

A CITY FOR ALL LONDONERS

Transport Workshop
9th November 2016, 9.30 – 13.00

Central 1

Violet Table Session 2

Facilitator comments in bold

Respondents in regular text

These notes are a summary of the conversation

Session 2, Violet Table

Facilitator, Sam Monck

Ian Simmons, TfL

Sana Nabi, CBI

Sam Knight, Better Bankside

David Leam, London First

Louise McBride, LB of Camden

Nigel Hughes, Better Bankside

Amanda Zambon, DHL,

Tom Buttrick, LB Soutwark

Nick Flynn, TfL

Ben Vickers, LB Camden

So I think we've had a quite setup and look on the strategy of Central, Inner and Outer London. Now it's really toward all of you to look at challenges that we might need to meet if they weren't brought up already. Or what you think the solutions might be, crucially?

About Central London, there's still antiquated language about getting rid of the car. Why is this? Certainly within the city I've been asked to focus on work streams regarding vehicles like buses, taxis, freight, etc. It isn't just about the car for private use.

Is it always necessarily about reducing movements for some types of vehicles?

The key thing is for us what is what to prioritise. Other than the pricing mechanism, such as the congestion charge, anybody can still have a dash and use that capacity. The thing that uses most capacity is the private use of vehicles and private movements of goods by amazon, etc. Those things are placing a lot of demand in Central London and need to be tackled.

Echoing that- when I'm walking across London, I'm conflicted by companies serving each other in Central London and corporations running transatlantic vehicles. Every company should provide their own solution to this but that runs counter-productive to the grand ambition of economic efficiency.

You might get economic efficiency but that spews out in pollution and congestion.

Can I just make a point about freight movements? We need to understand the misconception about how some vehicles are being used and some of them are running around empty, and we have to consolidate that information. Some deliveries are time definite and are b2b supporting London's businesses. London is becoming a complicated city to service because there is a changing nature of spaces. How do we tackle that challenge?

People can plan manage for change. At the moment, things happen by accident. The cycle superhighways was too politically damaging for TfL to tell the public that it would cause inefficiency. There is now an additional 30% in central delay. We couldn't plan for this reaction. We are going to have to manage demand because we can't manage supply when we are building capacity.

I think there's a case for better coordination between TfL and the boroughs.

We have to understand the communicative impact between entities.

On a related point, getting the acceptance outside the central zone is not a straightforward thing. We are not a political company and working cross barriers is not an easy task.

Not all deliveries can be re-timed.

I'd like to make a point on land-use perspective. I think it's important to keep the industrial lands in Central London protected for distribution than try to make them more profitable. Regarding a warehouse on an area of land, it's easy to say it's an inefficient use of land policy-wise, and try to turn it into flats. But we need the warehouse to manage distribution and the transport network; I don't think that argument is presented very well by the Mayor.

Yes we need that for consolidation. Because the distribution areas cannot move further out in London.

There's a case then for more innovation for these kinds of requirements.

It's about keeping functionality and not losing that to other land uses.

The Bond Street example of waste consolidation is quite straightforward of 57 suppliers down to five suppliers. The freight consolidation is much more difficult and adds costs to businesses rather than save costs. The bigger retailers have their own logistics departments to run their own services rather than use a consolidation service in Central London.

It's a gap in the market for the local authorities, supported by TfL to manage the freight, like social housing. It's the SMEs who lack support. It's uneconomical for their deliveries have to be placed somewhere and distributed later in the day. They need subsidies, unlike the big companies.

The virtual freight consolidation model uses just TNT and DHL as opposed to using a dozen different suppliers. In Victoria, John Lewis does not allow private deliveries.

I guess it's the pressure is that these goods vehicles are not allowed anywhere near the building in the morning, lunchtime and evening. But there are mini depots where these goods can be delivered.

Pedestrians are dominating the streets during those times of the day. Street space needs to be regulated for loading and unloading.

I suspect that London would operate well in binary. Closing some roads and opening others, but I personally haven't seen this. We can change the street's purpose three-four times a day.

Is there a difference between the operational use of the street and structure provisions such as emergency works that need to take place? It would be challenging for a developer to get in or out within time limits.

Lots of local authority's decision making leads to legislation or where TfL says no. London is a consequence of what is not allowed to happen. There isn't a corollary where there is an encouragement to do something differently.

I think that is why you need TfL because you need public sector leadership. Some of these regulatory constraints need hard work to overcome.

Looking at the handout document, do we need to have these figures broken down such as trip based mode share and reasons for travel? These can be broken down to different times of the day such as peak and off-peak hours. These numbers don't describe what those streets feel like.

Trials are important. Probationary period of six months is enough to see if it will work.

Sometimes TfL partly funds the private sector. These things are hidden from view but we are partly funding a freight organisation from Camden and another in Tottenham Court Road. Is there a quid pro quo for freight on the kerbside? Whether there's a deal to be done instead of looking at it as parking.

We have a very complex solution at present. We've proven that re-timing has savings. It depends of the business needs of our clients and the regulatory conditions. The thing about the trials is that they are beneficial. What we need is a buy-in from the boroughs or for the businesses to stay open so that we can operate.

Do you build that into your business model? If you know you have congestion charges, is there a premium price outside of congestion hours? If you use additional cost as a deterrent it's hard to change attitudes as to when you have a discount on a product.

For DHL, logistics is a very small percentage of overall cost. There are also all those barriers and it takes a long time to organise one trial.

There's an emerging topic around timing, specifically earlier morning and in the evening. There might well be a standard to make it easier for boroughs.

Retro-fitting existing neighbourhoods to embed that facility at an earlier stage.

This could also be the impetus; we could change it and see who complains.

There is a misconception in planning conditions. The borough can start recording and identifying the problems but it's not the responsibility of the boroughs to change. It is rather the freeholder's effort. A local authority cannot change the planning conditions. That can only be changed by the land holder.

We covered this quite well and I'm going to move on. One of things I want to discuss is kerbside parking or permit parking, taking up a lot of space. These may be residential or business cars. Can we reduce the amount of public space taken up by them?

One simple approach is given more obligated space to car clubs so they are moved very quickly.

There is a desire to maintain a variety of parking space for groups of people who really need work.

This could be quite discriminatory.

The schemes are founded on technical competence. What's the reaction of individuals of people if things are taken away from them? It's not going to be pleasant. So each time decisions are being made locally there must be an exchange that entices people. If their cars are taken away, they could be given two year free travel cards for example.

Think about Central London in 2030 or 2040, we all want better quality spaces and less traffic.

Shouldn't it be less congestion and not less vehicles?

The number of vehicles on the road works in 2012 was static but it's now roadworks has grown 300%. It's not about always pure numbers on the range. It's thinking about how these pieces are linked. There's definitely a piece about coordination roadworks.

I have to agree. It's about the pace of roadworks and the utility underneath.

If the Central line goes down, then whole network goes down. We need to keep building alternatives when one route closes down.

We haven't been able to lose a single residential parking space in Mayfair. At the same time our carparks are 60% vacant. We have off street carpark but they are not used.

Maybe discounts on public transport would be the incentive.

Or access to car clubs.

One concern I have is value of public realm and the healthy street approach. Kerbside capacity can benefit the public realm. Things like street furniture, benches and trees are gone and residents are feeling deep sense of loss. These are felt especially in poor communities. How do you take intangible elements into account at a political decision level? It's easy for us to make that argument on technical capacity.

Our last subject is about taxis.

There are big spikes in London at 2am for taxis. If there are massive queues for taxis at 8am it's a big problem.

Part of the problem is that the industry is conglomerated and which we can't control.

The data we get from the City of London through the day is that 50% of the vehicles that go through Bank junction are 25% taxis and 25% cars. The cars could be private hire vehicles. They are all personalised travel for hire. For the taxis, only one in 10 have passengers in them, and they could be functioning like private hire vehicles with their lights off.

Is there a good understanding of the different uses of private hire vehicles? Are they people who might need the money?

Taxi drivers see themselves as part of public transport. Is TfL using all of its measures in terms of licensing to control that? Are they going to come out favourably from this strategy? Strategy needs to be very clear in terms of its position.

Central 2

Green Table, Session 2

Facilitator comments in bold
Respondents in regular text

These notes are a summary of the conversation

Session 2, Green Table

Jo Uzoka, Facilitator

Richard Dilks, London First

Mark Jenkinson, Siemens

Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail

Peter Everson, London Forum

Emily Candler, Exhibition Road Cultural Group

Simon Birkett, Clean Air in London

So this is the Green table, we're the Central London group. I'll pass round this paper: a few facts and figures on Central London. Our ambition of what we want to achieve in central London is this: 'A world-leading cultural and economic centre that is highly accessible by public transport and a great place to be, for both people and businesses'. These facts and figures will help put that aim in context. Even with all the tube and rail upgrades, demand is increasing, outstripping supply. If you're looking at it from the healthy streets and places agenda, the load share is going up. The NO2 concentration is continuing to exceed limits. The Mayor wants to do something about it. And then of course you've got the other bits of information around support and growth. Central London is the engine room of London, a huge concentration of jobs and growth is coming from that centre. Let's look at that ambition, and then ask what are the top policies we want to achieve, what mode shift do we want to achieve? I want to tease out of this conversation what we should be prioritising. Where we're got less space, to what extent are traffic delays acceptable? We've got a huge ambition here; we can't have everything. We want your views on what we can and can't do. What does a car reduction strategy look like? I'm going to shut up and open it up to you.

[Pointing to section on A3 Central London information sheet, entitled 'Trip-based mode share for trips within Central London'] Taxis, in these mode share figures here, where do taxis fit into that?

I think that will fall under the PT. I will check whether it falls into car or PT.

There's been an Uber explosion. They are waiting around in the streets with their engine running. 12 of them waiting for one job. It's been allowed to become out of control.

What's the evidence for that?

I'm an Uber user and when I go online to see whether I can get one, they are everywhere

They sit in Res. Parking bays, on single yellow lines, just eating their lunch, waiting around. They'll keep their engines on now it's winter to keep warm.

Aren't a lot of them hybrids?

Yes, but they don't have to be. I think it's about road space. We don't have the ability to increase road space very much; people have got to use roads more efficiently. Congestion charge was bold, revolutionary when it came in, but now we need a more sophisticated charging system. We've got a finite amount of space. Air quality issues. Freight vehicles which are often not using their capacity effectively.

TFL hasn't pursued Break Bulk, their freight strategy. When Tesco Local came to our high streets, the goods were delivered by the standard HGVs, the same ones going to much bigger supermarkets outside Central London. TFL had a policy to stop that from happening but it hasn't been implemented. The worst figure on this sheet is that 25% of AM peak movements are freight. They're there at all the times they're not supposed to be. All shops want deliveries at 7am or 8am, but they're not supposed to until 9.30am. Why are they there? They stop the flow and disrupt cyclists.

As a freight person, I agree there should be more consolidation centres. Some of them could be better connected. A third of vehicles during rush hour are freight vehicles. You need a balance; what policy helps the industry isn't benefitting UKPLC, or society, or anything. I think there's a need for a rethink.

I agree with those points but I think it's worth understanding that fixing them is not easy. It doesn't lie in TFL's or GLA's gift to fix this stuff. Not in the industry's either. There's more everyone could be doing. Freight does make up a third of the morning traffic. That can't be right, we need to change that. There's been an explosion in van traffic that far outstrips the HGV explosion. We have very little data on it; we don't know who's going where or why. NTS can't fix all this, but it needs to make some steps.

It needs to set a direction.

I think that the biggest concern I have about this morning is that it's very incremental. The changes going on around us are on a greater order of magnitude than what we're discussing. NO2 levels are three times the WHO and legal levels. All the things we've see - ULEZ a bit here and a bit there - forget about it. We need to ban diesel, not just freight consolidation. Freight, waste, delivery, construction. Something much more transformational is needed to deal with these first-order problems. A lot of this stuff in front of us on the agenda is second-order.

Whose job is it, if not TFL's?

I'm unfortunately saying we should all work together.

In my borough, we have 15 waste collections going to different places. There's no incentive to use one; the borough hasn't come to a deal to use one that's cheaper to use than the others.

Bottom-up, there have been schemes that have done this. Bond Street for example. But you can't reply on the '1000 flowers blooming' idea.

The Mayor has the biggest power to intervene, more than boroughs.

Well, to an extent.

If you extend the ULEZ zone.

But it's completely impractical; it would be impractical if it happened tomorrow.

What we did 60 years ago was ban wood burning over seven years. We could ban diesel by 2024, by the end of Sadiq's second term.

But it has to be carrots as well as sticks. Normally it's just sticks, but when you're talking about the scale of shift that we're talking about, you need some carrots too.

I very much hear the point: we need some big interventions; incrementalism isn't going to get us there. How do you do that without a big stick?

Big carrot and big stick!

Big stick comes from the Mayor and the big carrot comes from the government.

In that case forget it. It isn't coming from this government.

I think the big carrot looks something like TFL and GLA looking at what land they can give up for consolidation for freight. What funding can they put into boroughs and get them onto the same page. We also want to see bigger, more intrusive, more intelligent road pricing.

Your earlier example about deliveries to supermarkets. It's the congestion quite apart from the pollution. They're paying a very low amount of their external costs, taking into account congestion, road accidents and pollution. Road charging in London is one way to tackle this.

This Mayor has ruled it out.

Has he?

Yes.

We need emission-based road charging. You have T-Charge and ULEZ sooner, and then - guess what? - you have all those things that are planned sooner. You roll it all into one scheme by 2019.

But your charging scheme tackles emissions, not congestion.

No, it tackles both. It has four elements: it looks at whether you are in inner or outer London; whether you're travelling at peak hours or not; the quality of fuel you're using (diesel, petrol, electric, etc.); and, lastly, the quantity of fuel. Which does make it about distance and congestion; you'll pay more if you travel more miles, especially if you're travelling slowly.

Your point about finding space. I went to the assemblies investigation about the future use of TFL land. It was all about housing. But it needs to be about consolidation as well.

The political narrative and financial yield are both all about housing.

My interest is in how we get people off the road.

Okay, we've spoken about freights, about charging mechanisms. You're saying: what's the alternative. Imagine the world where we've tackled all that, but people still need to move. We're trying to keep Central London as a cultural and economic centre - keeping it highly accessible.

Based on your figures, only 3% of journeys by car in Central London, haven't you already managed that?

We need to disincentivise all local travel by car. Improving public transport to make that happen. It's beyond TFL's control. One of the problems in Kensington and Chelsea's parking scheme is that it encourages you to drive.

Where I live, in Richmond, the council encourages parking in some places. Surely the transport policy should discourage car use.

Our group is central here, but there is a parking point to be made. There's a congestion charge exemption point, too. There's also the carrots. What else can you do with maps, stuff online, signage, to boost walking and cycling?

Apps and things.

The Mayor encouraging people to change modes by the new TFL pricing is good, isn't it?

London First distinguishes between financial incentives and non-financial incentives. Access to consolidation centres is a non-financial, non-taxable incentive.

You haven't got the power to force businesses to consolidate.

You do it by road pricing. We would be mad to say that Amazon can keep doing as many deliveries as they want. What we want to do is make people use lockers at stations, where Amazon makes big deliveries to lockers, and individuals pick them up on their way to work.

We discussed that on the other table in the previous workshop. TFL made a vague offer to Argos and others that they could have lockers in stations, but it was never a focus.

Is TFL's strategy to displace road traffic as well as to provide the services we rely on?

Exactly. Our focus, and I'm summarising: we've talked about charging for more polluting vehicles, about freight consolidation, about congestion, about making better use of TFL's land, and about using stations as delivery points so as not to have freights all over the place.

And the timings of deliveries. Morning peak time is terrible.

You need to understand the client's side of things - the guy in the van, waiting in traffic and breathing in fumes, doesn't like it either. The time of day point is about a lot of things.

What's the split between freight for Amazon versus construction and other things?

I've heard 2/3 is vans, but that isn't just Amazon. You've got small businesses and traders: engineers, plumbers, etc.

But they pass a lot of that cost on. I've got a painter at the moment that only uses his van on the first and last day of a job, leaving all his stuff at the site and taking public transport during the work.

Well that's very sensible.

One of the London First's ideas is about road building. Fixing bottlenecks. Rod Eddington identified that as a must-have for the UK's transport system.

We didn't say anything about road building. David said there wasn't going to be any.

But the river crossing?

That was it. It was just the river crossing.

I echo those points: you build more roads, you will get more traffic, and they'll fill up. I worry that people think letting HGVs in bus lanes is a good idea. It's a bad idea for buses, accessibility, and air quality.

I slightly disagree with you on that; you're going to have to facilitate it if you want to move HGVs out of peak times.

Putting others into bus lanes won't help anyone.

I think I do disagree. You have to ask: does this need to be just a bus lane all day? London's rate of decrease in bus ridership is up there with the highest of all UK cities.

Why is that?

Congestion, sheer amount of time it takes on the bus. It's gotten so much longer. Unpredictability. Sometimes journeys take X amount of time, some are Y.

And, until two months ago, it used to be more expensive to use more than one bus than the tube.

There are a lot of other things going on though.

My concern is that everything we've heard today is very incremental; you'd have a lot of fun producing and implementing the stuff on the sheets. But we're talking about transformational changes that will happen to London that are an order of magnitude bigger than the ideas here.

Where are you pointing the need?

Let me give you the NO2 example. The 2025 aim is a joke; it isn't even going to be 2030. If you want to comply with NO2 limits, which are three times over on Putney High Street, you can't do that with a bit of ULEZ. You need to ban diesel. This is just one of the areas - not the only one - congestion is another one.

And road pricing. To get better use of the road system, we can try to get some of the private car usage out, better efficiency for freight, improve air quality issues, improve climate change issues and all the safety issues. When congestion charging was brought in it was exciting and brave and revolutionary. We need something like that.

My point is not just air quality. The order of magnitude of our responses needs to be much bigger.

We've so far been silent on more cycling. The current Mayor has spoken a lot about that. Do you think we've done enough?

No, I think it should carry on.

We've over-exploited it. Some of our people are worried that we've done too much. Buses are tipped into cycle lanes by cycle super highways. You've got a pavement twice as wide as is necessary, then a cycle superhighway, then buses are tipped into the lanes of traffic. Looking at it now, you think maybe we should have used less walkway.

What Boris did was reduce by a half the road supply, but he didn't reduce the demand by half. So - guess what - you've got a lot worse congestion exacerbated by PHVs in four years, unless we have 20% journeys done by cycling. We need to reduce demand for road space from those who do have choices, like my painter example.

Are we creating more segregated cycle lanes or not? What I think you've got to do is incentivise more cycling in Central London, just relying on it happening isn't enough. This question about the backstreets, too.

From the perspective of major employers, the work that employers have done to promote cycling has been fantastic. But safety is such an issue for us. It has to be combined with getting dangerous lorries out of the way.

It's a basic demand response point. We have to respond to the demand around routes for cyclists.

That's the Southwark Bridge type thing.

We also have to educate the cyclists. Those 17 who were killed last year, why had they squeezed down the left-hand side of an HGV in the traffic lane?

If you look in detail at those figures, those lorries are going to construction sites.

You need to redesign junctions.

You need segregation. If you look at the statistics, it's the higher skip-style HGVs which are the problem. Bring that stuff in by rail. Because with those particular vehicles - I mean what side are you supposed to pass them on? We could do with more e-bikes too.

E-vehicles. Ban diesel. Incentivise green vehicles. We should segregate cycle highways. Give a green way to cyclists.

There's a future-proofing point for central London.

Exhibition Road and Royal Parks, cyclist and pedestrian safety.

People swear at you a lot as a cyclist! I got yelled at the other day just for slowing down. There's a horrible anti-cycling climate.

That's because it's not segregated.

Can I veer the conversation? What about pedestrians, the fabric of what we want Central London to look like?

The river. Let's use that more.

The count-down timers. There isn't a simple pedestrian crossing I use in Central London. I'm fairly fit, but I have to scamper across every crossing. Boris squeezed the time they give you.

There's technology now that will see the number of people waiting and alter the time you've got to cross accordingly.

Outside TFL HQ in Southwark, they have this fantastic, enormous crossing. We wanted one in Chiswick and they said that we couldn't. That it would cost too much.

Accessibility is a key issue for us too. Wheelchairs and buggies. We have 180 buggies coming through Kensington station an hour. We need to look at the profile of users.

Good access in Central London is a bit thin.

It's pretty tokenistic.

All roads seem to lead to Green Park when you need access.

Going back to carrots, what about electric taxis?

They're coming in next year. But it will be a monopoly for Bolloré, not the other car clubs. The whole thing has been a disaster. Emily's borough has 20 million visitors. It's also worth talking about secure cycle parking. One company near me has 100 people on the waiting list for secure bike parking under the building.

When Boris was appointed, one of his policies was to tax private workspace car parking. He wanted it replaced by cycle parking. He never brought it in.

In Nottingham, they've improved their accessibility, encouraging sustainable transport and discouraging workspace levy.

If people can't park bikes securely, they tie it to a lamppost, which is bad for pedestrians.

Yes, they tend to slip down and block the way for pedestrians and wheelchairs.

I've worked in Germany and there was always somewhere to put the bike.

The problem is: you need a decent bicycle to go any distance, but you aren't going to use it if it's going to get vandalised or stolen.

We need to think about businesses that stay open throughout the night. The Night Tube makes a difference, but we do need night parking at the rest of the time for businesses.

This goes back to using distance-based and time-sensitive charging.

I think we're running out of time, so Peter if you'd like to have the last word.

I think we need more cycle parking. We had to get permission to go into a park to put in bike parking. It took a very long time, with no support from TFL.

Central 3 Strategic Transport Priorities

Session 2

These notes are a summary of the conversation

Session 2

Facilitator, Ian Birch

Josie Drath, Atkins/Institution of Civil Engineers
Jerry McLaughlan, Mineral Products Association
James Trimmer, Port of London Authority
Karen Tiley, Confederation of Public Transport
Tim Long, Westminster City Council
Jenny Sibley, London Councils
Sally Crew, Southwark Council

Rail termini passengers are up, bus mileage is up 10%, for streets walking has gone up, cycle flows went up 237% from a low base, about 25% of all road users in the morning peak are cyclists coming in to central London. NO₂ is likely to increase: see the red streets on the map. Expected growth: most employment growth is in and around the centre, north of Isle of Dogs. About 35% of jobs are in the centre, which is about 2% of the area of the city. Around peak movement in the centre there is 17% freight during the day. We expect cars to go down, while vehicle delay is expected to rise.

We want to come up with policy responses to the three main themes previously mentioned by Lucy. Think about the scale of change that would be reasonable through the transport system.

Roads are constrained space now. How do we prioritise the space we have for the right things, and what are they? Can we prioritise the most valuable trips?

Time of the day is huge: Wednesday morning is very different from a sunny Saturday afternoon, so managing time and space is critical. Sometimes presentations are journey-to-work focused, but other times are of value.

So think about different uses of the system and how places are used at different times. Is infrastructure mostly used for only three hours a day? We need to future proof and have a flexible timed approach to management.

Access to the main roads is reducing all the time. Central London doesn't work much for walkers; look at the crossings and main line termini. They need a better response.

So more investment to make them work better or to reduce numbers of walkers?

Many people just walk down the road as there is no footpath space. Look at how that is managed.

With freight, there are times when there is capacity and we could use it more evenly through the day. Most deliveries are between 7 and 11am, which is when customers want it, so we don't want to deliver then.

There was a Melbourne study involving free travel before a certain time of day to see if they could shift the numbers, but it didn't work, because businesses such as freight are time limited in what they can do. The surface delivery transport strategy collects data to help manage road use to fit policies, so traffic light timings could be changed, for instance, which is an opportunity, but how do you decide who and what to prioritise?

To move more around London the vehicles need to be smaller, i.e. pedestrians, cyclists, cars, etc.

What about autonomous vehicles (AV)?

They are an opportunity and a threat. It could lead to more road space to move more people and enable freight, or lead to more vehicles and then more congestion.

So think about the space each mode uses and its efficiency.

So are they fully autonomous or partially so that drivers make decisions which make take away the full benefit of AVs?

They would all have to be AVs.

In central London is it a major opportunity.

Potentially.

We are just shifting from one type of vehicle to another.

Is the efficiency gain in road space as major a topic for those using public transport?

If most are AVs you could have congestion benefit.

I read that AVs will reduce costs by 80% for drivers, so why would you walk or use public transport? Why not put children in one to go to school? Everyone used to own a horse until cars were invented. In 2020 when AVs come in the shift could be dramatic.

In central London, where 1.7 million people work, most arrive in a two hour period. Would AVs impact on that market? Rail still gets more in in a short time.

If congestion increases, people will use public transport.

Would you sit on or cram into pricey public transport or go for an AV in your own bubble where you could work, sleep?

It should get you there quicker.

Congestion adds 1+ hours to get into London.

So congestion is a hard-to-shift problem despite technology. There is a fixed supply of roads and we are not willing to build urban motorways, so we have to work with what we have. What should we do if AVs make the problem worse?

Increase public transport.

Pricing will discourage some from road use and the remainers could plan journeys better.

There is the congestion charge. What was the effect? Numbers went into a spoon shape: congestion was high, went down and then went up again.

You have number plate recognition so maybe cars could be charged.

What about the different journeys and times? How do you manage a policy?

AVs can reduce driving by 80%, which could increase demand, but could affect road pricing where we replace fuel costs with a tariff for congestion areas.

On the impact of congestion on bus journeys, in the short term I think we should look at the network and consider whether it is moving people as intended, because people are walking more in the last part of journeys rather than staying on the bus. Do buses need to do that last part? Could there be fewer stops? Most routes go across London. Should they? In the short term we could find more capacity. We will have that in a way in Oxford Street.

As long as the space isn't used by private vehicles. It is used for walking in Oxford Street.

In terms of the congestion charge, who doesn't pay? Is the model the right one? Does it target correctly?

What happened to the western extension? Lost by Boris Johnson?

The low carbon zone sort of changed things.

Freight needs to get out of central London.

Central London cannot be looked at in isolation. The origin isn't central for travel, so links between in and out cannot be in a vacuum. You need to look at solutions outside. You can get a truck full of aggregate into central London but it comes from outside, so I suggest consolidation: getting containers in as close as possible for the final leg.

People talked of consolidation but there isn't much.

There is for projects, but there is a mass of cargo that could start at Tilbury, coming to the river. We looked at containers in west London. No one has done our idea so people think it won't work.

It works for projects as there is a coordinator in the middle.

And a guaranteed plannable method. It works because there is no alternative for some sites. You can consolidate some activities.

There are tunnel segments. It hasn't happened because it is a novel idea, we have an existing pattern with HGVs to rumble in and there is a mature industry.

Is coordination hard to do?

Some materials do not lend themselves to consolidation.

Different policies exist.

What is the best way to coordinate? To make people use your system?

With containers going Northants to London and back you could use the estuary and get them to central London. It is possible but it hasn't been done; it's hard to break out of the traditional system.

So it's a conservative attitude needing leadership.

With construction spoils, you put them on a lorry because you always have done. There is another way and some views change. Planning policy and leadership could change the market.

What about profit margins?

Anything other than by truck is considered pricey. Stick works better than carrot but takes more nerve, and there isn't enough cash to do carrot.

Our supply chain works on thin margins. Customers aren't willing to pay more for a more sustainable option.

Corporate social responsibility: we use the river because it's good, but it is high volume/low margin. There are other schemes available.

Is there an opportunity for congestion? It needs to be large scale.

What is 'big'?

We need a single London approach.

There will be some London-wide thinking, but if you have a central London vision it will be different from other parts of London. We could do more pedestrianisation in some areas. Policy responses will differ. Freight still runs through streets. We can tweak to change behaviours in areas.

In some countries large HGVs are banned. Is that possible?

It is about consolidation. For Paris, there are areas on the Seine in the centre.

If we had proper infrastructure for bringing materials in bulk to the centre, could you distribute them in smaller vehicles?

We had HS2 asking if we could deliver concrete in bigger vehicles to reduce journeys. Is that safer than having many more smaller ones?

What is the point of black cabs in central London? Could they be autonomous?

What about the three main topics?

Look at what we have and how best to use it. People think we are doing that, but I disagree. No one comes to central London for fun. It's not an easy journey. About freight and timings, there are reasons why they cannot work well. We should discuss that.

So we have ideas that are too general?

If you look at black cabs, buses and private hire, you would find a lot of capacity in central London.

Remove TfL from the network then?

Stand at London Bridge station and look at how many buses are full. How many people cannot cross the road because it's blocked by empty buses?

It may be quicker to walk than take a bus.

London Bridge station is doubling capacity with the same size bridge. Why isn't there a second bridge over the river?

Some extra trains will go over the river.

We have an empty bus lane over the bridge, two empty general lanes. You may not need another bridge but could give some lanes to pedestrians.

Encouraging people to walk would be harder.

But people are there at peak times.

The bus service has had major investment over the years and eats up a lot of public money as it's subsidised.

It comes down to a nuanced basis for charging.

It is to get more efficient use of roads.

What about pricing? Is it a poor idea? Is it deliverable?

Easier now than it was, and now the scale is different and there are different prices for different things, but bringing it in to start with was more difficult.

Is it easier in central London

Is it linked to the congestion zone or type of vehicles?

Is the money raised for specific things?

What is the alternative to congestions charging? I cannot think of anything suitable. There is a global ambition.

Consolidation!

Question time:

There is a funding gap. TfL sponsors expensive projects but many significant schemes in the middle are unfunded, such as bridges over railways. They are left out and missed off. It applies to all regions.

Tim Long: I am surprised there was no mention of AVs, which may hit in 2020 and could change our streets and transportation, so I think it needs more thought.

Our table emphasised demand management for inner London. There is a need to manage demand for every road user type for a strategic approach.

Siemens: we talked about incentivising people to electrify vehicles and use the river more.

Sub-orbital transport needs more thought. TfL was to join up the railways but 2050 is too late; we need it now. We have the S26 Croydon and Heathrow is overburdened. We need more transport and bigger. We were told by TfL we cannot increase what we have. Borough links need consideration. We need to be linked up.

Peter Everston, London Forum: London councils talked of London boroughs having more influence on where buses go. In my area in west London no buses go past the library, for instance.