

# A CITY FOR ALL LONDONERS

Transport Workshop  
9th November 2016, 9.30 – 13.00

## Strategic Priorities Transport & Place Table 9 Session 1

These notes are a summary of the conversation

---

*Session 1, Table 9*

### **Facilitator, Jeanette Barman**

Louise McBride, London Borough of Camden

Iain Simmons, City of London Corporation

Jeremy Leach, 20's Plenty for Us

Emily Candler, Exhibition Road Cultural Group

Benjamin Vickers, London Borough of Camden

Peter Eversden, London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies

Chris Barker, London Campaign for Better Transport

Ben Richards, TfL

George Weeks, TfL

---

We are looking at strategic priorities for the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the London Plan, although it'll be largely focused on the Mayor's strategy, which is emerging. Here we can bring concerns together, but also look at opportunities. Spencer highlighted that money is an issue going forward. Although we would like to do everything possible, we need to make choices. What we need to come away with are themes, which are important, the sense of the role that transport needs to play, and the main challenges and opportunities that you would like the Mayor to consider in his work. Let's spend a little bit of time looking at what people understand when they hear 'place' and 'positive transport'. Does that play a role in the context of the direction of travel that the Mayor has set out?

'Place' is a concept that people are confused about, so what do you understand by it? We can spend a little time and see if we are talking about the same thing.

My feeling about place is the use of space in the streets. We think that TfL and the Mayor should be looking again at some use of space. The cycle superhighways have taken out bus lanes. The buses are now stuck in the traffic, and bus usage is falling dramatically because people aren't prepared to have delayed journeys. Is this wise? If you look at the north-south one, there is pavement space for twice the number of people on the pavement, and there isn't

enough space for the vehicles. That might drive people off the road, but is it the right thing? It needs to be revisited. If you take the cycle superhighway on to the A40 elevated motorway and take out the lanes, then won't you end up with Marylebone Road at a standstill and the air quality going down again? We are suspicious, as though it's a drive for one mode without considering others.

That was the work of the last Mayor. Does anyone else have any thoughts?

We need to look at how that place will be used and make sure that we strike the right balance. We need to understand the issues that we're trying to address before jumping to solutions. We don't confidently know why people aren't travelling on buses. Are delays the whole reason or part of the reason, or is it because we are encouraging people to walk and cycle more? We shouldn't jump to conclusions so that we can balance the use of space in a location. We shouldn't make sweeping statements.

What do you mean by sweeping statements?

We don't know for sure that people aren't travelling on buses because of the delays.

TravelWatch are looking at it.

Can we be so passive about the fact that the working population in London will grow in the way it's forecast? Shouldn't we think more about decentralising work and places? Stratford and Old Oak Common have been mentioned. It's important, but transport to those places will have to be developed in a much greater way. There could be a light rail system from Old Oak Common. The idea is regarded as zany, but those things will be essential in encouraging people away from central London. We are told about the increase in population that will come as if it's something we can't do anything about. We can do things. The Mayor of London could make contact with the Mayors of other cities to talk about the possibility of sending work and homes to other areas of the country. We shouldn't accept the fact that London will grow in the way it's predicted, because we will then have enormous problems with road space.

The local authorities have drawn their local plan from Brexit. They don't understand the effects on their local economies, around London but not in London. Some of these must apply to London.

In terms of the question of place, what defines place? What is the difference between place and space? Space is about the human element, place is about spaces for people. Fundamentally, what does it do to create the optimum human habitat? I would argue that that should be the starting point with the urban design pattern. Are there any thoughts?

How quickly can the Mayor do things with the buses? In Putney, they had to hire air detectors to prove that the High Street was terrible. Only then did all the routes become hybrid buses. Can TfL afford to do it as quickly as others, if others think that?

My organisation is restructuring. Some of the chief officers have been given briefs, and all the large organisations work together like TfL do. However, there are things that get in the way. We have identified three key themes. One is place, the other people, and the other prosperity, so the same things as today. The last six months we have been thinking, talking and examining as an organisation. We have defined 'place' as connectivity, character and capacity. Those are the three key things.

We are looking at everything we try to do, and we will be working corporately. Everything that anybody does has to link back. There is a lot more to do, but there is significant reorganisation. We have a way of trying to understand it and make the right decisions. Things like Crossrail take 20 years, and it takes ten years to do a challenging scheme, therefore a long-term plan as to where to go in the direction of travel is needed. If people work at something for a few years there might be a different shift, like there was with the last Mayor.

You then have a regeneration project, and all the decision making in TfL is about cycling. The key bit for me is that politicians want quick wins and make decisions that look good politically. That often takes time and effort away from doing things that really need doing. The short-term things do really get in the way. That is the biggest challenge for any Mayor, not just this Mayor.

You suggested that we decant everyone back to Manchester. Really? How many generations would that take? If that is on the agenda, what are we planning for – more or fewer people? London will go into chaos, so there has to be a game plan, and when that is there, everyone has to play their role in making things happen.

That leads to another challenge. The challenge is not for the major projects, because it shouldn't take ten years to get them on the ground. How can we speed that up and deliver them quicker, so we can deliver the benefits? You end up going round in circles, because certain things change, but that shouldn't be the case. We need to get a scheme from conception to delivery.

Yes, respond to issues whilst they are still issues.

Yes, but then you get how TfL do it. They don't talk to anyone and only communicate with themselves, and then they take it to authorities. They don't talk about local issues, but the local issues then get in their way. Cycle superhighways are the best thing to happen to London in the last 50 years politically, but it was done quickly by not talking to people. If you don't engage with the community, people won't own the problem, and then they won't own the solution either. It takes a number of years for people to own what it is and to develop it to local people's needs. You are having it as tail blocks of the '60s.

Yes, there are things we want to put forward as opportunities here. A lot of what I am hearing is the same. Emily and Jeremy, do you have any thoughts?

Place is about identity and character, too. Distinctiveness. These are places that humans identify with and want to be in. South Kensington has 20 million visitors a year, which is great, but it's also about being places where people want to live and study. Each place has its own story, and transport is key to celebrating that sense of place and making it desirable. Look at how working patterns may shift and change. Do people want to commute into work? If not, where are they working? We value congregation in South Kensington, and that is why the world's leading institutions are there. Why is that?

You can go up and down it without being run over, which is inspirational for Oxford Street. Places function without tons of traffic. Have TfL worked out what the low emission zones are doing, and are we going to tax cars off the road? Are we going to do what Boris Johnson refused to do and tax private parking in old office blocks, where the company car was left at home for the wife to use? I don't think things like that are fully evaluated. The schemes to reduce air pollution are fine, but what implications do we need to reduce traffic? Can you pedestrianise more of the roads, because you can then shift vehicles left into other routes, like other European cities do? Don't just reduce the traffic, direct it.

For me, this goes back to the work of the Roads Task Force. They had this idea of a role around place and movement. I do think the journey that London is going on is picked up in this strategy. It is increasing the role of place and not prioritising the issue of movement. I do think there are opportunities to make movement, and to make the use of our streets more efficient. At a surface level, if we can move more people by cycle and public transport, then you can move by private motorised means too. That move is a good potential theme around place, but place needs to take more of a priority as against movement. Let's take the example of the Camberwell scheme, which was on the cards for ages. It fell down as a place-based scheme because the movement function had to carry on. When you talk about place you will have to make difficult decisions. If London is becoming a city for people, we have to prioritise the issue of place.

Interchanges are important when it comes to place. Putting bus stops a long way from junctions to help traffic isn't a good way of encouraging people to switch.

We are getting some good insights into what place means. It has to be for people and have character. That is place at a local level, but we have also talked about how you have to get to that place. If it's good, then you don't want tons of traffic. How can we make it more sustainable and more place efficient? We will look at things such as mode shifts, and then come back to Iain's point about real commitment and long-term plans. You can't just tinker around the issues by changing junctions. Are those themes capturing what we talked about?

I think so. I had to do a presentation to politicians yesterday about congestion. Some politicians were saying that it's different now and they want to go back to how it was two years ago. Others were saying that we are on a journey and they want to keep moving on. Supply and management can be done quickly, and that is what it comes down to. Some places change kerb lines and bring in traffic wardens, but in the big picture that makes 0.1% difference. Map work is the big thing, as is supply and demand. There is no appetite to bring in supply. The previous Mayor said that he would bring in tunnels and maintain capacity to stick it somewhere else. That wouldn't be acceptable. We are in a world where there is no capacity increase, and we aren't creating space. All we can do is deal with the demand side of things. It is purely the appetite for the community to accept change.

Part of that is that a huge amount of servicing goes on at night in the city, and there will be more, because these buildings can't sustain themselves otherwise. Some people will have a vehicle near them, and the challenge is about how to keep it quiet. It might be mitigation, and bringing in double glazing where there isn't any now. Use rubber wheels, not metal ones. They are minor things, but there are compromises. If anything is there as an absolute then it falls off. The presentation I had to give was about how it changes, and it takes forever to drive a scheme through. Congestion is an issue, but there isn't much in London. All the data from TfL shows that in the last year, delays throughout London increased by 30%. However, capacity reduced by 25% in my area. That happened overnight. The only way to get it back to 2014 is to reduce demand by 30%. Get 30% of the vehicles off the streets. What brings about those changes? Everything else is so small, so the growth of London gobbles up those tiny things people are doing.

That's an interesting point.

For London there might be two massive things. Focus on those and deliver them. Don't keep spending huge amounts of money on fiddly management things that don't bring about change.

We haven't mentioned road charging to extend the congestion zone to the rest of London. Make it easier and more technological. That should be done. Another problem related to the growing congestion is the use of private hire vehicles like Uber. Having control over that is important. Include them in congestion charging or road charging, and make sure that the road charging is to do with congestion and not some other issue. If you exclude low emission vehicles, the growth of low emission vehicles will defeat the object of bringing in a congestion charge.

I hired a car in Melbourne, and you only hear the click under the dashboard on certain roads. You are only charged on certain roads, but they haven't examined that idea here.

Two things exploding are personalised travel, like Uber, and personalised shopping. Whatever else is happening, that has grown. Whatever else is done, that will consume as much capacity for movement. It's all to do with private people and private goods. I am not a socialist, but this comes down to restriction on the liberty of the individual on the collected goods.

Uber is a problem for congestion, but there is also the issue of drivers waiting. They wait with the engine running to keep themselves warm, but this is polluting the atmosphere. If you look to get an Uber, 12 of them are available near you. They won't get the business, and some of them might give up. There is hell of a lot of pollution that wasn't there before.

Yes, especially in the central London context. It sounds like there isn't one solution for the whole of London, so different solutions are needed for different areas. Louise, what do you think?

We aren't building capacity, so we only have what we've got to work with. We need to think about the timing issue. The streets can't fit all people at all times. Low-emission vehicles will still create congestion and affect the quality of the place. Our West End project will have bikes on the road at certain times of day, and it will exclude taxis. However, even if you take away the taxis, you will still have congestion. Free modes of transport that we don't want to be there, so then there are only modes of transport which we want there. This could be a model for Oxford Street. You would be making a choice about where people can be, and put others in a movement corridor.

The number of vans going around delivering online shopping orders increases congestion, but a lot of that is delivering stuff to people who would otherwise use a car to go to the supermarket.

Next day delivery increases the number of vehicles.

I was thinking grocery shopping.

Companies like Amazon deliver goods in private cars the next day.

They were taking space in TfL stations. You could put your code in and pick up your things, but now they've given that up and are using vehicles instead. I don't know if there is an agreement between Amazon and TfL, but they could use that space in stations.

Where should the Mayor's Transport Strategy go? What do you suggest, and what do you think of it?

It's about balance. Previously, everyone could have everything. You need clarity around that for people like Louise. Promote schemes and bring things forward. You may work at something for

ten years, take it to an approval committee, but then get told to do something different in that decision forum. Where was the information about choices and change? Suddenly, different groups of people are telling you to do something different.

It needs to be a clear policy. It needs to be clearly transparent. Tell us what the policy is. That is a real strength in terms of defining where the schemes come from and what they can achieve. It needs to be strong, ambitious and achievable.

Changing the subject, we need to think about residential streets and their roles. I was struck this week by the release of the new national child measurement statistics. Across London, 38% of Year 6 children are obese or overweight. There are three boroughs where 43% of children are. I feel that missing from this strategy is the role of our streets – residential streets – in relation to child mobility. They need to move independently. I know we are talking about central London mainly, but there is a need for that. It's an absolute priority to think about health, child health and levels of activity. We are handing the streets over to motor vehicles. How can we liberate young people in London to be a part of the streets again?

I agree. There used to be walking buses. You could deposit your child at the end of the street and people who cared walked them in. I have seen a drop in that.

It is so much more about who owns the residential streets. At the minute, they are dumping grounds for vehicles. It needs to be more than that.

It isn't on a London level, but a borough level. It's about health and wellbeing. All you have to think about is health and wellbeing. We struggle to find a locus and a remit, and we need to work out the local authority structure and how to get in it. Influence those decisions to drive health and wellbeing outcomes.

Okay, so there is direction missing.

What is the best way of interacting between the Mayor, MTS and the boroughs? How can that be strengthened as a direction?

All GLA documents are structured documents. In strategy documents, the bit between the idea and implementing the project is missing. If you don't have that, then these stupid projects just fail. Just talk about the direction of travel, how much money it will cost, the mechanisms it will deliver, and then whether the Mayor or TfL are delivering it. It could work with local authorities or the broad third sector.

Okay, so we need a long-term MTS action plan?

Yes. A strategy should have the key things it's going to do in it, and they need to have thought about it enough to have a plan. Make sure you know how much it will cost and what outcomes you will get, whether big or small, positive or negative. If it's at that level, whether TfL or boroughs, then anyone can pick up a project and deliver it. It has to be clear, it needs to go through a formal process and it needs to be approved by a political body.

You spoke about tunnelling. I would like to reclaim some surface. I was very much in favour of Boris's approval of the Hammersmith underpass. The amount of land you would recover, and the savings TfL would make from not having to mend it every ten years, is enormous. Look at that. Talk about local streets. In my area, we haven't expanded Zipcars at all. All councillors voted that it's unfair to allocate borough surface road to profit-making companies. We started

having Zipcars, and everyone was getting out of their car into a Zipcar when they wanted. It was expanding, but then it just stopped dead.

It didn't stop expanding; they were just overambitious with their forecasts. The take home wasn't as great as planned.

There were complaints about the lack of them where I live.

We talked about what we thought the themes were. The challenges that we have been articulating include congestion, air quality and technology. Congestion requires specific commitment and it needs to move forward.

Chris and Iain talked about the need to address volume.

Yes, it addresses volume.

We need to reduce the use of cars and the need to buy cars. Club cars are important, as well as improving public transport and cycling.

The point about Amazon lockers and TfL using its property portfolio to support investment is important. It replaces the need for travelling.

Our local council is trying to do something about 15 waste companies using the one High Street. Each retailer is going through a different company.

They all need to be looked at, but we also need to work towards the bigger commitment of reducing traffic. The other key thing is about local streets not just being lovely, but we need to create a healthier and better city with an eye on young people's futures. Have I missed anything?

I agree. Health is important.

In summary session:

Peter Eversden: London is very lucky to have built a canal with no locks from central London to Park Royal. It isn't used for construction and deconstruction material, or freight. The transfer stations from land to water are being built out by the developments. Is that not something we could bear in mind and try to save?

# Strategic Priorities for a Growing City

## Transport & Place

### Table 10 Session 1

**Facilitator in bold - facilitator comments in bold**  
**Respondents in regular text**

These notes are a summary of the conversation

---

*Session 1, Table 10*

**Facilitator, Robin Buckle**

Lee Parker, Croydon Council

Nigel Hughes, Grosvenor and Victoria Business Improvement Board

Mark Jenkinson, Siemens

Peter Jones, University College London

Neil Bullen, Waltham Forest Council

Max Sugarman, Institute of Civil Engineers

Robin Brown, Hayes

Amanda Zambon, DHL

Pippa Edwards, Freight on Rail

---

The question we've been tasked with is: how does London feel as a city? How does that differ in different parts of the city? So, let's begin, how does London feel as a city?

I think, in terms of congestion, it's staggering how quickly it's getting worse. I have worked in a borough for years. Two years ago it was the other way round. Every year that passes, the perception is that things seem to be getting worse.

Public transport or roads?

Both. Tubes have reached capacity. At rush hour, that's clear.

Can I echo that? I worked in London for ten years, then worked in Abu Dhabi. Having been there, and now working in Lambeth, it's staggering to see the number of people cycling. Lots of bikes, but still, completely different from three years ago.

That London council slide. One of the big areas is that people have to rely on cars because they can't rely on public transport.

Given the time it takes for public transport improvements to be made.

Trying to alleviate the problem is what we're basing strategies around – how London feels about this. Does anyone have any thoughts on place rather than just transport? What about the environment around stations and roads in outer London?

King's Cross is an example of good place making as a large transport interchange. We should be replicating lessons learned. King's Cross is a model. There are lessons there in place making.

I appreciate London for its variety of places, but there is a problem at interchanges.

That's a good point. They're going to have to look at changes, particularly with Crossrail and HS2.

In the outer suburbs, that's about education. The perception is, not liking public transport, expensive parking. In Richmond they are encouraging parking, I think. But you have to make public transport good and affordable. The perfect option until recently has been that public transport is good. In the outer boroughs there is education to be done.

I live in Elton, but I used to be in Greenwich. To get into town it's an extra 20-30 minutes by the 132 bus. Come out of Greenwich tube and there's a melee for the bus stop. People in Croydon say, "To get to Brixton I've got to come out to come back in again." Great bus network in inner London, but not in rush hour.

From a freight perspective, congestion has an impact. On top of that, reducing kerb space. We saw a big change to the roads: loading bays were removed; changing street furniture; taxi bays; bike stands. I think it's conscious that the city needs to work for all sectors, but it's becoming difficult to service shops and pubs.

Has anyone talked about a solution?

Night-time deliveries are a really good idea, for some deliveries. It can be difficult to arrange – protecting residents from noise. For some retail you can't do that. On the regulatory side, we're being held back. TfL is working, but not there.

Do boroughs make it harder?

London is a very hard city to navigate, so it's a lot more complicated between boroughs.

From a West End perspective, the last years, with increase of public rail with private sector working in it, is a key example of what can be done. Crossrail coming in, Victoria Station working hard. But there's restrictions from boroughs. Westminster is so protective. Oxford Street's got about 200 kerb parking spaces. It's a fight for them.

Lots of new homes. How are we going to incorporate deliveries?

Building homes, we should be bringing in construction material. Taking it in, taking spoil out, you don't need a posh terminal. 30% of London aggregates come in by rail. The big HGV isn't the right way for multiple deliveries for society. Freight might be. A lot of cities are using low emission vehicles. Transporting environmentally, as in Brussels. Electric bikes for cargo. If you can consolidate from the hub, in London, you can use rail for long distance. Try and ship in low emission vehicles. Nitrous oxide emissions are very high. Look at things in a more holistic way. HGVs are the right vehicles for supermarkets.

Consolidation isn't mentioned as much as it could be. That's a huge part of reducing HGVs. At Heathrow, they have the tech to record where vehicles are coming from. We should be consolidating further up the country.

29% of HGVs travel completely empty. That could be reduced by 10%, as in Germany, with distance-based lorry charging.

I agree we need a mixed solution. The truth is, servicing is complex. An HGV is more environmentally friendly than a van. This perspective that we're running empty HGVs all around London is a myth. Costs of HGVs are huge, so we don't want them empty. Cross-docking facilities are something to be talked about, with affordability. Limiting HGVs on the road – they carry more freight. With Euro standards, they are a solution in some circumstances. We run one in Camden and at Gatwick. Lots of deliveries into small spaces: they work. If you add in extra movements, changing freights, it adds to the costs and doesn't help the environment.

Let's get off HGVs and back on topic.

Broadly, the quality of environment has got better in my life. It's a city that's getting better and nicer to live in. You can sleep well. 40 years ago, things were more focused on parking, but things have changed for the better. The realisation of the value of spaces – commercially and environmentally – has got a lot better.

Do we feel the public realm is a nicer place to be? Robin, you talked about variety, but opportunities were eroding.

There was a TfL design exhibition on Regent Street. One of their marquees had the products of the Road Task Force on display, informing about futures of streets in London, but it didn't show anything from the Healthy Streets publication. That was before May. I was disappointed. But this is a good way to approach streetscape and traffic management. I endorse the approach with regards to local areas and diversity of approach instead of a mega-design.

People feel a pillar is getting walkers and cyclists. Do people feel that's happening more?

In Croydon, the council is very clear about contributing towards public land, but actually looking long term, factoring in health, not the five millions but the 50 million plus.

What's going to make the difference?

Volume. Speed of change. Rather than stretching it over 20 years, more like four. But doing utility co-ordination while we're doing that. Putting in fibre optic broadband etc.

The money makes a difference. Nearly £30 million has been spent in the last 30 years. Since 2011, we've actually more than doubled our target of cyclists, because this lovely infrastructure's gone in.

Members have a reason to stick to their guns now.

It's slowed down.

About half the schemes are in, so it's slowed a bit.

Often I'm not quite sure about the best way to go. Citymapper has improved things: we have more info. "How do I get to a place? Oh, walking's quicker!" when I would have tubed it. More information is good.

Not having to take routes that are ugly or busy, like Victoria or Oxford Street, is something that's been made quickly achievable.

Cycling is the same, being able to navigate busy streets.

I go one street back from Oxford Street to avoid traffic. Local knowledge for tourists is key. I go to the City and get lost. People have their totems, but they're great to know.

So more scope for tech.

Yes, definitely.

Air quality: there will be more information, now people are more aware. We need to show the routes at risk. Show the back routes, where you're not walking in traffic fumes.

South Korean cities are cluttered with street furniture.

A Mayor of Seoul had a whole scheme to remove street clutter.

How many people cycle?

Occasionally.

But lots walk. If you could, what would make London better for walking?

It's about making the route nice. No one wants to walk next to a dual carriageway. If TfL can help increase information, like Citymapper, that will really help. If you don't have the knowledge of where a good route is, it's hard.

Red signals, where you can cross diagonally.

There are a few, but they're not obvious enough.

The crossing countdown is good. I love walking around Canary Wharf. The air's better, it's one of the top places for air quality and walkability. Canary Wharf is top.

Footways maintenance is key. Potholes and trip hazards put people off.

Are wider footpaths a solution?

But then you're competing. Making certified cycle sections causes hostility towards that. Pedestrianisation of Oxford Street has really helped.

Does it cause problems, though?

As long as it's a bottom-up approach, it considers all road users. Infrastructure benefits things, such as stopping water run-off. That comes from increased greenery.

One mode that is affected: coaches. Damage done around Vicky coach station by them is massive.

Keeping local identity and diversity is key.

King's Cross is a great place to go out now. Ten years ago I wouldn't have gone anywhere near it.

Is that helped by the canal?

Yes, and restaurants. It's quirky and nice around there.

Richmond Station used to have taxis alongside the station, but it's a nicer environment now with the changes.

More e-trucks?

Taxis must be primed for being electric.

It's only recently that's come in, though.

TfL has a map of minutes to walk to each station, which is great, but that should be in every station.

That's why Citymapper works.

That's great. Thank you very much.

Internet on the underground might help, knowing which exit to take.

I think it's important bus lanes are kept for buses. London has motorcycles and cycles. The freighting industry is pushing for HGVs to be able to use them, but that will reduce bus reliability and safety for cyclists. I feel very strongly about that.

People are being much more innovative today about designing buildings.

So what are the priorities? The tech side seems to be primary. WiFi.

Considering all street users' needs. A debate needs to be had.