep a bike and carry it down stairs. With access to electric bikes, they might make use of them.

This is an opportunity to think big and be bold in what you want.

Ultra-low emission zone (ULEZ) – bigger, stronger, smarter, sooner. Tube dust – TfL keeps ducking this subject. Taxis and private hire vehicles (PHVs) – rights and responsibilities for each. Black cabs provide accessibility so avoid congestion charge; PHVs should lose those rights. Need to be clear what is meant by zero carbon. We need to articulate this. Need to get rid of fossil fuels, so liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) not the answer. Crossrails 3 and 4 are needed.

Health benefits.

Move around with zero carbon.

Assuming rail is zero carbon.

Everything will be by 2050. Delivery consolidation – also freight and construction. Emissions-based road charging. River emissions. Driverless cars. Minicabs using areas to wait for calls. Charging infrastructure. Residential parking. Look at exemptions for parking and congestion.

There will be no exemptions.

Yes.

Protective cycle lanes. Waltham Forest reported significant reduction in car use, so mini Hollands do work. Safer lorries. Bunch of standards for freight operators to use. London cycle design standards should be used in every traffic system. Road pricing – emissions based or just in principle.

Looking at travel demand forecast pie charts.

Plan is for 2041. Hope that it would be different. Think big. If we are going to hit target to keep Londoners healthy, we are going to have to make walking and cycling attractive. What are the big bold things that need to be done?

No cars. No van deliveries.

Every street is a reservoir of parked cars. Need to do other things with our kerbside space. Have to look at parking.

Potential in relation to this forecast. Active travel. 5% cycling is very unambitious. Freight – think ambitiously. Healthy freight. Changes have taken place; need more incentives. Robots that do deliveries – lots of ideas out there.

Freight and delivery – difference for me is freight is going to shops and deliveries to homes.

Also, servicing.

John Lewis banned people having deliveries to the office. Someone jokingly remarked we could have something like a post office, where parcels can be collected! Councils can't bid for street collection of rubbish. Many different operatives.

What do the boroughs think is important for residents' health?

Safety issues for cyclists are important. Encourage people to use cycle for work and leisure.

Many injuries to cyclists, minor ones that are not part of statistics, and these are increasing.

Route-based planning. Don't think strategically enough. Outer London with ebikes could increase use to 30%.

Mini Holland scheme. Investment, but starting from low base. Support ULEZ covering whole borough. Clash of policies – for example free travel for school children on buses encourages them not to be active.

When I went to school you only had a bus pass if you were a certain distance from the school.

Children and buses. There has been some research into why they choose to take the bus for such short distances. There is a social element.

Support free bus travel. The social element for children could be replicated by cycling in a group, but this is too dangerous.

It can happen.

Noise again, from emergency vehicles. We have emergency vehicles using their sirens all the time, but they don't need to. Use should be risk based and not a matter of course. Big quality of life thing.

Noise pollution has a huge impact on health.

Prioritising time – what is the one thing that is most important to each of you?

Cycle parking is in London plan but boroughs have not necessarily adopted it. All work being done in Enfield providing tracks and at stations.

Have to think about quality as well as quantity.

Car parking also needs consideration.

Standards are quite loose.

Which policies do you think are most important?

Road pricing.

Ban fossil fuels.

Mini Hollands for all boroughs.

Improve air quality.

Mini Hollands for all boroughs.

Set an ambitious target.

Transformation of cycling. Potential is massive.

Road pricing to change service delivery. Step change on walking and cycling experience, mass transit.

More capacity in public transport. Needed where it is. Many tube lines overloaded.

Lots of pavements need to be improved and cycle lanes provided.

Emission rate charging. Charge the polluters and pay people to walk and cycle. Quite exciting.

These changes will need bold leadership. What are the challenges?

Climate, population growth.

Funding for boroughs. Road pricing would help.

Lack of political courage in councils.

Okay, thanks everyone.

Strategic Priorities

Transport & Health

Table 7 Session 1

Facilitator comments in bold
Respondents in regular text

These notes are a summary of the conversation

Session 1, Table 7

Facilitator, Katie Hunter, GLA

Joe Baker,
Jennifer Sibley
Simon Monk
Simon Lusby
Adam Mills
Tom Platt
Sam Monck
Alison Cowie

Let's start off with what you think transport can do to improve health in London?

Lucy Saunders said car ownership in a household is a central determinant of outcomes, car dominance is the huge issue in terms of health, it's the single biggest transport issue.

I agree. Transport impacts everyone's health in London whatever mode they use for a journey. The biggest impact is enabling physical activity, and improving people's health: getting more people using modes that increase physical activity, reducing car journeys.

A subliminal nudge is a key factor. If there are bus stops every 300 metres you'll get the bus, but if it's 500 metres away you might walk further. That nudge concept is key. London is flooded with bus stops, and that's a good thing, but compared to Bristol where they're further apart, physical activity there is higher.

But does it cross the threshold of forcing people to drive because they're too far apart? People realise that petrol's cheaper, and they drive as often as they can.

Take away parking is the ultimate solution.

What is the quickest most convenient way to central London, and what is the quickest, most convenient way from where you are? People make decisions very quickly, they'll just get in their cars. The broad stroke is how do we get people to move around in a way that's not using their car.

I agree.

What kind of policies do you think we need to enable car not default option?

There are two sides: increase sustainable modes, and nudge things that way to reduce vehicle dominance. Reducing the amount of freight coming into city centres when there are lots of people. There are good proven measures around walking and public transport: reallocating places to walking and cycling, improving routes to school, reducing vehicle dominance and speed.

I agree. There's lots of good practice but it takes a brave authority to implement it. There's a big local backlash against some of it, the fear of giving up the vehicle that people have become accustomed to.

I live in Walthamstow, heavily involved in the Mini-Holland scheme. Every borough has a choice right now and is making that choice constantly. We've got to start having conversations about parking, congestion, if we manage somehow to miraculously move half the cars off the road, all that will do is put another half of the cars on the road. You have to do both: enable people to walk and cycle, take public transport, but at the same time, not prioritise the vehicle.

I'm not sure the general population is there.

What should do to make our streets better for Londoners, and how do we sell that to the general public? Walthamstow was sold as a cycling street, but it's great for walking. If it had been sold as a healthy street scheme, great for kids walking to school, older people to get to their GP. We can't start with, 'We won't get buy in so we can't do it.'

There are two things, data released in the Standard about Mini-Holland has reduced cars by 50%, with no rise of traffic on other streets. The evidence base begins to grow. The other thing that came out in the Standard was the consultation responses for Tavistock place. Camden are being brave, taking a lot of heat, and campaigning organisations like yourselves can step in and help those decisions. We have a hugely sceptical population, and as more evidence is available, it must be publicised collectively as authorities.

One conversation is about what we need to do, and it seems there's quite a lot of consensus? How do we do it? Political bravery is the biggest thing. Waltham Forest took eight years to build that bravery with a lot of dialogue. Without that Mini-Holland would have been dead ten times over. Enfield have had to build that, they didn't have it before the scheme landed. There are some real issues about political bravery, leadership and how we get councils to -, I've had meetings where you don't get a sense that is on the agenda, there's no desire to push the population.

If you take care of public perception it takes care of politics, politicians react to what the community is feeling: safety issues for cyclists, making public transport seem desirable.

There are different sells for different groups. Better Bankside has done lots of great public realm stuff and businesses want to attract more people there. Residential areas too, although priorities are different. Air quality is really high up the agenda, along with obesity and other issues. If we want to deal with them, for example, 'How are we going to deal with London's huge population and congestion,' if you're a business in London, the only options are changing the way people travel. We can't build our way out in the timeframes.

People are scared of the change, politically. There needs to be more of a drip feed around some of the air quality issues, for example. Cycling has seen change because, unfortunately, there

have been so many deaths. We need to have the negative and positive issues force fed to people.

You need to give carrots to people who are also being beaten with sticks!

Walking has a huge role to play in terms of better public realm. You improve public realm, retailers benefit. It's a missed opportunity thus far in London, which has fallen behind some of the other world cities it compares itself to in terms of public realm and reallocating space, and in saying, 'What kind of cities do you want?' Oxford Street is one street, but it's symbolic.

We can't afford to wait for businesses in Enfield and Palmers Green to wake up, that'll take another 50 years. We have to develop a suite of tools about how we engage better, and how we soften the blow. There is a simple answer, a whole bunch of politicians are going to have to stand up and start the conversation. Oxford Street's a great scheme, and it's emblematic. But businesses in Palmers Green will look at it and say, 'That won't work here'.

They say no because their business comes from people parking in front of the shop. So how do you move them on from that? We need to keep having lots of messages, positive ones about successful schemes like Mini-Holland.

Each street is different, there's never one way of designing. How in principle you say, 'These are the solutions to deliver healthy streets,' completely vary.

Would you like to see for an MTS a London wide document, rather than specificity, bring some general principles in?

It has to have the strategic stuff around ambitious mode shift programme and reducing car dominance. It needs to have things underneath that like ultra-low emission zones, those are the big things, but it also needs to have smaller things, like how do we use the LIPs.

The key is how individual boroughs relate to TfL. Oxford Street is a classic example. Businesses are saying we want this, but councillors have been going into meetings saying businesses don't like it, so they're wrong-footed. They've lost the excuse they had, but they're still trying to campaign against it. You've got the council there fighting TfL.

Wood Green high street has eighteen bus routes. There needs to be a strategic decision, the buses, transport, taxis. If TfL said we could get rid of the eighteen buses down Oxford Street the city council would say yes.

Those that campaign say don't just stick them on side roads. We need to have a look comprehensively at how bus routes are planned. Once there's a desire to make streets healthy and reduce vehicles, solutions can be found. Oxford Street had three or four proposals, then you have to figure out how you do it. You can't just tackle that street you have to look bigger picture.

It comes back to the relationship between TfL and the boroughs. Oxford Street is going to totally change the way that relationship functions. Boroughs around that area like Kensington and Chelsea will really start to focus on how does that relationship work. At the moment it seems problematic. Re-tooling that relationship will unlock a greater ability to do a lot of this stuff.

We recognise it's easier get mode shift in central London because of the high density. Do you disagree?

I totally disagree.

A big challenge is reducing car usage in outer boroughs, and needs a different approach? What are your thoughts on that?

You need different approaches in different areas. Spatial planning and density is important. Focusing on town centres, is a really sensible approach, it's all very good for walking and cycling. Most of walking growth in last few years has been through increase in public transport.

The link between car ownership and health is important: once people give up cars they start walking and using public transport.

The Dutch model works. Look at Amsterdam suburbs. They just know that if a journey is two kilometres you walk, if it's six kilometres you cycle. 95-96% of Dutch people live within six kilometres of a train station. That's why they have over 50% of Dutch people cycling and walking. For mode shift in central London-, Westminster already has 75% of people walking. Central London dominated by vans, taxis. We're not going to see dramatic mode shift in central London. In Enfield we could see a dramatic shift if we enable that two kilometres/six kilometres thing. If we could do that, it would really work well.

The Dutch model has a lot of enabling infrastructure. My neighbour drives to the station, which is less than two kilometres away. She's worried about antisocial behaviour en route to the station, and says there's nowhere to park a bike. There's not enough integration.

That's a rare person. I'd query the reality of her situation. The number one barrier people worry about isn't bike parking, it's being hit by a car on the road. If you fix that, and you see this in Walthamstow, when you fix it, bike use explodes.

Do you think your neighbour appreciates the health benefits of not driving to the station?

She pays to go to the gym! She thinks that's a better use of money.

Do people understand the link between health and transport? Is there a way this could be improved?

I'm sure there's some awareness. But so much more is about making the easiest and obvious choice. If they don't feel safe and it's not convenient-,

It's perception too. People don't trust experts at the moment. If I don't feel safe, and I read in the local rag that someone was mugged on the river loop walking to the station, I'm not going to use it, regardless of the fact that I'm miles from where the story was reported.

The cost of parking at the station must be huge?

No she's inside the zone in Enfield where she's already paid for the parking.

Is there a link between parking and health?

Parking should definitely be a part of this.

Before you get to talk about cycling schemes or walking schemes, twenty mph speed limits and starting to tackle the parking in London and restricting it would drive a huge amount of people out of cars.

How can we make that more palatable?

A ward is won on 200 votes. If you have a single issue that mobilises 200 votes you can lose the ward or even the council. It's interesting that Enfield got both political parties to sign up to the scheme before it landed. But now they're going back on it.

You need to be careful about saying we're going to get rid of parking. So often once things are in and people see the positive benefits-, there's no single answer, we can't just tell them it's healthy, we need political strength and help understand this benefits everyone.

Walthamstow is a good example. They had a terrible start and it affected them badly. But there's been very little fight back against the Lea Bridge Road. They surveyed businesses, hundreds of them, and said, 'What are your parking needs?' They also stopped people outside shops and got parking surveys. They compared what businesses said they needed and what customers said they needed. They were very different. It turned out businesses were using the parking spaces in front of their shops, not customers. They went into the businesses and said, 'Did you know 90% of your customers are arriving by bus?' When the scheme went through, none of the noise you see about other schemes came out.

It says that the foundation and development of the scheme is just as important as the cost of implementation. In terms of revenue funding to get the project right in the first place, that's just as important.

Politically you can do public realm projects in a relatively short time and get political payback. There are political benefits to that. If you convince councillors that improving this high street will benefit you politically...

We need to choose priorities to feed back. Reducing car dominance is the biggest issue and has biggest impact on health and physical activity. You've been saying you need enabling factors for walking and cycling, and factors that reduce the need to use the car.

It's about offering alternatives, better choices.

You're saying that framing things (language) is important. You mentioned mini Holland, re-phrasing as good for everybody improves public support, so it's not just about making things better for cyclists.

If you speak to anyone at TfL, they still think only cycling. Walking is overlooked, but it's a huge win for the population.

We need to disseminate from Lea Bridge Road scheme where businesses realise customers are arriving on foot. Engagement is key.

Integration is really important. I was shocked arguing with TfL officer on a scheme about cycling, and he said, 'This is a rail scheme'. There needs to be some cross-referencing.

That is part of the intention of the healthy streets agenda.

One decent budget stream would help so you don't have just lots of little bits of money for different things.

I'd challenge that: there's no money! It's about getting the most out of your money.

The other way is that you need senior TfL leadership to say this is a priority through all of TfL's work, so it doesn't carry a budget of its own.

So it feeds through every aspect of its work. Otherwise some boroughs just do a bit of it and ignore everything else. Cycling, walking, public transport, public realm: I want them to be considering all of that.

It's a shared responsibility. For example, the bus budget is ring fenced but they're the biggest polluter in my area.

So how does TfL make sure healthy streets agenda runs throughout the organisation?

Indicate it in every arm of TfL so everything's focused towards it.

If it does harm, that causes change. Why do we agree bus budgets when they're the biggest polluters?

My experience is there are always trade-offs, but if you set up the objectives at the start, although there is some compromise, the objectives at the beginning set the whole direction.