A CITY FOR ALL LONDONERS

Transport Workshop
9th November 2016, 9.30 – 13.00

Inner 1
A spatial approach
Session 2

Facilitator comments in bold
Respondents in regular text

These notes are a summary of the conversation

Session 2

Facilitator, Gareth Fairweather
Spencer Palmer, London Councils
Chris Bainbridge, London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
Ian Henderson, Network Rail
Tom Bogdanowicz, London Cycling Campaign
Aled Richards, Hackney Council
Lucinda Turner, TfL
Lilli Matson, TfL

Hello. I am Gareth and I am from TfL, leading on the London Plan. We are going to talk about inner London and pick up on some of the points that Lilli made about managing high levels of traffic and making the areas in London people-friendly. We want to get the balance right between big schemes and smaller interventions. I have some information on these A3 slides that might help generate ideas. Let's start with some introductions.

Let's open it up to the table now. What are the challenges and priorities?

A priority in Hackney is Crossrail 2, and the other airport.

What are the issues?

We want Crossrail 2 to be east and not north. Come from Hackney Central, Newham and Barking. Our big priority is trying to get that going. In terms of air quality, whilst we support it covering our borough we are also doing work with other boroughs in London. We don't think there will be enough support for it from the boroughs because it affects too many people. Some parts of a borough are in and others are out, and that is a difficult position for a lot of boroughs to be in. We aren't trying to look for an alternative line.

Is Hackney in it?

Yes, but we are taking a leadership role in responding to other boroughs' opinions. Take Southwark or Lewisham, for example. The South Circular cuts halfway between those boroughs. Half the borough is in it and half the borough out of it. It's not a situation we want, and we want to support and help find a solution.

It's a problem for Hounslow. Chiswick is in where I live, and Brentford is out. 50% of trips in Brentford are by car, and they are frightened of backlash.

This does touch on the challenges of having a spatial approach when trying to draw hypothetical boundaries of what is central, inner and outer London.

That is a problem. You have to draw the line somewhere, but it is difficult. Communities don't keep to lines like that.

Why don't you make it so that any borough which is in it is all in?

The one idea we are moving up with is why not make it London-wide, and put leniency on cars in the outer London area? You can ramp the low charge up over time and introduce something in the low emission zone that can be improved as you go along.

Are you assuming that people within the zone will not be charged?

The assumption is that they will be charged.

Is there anything interesting about inner London specifically, or are their challenges outer London's challenges too? Is there a particular approach to transport in inner London?

Air quality and pollution are issues. Inner London is plagued with poor air quality, but when you go out it is blue and green. I live on the border where it goes from yellow to green. Inner London is affected the most by air quality.

Outer London is affected by cars, but inner London isn't. We have won the battle with cars there. Taxis and buses are a big cause of pollution now.

Regardless of the measure or scheme, air quality is a big thing that needs to be worked on.

Have we won the battles on cars? Where I live they have taken out speed bumps and parking restrictions. My neighbours drive five minutes down the road to the shops in Wandsworth. We might not have won, but traffic is going down, as is car ownership – something we once said would never happen.

Is there more traction?

I was brought up in Wandsworth, and they've had a Tory council for a while. What it has done skilfully is restricted the traffic coming in. Others have made no effort to restrict traffic coming in. Wandsworth have created traffic management schemes across a large proportion of the borough. To get in isn't that easy – only a few roads you can stick on. It enables them to change the rules around traffic management schemes, so in a way they've been looking after themselves.

They will find it hard within the borough. There was consultation to change the road in Tooting Common, but there was huge backlash because it was taking away people's right to drive in that area.

We can't say we have won the battle because there's still a lot to be done. In Lewisham and Hackney, car usage is going down. It is a combination of pathway development policies in local plans and measures to improve walking, cycling and public transport. It seems to be working, but we need to apply that model elsewhere to places that might not be ready to adopt it.

There are enough places to work. We need to tackle issues, improve traffic flow and make private cars more desirable. There is still dependency on cars in outer areas, so won't improving traffic control and ownership end up with people who will jump back in a car?

You have to give people an easy alternative, and the easier it is the more likely it is they will do it. When driving, you step outside your home and see a car. Even with a bicycle, you might not have that instant convenience. It needs to be easy.

Yes, cheaper and quicker.

It is those things, and healthier. Convenience and safety are issues with walking and cycling.

I am hearing that people in their 20s and 30s don't do driving tests as much as they were before, and they don't buy their first car at 22 years old. Young, trendy people in Hackney cycle everywhere.

A lot of people give up their car in London, especially inner London. Is there scope for car sharing in inner London? Is car sharing going to make a difference, or will it lead to more cars on the road?

It could be good for those people who endorse public transport. I took an Uber back home and it's easier than cycling. It could claw back some of what we won by putting more cars on the road.

The major car companies are more interested now. That tells me there is a market for it, but the fear is that it will encourage one-way clubs and a shift away from public transport to cars.

We had a floating car club model in Hackney. We examined it for a year because we were sceptical that it would lead to more traffic and congestion. The analysis and work showed that it wasn't causing any more problems.

Some other boroughs have experienced the opposite. It might be that it works for Hackney, but further out it won't.

The purpose of hiring a car is that you don't want to take stuff to one place or do an awkward journey.

The digital age means that you could prioritise and point score people who don't own a car. Have priority access for vehicles. You don't want people to have a car and also use a shared car, because it means they don't have to pay a congestion charge or pay for parking. We want to convert those trips to cars to additional cars users. We don't want to generate additional trips. The issue with cars is that you spend £5,000 on a piece of metal and tax it, but then every journey feels free. You think that your travel is free, and you have motivation to use it because you paid for it. We have to move towards a system where we encourage people to realise that

the cost of motoring isn't a car they will pay for once and then it's free trips. It's the ongoing cost throughout the life of that vehicle. We need to pick up on the social cost of it and the accident cost. How we do that is beyond me.

What if every vehicle was electric?

We would still have congestion.

You don't get the health benefits, but it would improve air quality.

Can you pay for a parking permit in addition to paying to drive?

There are no designated places on the street. You can have a resident permit.

Where I live, people rent out their driveways. You then incentivise driving into inner London, parking in someone's driveway, catching the train into central London and saving the cost of parking in central London.

It is difficult to manage and police.

You could lose the parking permit.

You could have a policy where you don't allow people to do this.

Kensington and Chelsea don't allow crossovers to be built.

The planning rules are a bit difficult.

It is an outer London problem, not inner London. They don't have places with gardens.

Is this achievable? Can we achieve a level of mode shift?

If you listened to Chris and me, we are confident it is happening and that it will continue. Trying to migrate it from inner London to the other boroughs is where we are sceptical.

Is it a good thing to do? Would it help you guys? If boroughs further out had similarly ambitious policies would it help life for you?

Yes.

It has to. When arguing with some developers, we said that they couldn't have too many parking spaces. There are more elsewhere. Other boroughs don't want parking. If you try and get the competition going the other way then it might work.

Part of the inner London traffic problem is the outer London traffic coming in.

What about freight?

It isn't just the larger vehicles that we can see; it is the smaller vehicles like the private cars and small vans. We don't know what is in them.

My worry is that they aren't carrying anything, and are just a job creation scheme for people who are unemployed.

We need to tackle that. People getting deliveries at work are a major issue in inner London. Immediate deliveries are being offered. There is no consolidation. Personal deliveries at different times of day create traffic. We don't really know how big the problem is.

The discussion at the last table was about the fact that John Lewis has banned workplace deliveries, and HSBC did it ten years ago. We are talking about an idea of something like the Post Office, where you can pick up your stuff from a central place. Councils can't tender for waste collection, so the waste collector here can't collect from businesses. You then need 47 companies collecting. It isn't common sense for business, so the businesses in Bond Street save 25% of the cost by consolidating.

Some business districts are doing it with deliveries. More of that has to happen.

The problem with consolidation is finding a model that works and a location where you can do the consolidation. We were trying to do it in Shoreditch, but the only available site was a temporary development site, because everything is getting built on. We struggle.

That's where strategic authority comes in.

We need TfL to do that with the GLA.

The Post Office used bicycles, but now they all use vans.

They also had purpose-built consolidation centres.

We are using seaside land for transport. Should we safeguard specific parts of the land?

The Mayor's Transport Strategy should say more about freight and consolidation. The London Plan could then talk about designation of sites.

It is problematical. They won't yield high values because developers come in for housing. They will always trump. The priority is social and affordable housing, but the developers can't offer other things like transport.

We do it for Crossrail – places are safeguarded all the way up and down – so why not for this? Unless you're making good progress with structure consolidation. Crossrail is a good example. When we think of freight we tend to think of big stuff, but we need to think about movement of goods and services and build that in locally as well as strategically. Your conversations locally with developers are about making sure they're providing the goods and services that the new developments need. Often when you retrofit it doesn't work. Movement of goods and services is essential.

We need to distinguish between freight and delivery. We need to make people think about freight in terms of delivery and not just larger goods.

As well as the delivery of goods for household shops and things like new watches, it's also about the services you require. We require maintenance and building services. All of that is moving around, but a lot of it happens in private vehicles. Does it all need to? In the trade sector we need a cultural shift. A lot of the movement on roads is from vans with few people in them.

Somebody used the expression 'healthy free'. Workmen come to my place with a van on the first day to deliver stuff. The next 5 days they come on a bicycle because there is no need to drive.

It is happening. There is a shift already. Great.

It can be done. Some gardeners work off a bicycle, when previously they would drive because they had a free parking space. When they have to pay for it they start thinking about it.

Road transport is essential. Delivering stuff in lines goes through pipelines. Abolish bottled water and drink tap water.

We have talked a lot about things that we can do to force people to make changes. Are there any other things we could think about?

Road space allocation. Cyclists' use of highways. There is always conflict around it, there are conflicting views. If we dedicate space to them, evidence shows that you see an increase in the number of cyclists. Cyclists benefited from having real road space, as did buses, to a certain extent.

We need to see more of this roll out in central London.

Oxford Street, in terms of the need to pedestrianise. We need to prioritise for a certain load, so bold decisions need to be taken.

Time is important. I cycled here and it saved me half an hour compared to driving, and 15 minutes against public transport. If carrots are there all the way, and you have bike parking, you will do it. If you eliminate the stick of my bike being stolen, I am incentivised. You can pay people to do something, but you will need other carrots out there.

This idea of access to transport being at your front door is interesting. I live in a basement flat in Islington, and getting my bike from there to the street is a nightmare.

Your councillor has deliberately chosen not to install cycle hangers. I never understand why some councils do stuff and others don't. Hackney has put in 100 and has unlimited demand. Islington will trial one. It isn't inclusive. There is nothing to stop you prioritising hangers on council estates.

We did that first.

I remember I cycled past them. City of London has put in 100 in the city, and Islington two or three. Why? Why is one council sending a funding application to TfL and another not?

It might be that they want to spend money on something else, or have prioritised something else.

Some of the streets in the city are slower, and there is less on-street parking. There needs to be a bit more of a consistent approach from borough to borough. We want to make sure that we share good practice when we see it, so that others learn. There are political decisions around what is incentivised.

It is the contraflow argument. The bloke from the City who did it had a whole scheme set up. He worked out how to do multiple traffic orders and sign it. That was shown to every borough cycling officer in their meeting. What was the outcome? In Islington, zilch.

Members' car parking for residents is powerful. The number of spaces on offer is powerful. In Hackney, they are off-street estates so it's easier.

There are areas where we can't put parking in. We have a problem with the parking team. We don't want them putting spaces in that they will charge for, but we are getting them in.

Hackney is doing it.

You have to provide the facilities to encourage certain modes of transport. In inner and central London we have seen falling bus usage for the first time. It's good if that is down to everyone cycling, but I don't think that's the cause. The main reason for that is that buses are less reliable, so we need to keep an eye on it. If another mode becomes more desirable, people will shift.

Yes, or if buses become too uncertain.

In central London it is more reliable to walk or cycle, but now it's quicker too. Those who can't walk or cycle need a reliable bus service.

There also needs to be enough road space. Buses are 13 times more efficient in terms of road space. Road space is the main criterion. We need to do more for buses.

The problem with the buses in central London is that they rolled out too many superhighway schemes at the same time. They had to get it done by the end of term, but it should have been planned better.

People talk about it as though London was paved with cycle tracks. It wasn't; it was a tiny percentage of London roads.

They did it because of the congestion. I remember going to south London for dinner on Valentine's Day and being stuck in traffic for 40 minutes.

Someone is to blame. London Bridge is a key railway station, but a two-way street is currently closed for a year, which just doesn't work.

I bet the Utility Centre was pleased that the stick was aimed at the cyclists, not them.

There are so many cycle projects. In other areas everything is individual, but not with cycling.

The key problem is that there is so much development. In the long term we might have it sorted, but in the short term it isn't.

That is key, especially if we need more growth and economic development. There will be more disruption.

Lorries are a problem for cyclists.

More deliveries.

Someone spoke about utilising canals. Not radically, but look at what was done in the past. Can we use rail and water more efficiently?

We tried it at Earls Court. If you can't use rail there, where can you? In the end, London Underground didn't want these trains coming in to destroy their operation. Where can you do it?

Sites next to railways are few and far between. They're not available. We need to make sure that we maintain the network at the same time. There are lots of barriers.

If we look at water-based transport, something needs to be done with the air quality issue. Emissions that are produced are very significant, and there isn't any justification for transporting passengers via water transport unless emissions reduce. We do have large quantities of freight.

It needs to be cleaner.

We have talked a lot about small-scale interventions. What about larger projects? Bring in inner London for big schemes like Crossrail. Are they benefiting others?

The underground has transformed connectivity in London, but opportunities to replicate that are few and far between. The overground has had problems in the past year.

The thing that worries me about Crossrail 2 is that it's geared towards long-distance commuters. It isn't concentrating on the other people.

It might make it worse. At the previous table there was a bit of a suggestion that we were missing a trick. We have large schemes like Crossrail, and small schemes, but nothing in between. Think more creatively about trams and light rail.

Politicians like to be associated with big projects, so it's difficult to implement smaller projects and infrastructure, whether in town centres or in London. To some extent, it has been packaged like a bigger project. All the cycling stuff happened at once, which made it a big project that the Mayor could be associated with.

What about how we encourage more inner London characteristics further out? Presumably, that affects how we think about the structure of London in terms of its town centres. What about the areas that aren't in central London, so getting people into Croydon and places?

We need a wide range of functions in those locations.

I remember Dalston as being nothing exciting, but now it's the place to hang out. Transport is part of that. The development of two stations has made it easier to get there.

There's an underutilised transport asset there that could be brought back to life at a low cost.

Cycle access was important in Hackney. The growth of cycling in Hackney has made everywhere in the borough easily accessible. What Hackney has done successfully is create areas where people can cycle, and you can take your child to school without using main roads. The problem for Hackney now is to bite the bullet on the main roads. They remain barriers to cycling. If you want to go to the town hall, you have to cycle down Mare Street.

It isn't within our control. Mare Street is a part of the TfL network.

Whether Mare Street or Hackney Road, they are challenges.

If you want to take the inner London experience to outer London, you need to be much stricter with car parking standards. You can't do it where there are low amounts of people. If you have a place in Newham or Barking, it's not hard to make it free.

You can't do it with unlimited parking.

It is the planning of places.

You are working on the London Plan, Gareth. How can you make the London Plan deliverable at borough level? It is fine for you to say that you want to reduce traffic in outer London, but what forces Barnet to implement it?

When you introduced the MTS, we had to respond to it as a borough and meet the objectives. We have to produce a strategy and show conformity.

What makes you have to?

It is law – the Greater London Act.

It would be interesting to see if Sadiq could enforce it. That is what we would want.

Inner 2
Inner London

Purple Table, Session 2

Facilitator comments in bold
Respondents in regular text

These notes are a summary of the conversation

Session 2, Purple Table

Facilitator, Alex Goodship, TFL
Simon Phillips, Lambeth Council
Giudia Andrews, LLDC
Simon Munk, LCC
Murray Woodburn, London Borough of Newham
Max Sugarman, External Relations Executive
Denise Beedell, Federation of Small Businesses
Jenny Bates, Friends of the Earth

Let's begin with familiarizing ourselves with the hand-out. Starting at the top there is a list of the reasons for travelling within London.

I'm very surprised that there are only sixteen percent of trips counted as traveling into London for work.

Well, there are lots of trips that aren't work trips. People leave the house for things other than work and shopping.

Shopping habits are different for inner Londoners.

We also have a measure of the public transport experience. This shows what the crowding experience is like, showing the concentration of areas where there are five people per square meter. There are also the different modes of transport, showing that the percentage of car modes is relatively low.

There are parts of Lambeth though which are quite suburban where car use is higher.

People's experience of streets is much lower than their expectations. They were expecting the quality and feel of the street to be higher due to traffic dominance. London will need to accommodate one million more residents by 2041, concentrated in the eastern region and this will further add to congestion. Already more than 142,000 hours are lost to congestion every day.

A lot of our air quality and congestion problems are caused by trips which don't have an origin, just a destination. Unless we can do something to supress trips, we will continue to have

horrendous traffic. There needs to be the same level of control over housing provision, as traffic in outer London.

The first thing I think of are the car parks.

It's extremely difficult for small businesses because they need to get their goods and services to their customers or receive them. The frustration is that they see privately owned cars taking up space they would like to use, or space only for residents during the day and they're restricted from using them for deliveries. If you're in the freight industry, you accept the tax you have to pay but the system makes it difficult to comply with drivers' working hours, to find a safe space to park, due to a lack of understanding by traffic wardens. For example, there are timed parking spaces that make unloading unsafe by rushing the process in twenty minutes. They want to comply with the laws but conditions make it difficult. We should make sure that small businesses aren't seen as the sole cause of congestion. There are lots of other different sources.

There just won't be any space in inner London to make trips that aren't entirely central. You also can't free up space for other things like cycling if you do that. It causes terrible blight.

The way that the structure of fees is set up sends a strong message out to the public, for example the fact that residents are getting discounts for cars.

That's a good point. Maybe they shouldn't get discounts (agree x3).

We decided the day of the carrot is over, and the day of the stick is here, in terms of encouraging people to use different modes of travel. There should be a penalty if you use the vehicle.

Changing business parking prices is another issue – I know someone who usually goes over £2,000 per year for expenses as an accountant travelling for business to meet his clients. Suddenly it's gone over £12,500. That's an increase of over 445 percent. There should have been at least a graduation.

We are out of carrots now, and onto the stick.

I think there is also an issue with online deliveries too, as there's been a huge increase. A third are deliveries where no one answers the door and the carrier has to redeliver. We should question how to make those trips more efficient.

That's across the board: deliveries to big and small businesses, schools, and so forth need to be re-examined. Can you make these trips through cycles or public transport, or consolidated?

Or dropped off, at a post office?

Talking about van growth, it is going up really fast and is projected to continue doing so. A lot of it is due to businesses and people having higher expectations.

It's going to be a massive problem in the future.

An alternative would be to have businesses delivering products or services on cycles.

You can't have businesses conducting business on cycles.

You can.

You can't.

The potential to switch over – that argument has gone out the window. Look at the cities in Europe and the difference in what we're achieving.

The viable business model at the end of the day requires tradespeople to be physically fit enough for the job. You cannot carry all the tools you need in your hands on your own and not be knackered at the end.

How do we make sure we only have essential traffic on the network? How do we get there?

Road cost. The beginning of road processing.

Plan accordingly. It's going to cost them hundreds of thousands of pounds. They have to do business planning five years in advance, including accounting for their vehicle they have to purchase.

You've got to start the pace of change at an early point. In the case of HGVs, it's a very specific type of vehicle of HGV that is killing people on the road and it's going to be another eight years before they're off the road entirely. Businesses have to accept the changes that are coming whether they like it or not.

In the past three years, small businesses have had to cope with increasing minimum wage rates, and the rising cost of rent. They are adaptive, nimble, and keep London going. We are in danger of killing that golden goose because it's the small businesses that generate job growth. If they are thriving and sustainable they will employ those people who don't need to make long trips.

How do we get rid of the trips we don't want?

Facilitate them into Silvertown.

All talk of road building in London has disappeared from the agenda.

Low reliability: that is something that TFL needs to sort themselves out about. Limit use during certain hours.

There's possibilities in closing roads, for example according to school hours.

But the congestion charge has been a bit blunt, because it's the cost of doing business. You look at the graphs of it and the effects have levelled off because people have come to accept that they need to pay a congestion charge.

If you look at cycling in London, the biggest leap is due to the congestion charge. Some businesses shifted, but we're a growing city, so other people showed up and took the place of those vehicles that went off the road.

There's all kinds of ways doing it: paying by mile, for example.

We are very in favour of those things, mileage, time of day.

So the average mileage is around 40 miles. So where are these people coming from? From out of town and going to their secure residence in Canary Wharf or whatever.

We do need more crossings in the east. You've got to pay all the time if you're travelling there. There was a promise that the toll for the bridge would go, but it hasn't. It seems to be that west affluent London gets away scott-free, but the less affluent parts are paying the cost.

Every time day and night, there's a massive queue. The answer is to put it on the west end as well.

There's a sense of fairness and equity that needs to be there, and that promises need to be kept. So moving the goalpost is downright unfair and it also won't make that much difference on the air quality. If a small business owner can demonstrate that they are trying to comply with regulations, we don't feel they should be penalized. They don't make unnecessary journey for the hell of it.

We've talked a lot about management. Going back into what we're trying to achieve for inner London, are there any other priorities we need to address?

Regulation for where lorries can and can't go: the lorry control scheme. There's a concern among the freight industry that this will be a mechanism to restrict where you can and can't go and will be counterproductive to everything they're trying to do.

I would agree with that. The work of Michael Barrett in terms of reducing lorry activity was great. They found the sites already full of loading and unloading lorries, and the drivers would just drive around the block, around and around, thousands of them per day which were adding to pollution, collisions with cyclists and so forth. Michael's solution was to put a place for them to park, get in, and then get out. There are huge inefficiencies that can be solved that will do loads to drop off extraneous journeys.

Having said that, in the big companies, they tend to be blinkered sometimes. Smaller businesses tend to know the whole operation, and are trying to do the right thing.

I bridle at that because at my former position at mini-Holland, they did a survey of customers and then looked at their vehicles outside. No customers could park because all the business owners had parked outside as well as the company vehicles.

I had the same experience.

There's a similar issue around schools, where students are parking their cars in local areas instead of the school car park.

What can we do through planning regulation to make sure they can consolidate that? Your average Tesco has a ludicrous number of vehicles servicing them every day.

They've been better about that, but it's still an issue.

So is it better to have ten HGVs or 50 trips by vans?

10 HGVs (agree x4). They're actually delivering what London needs, although they are villainised.

Construction wise, in terms of consolidation there, there's a big distrust in consolidation which can be improved.

That was the case for the London Olympics. There was a model for the movement of lorries that didn't generate a giant complaint. I don't know why we didn't continue with that.

TFL has done it before in Bermondsey, which was seen as a big success.

It's a legislation thing. We can't just ask people politely to do what we want them to do anymore.

The public sector also has a part to play, as well as the NHS and other big public sector bodies because they don't play by the same rules that other businesses play by. They consume an awful lot of things and employees that have their Amazon things delivered at work

I work at a Borough and we should be doing it – if we can't no one else will, but it's still not happening.

It's an issue with some London officers, that they're not accepting these changes.

It's taking some time for everyone. There's no policy in place for employees getting parcels, for example, or driving into work.

Let's address the ambience in inner London. How is that important? What are our aspirations and how do we achieve them?

Encourage the sustainable movement and businesses to consolidate their trips every day. Establish a more central model. What we've discovered in east London is that even though we want to look and feel like central London, it's not possible because the quality of development isn't as good.

But where's the money going to come from?

Also for example, with the schools, nothing will change unless something changes from inside, for example with the allocation of places.

It's not directly a transport thing, but if you want to encourage more small businesses to move into outer areas, you've got to get good broadband connections out there. It's not just about cost but it stifles business growth because the speed takes so long. If you can include it on the applications that will attract small businesses. It's hugely expensive, problematic, and time consuming.

The future would be to say that you could get to Stratford by foot, to the schools, to places of employment.

It's costing us eighteen million quid to upgrade the schemes in Stratford. And other boroughs are getting squeezed in terms of getting deliveries.

So you need a new funding stream.

Just to talk about working from home: it could be a way to get people off congested streets and reducing the figure of pollution even more. Trends indicate it's increasing.

There are some figures around with planning applications that planting more houses won't alleviate traffic because people do work from home. It's an opportunity for more self-employed people to take that route.

It's the way that we assess our road network in terms of agreeing what can and cannot be done. If we do want to transform our streets for pedestrians and cyclists, we have to change to appraisal.

We have to address the nature of congestion, and the best use for our streets.

Going back to working from home, I was working that way for a number of years and most of my journeys were made off-peak.

It does take pressure off the peak times.

If you look at cultures that have embraced working from home, it does tail off because people do still need that human contact. I don't believe that the share of employment is going to dramatically jump. What the focus should be is autonomous vehicles, and what that means for ownership, deliveries, consolidation. It will totally reshape everything.

So car shares would be better.

Just to recap, the priorities we've addressed have been demand management, curb side – challenges around parking, residential parking, consolidation, working from home.

There was the argument that inner London has to match outer London in terms of parking.

Inner 3
A spatial approach to achieving health streets

Orange Table, Session 2

Facilitator comments in bold
Respondents in regular text

These notes are a summary of the conversation

Session 2, Orange Table

Facilitator, Ben Richards, TFL
Kevin Twomey, Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation
Joe Baker, London Borough of Haringey
Tompion Platt , Living Streets
Peter Jones, UCL
Tim Reitter, GLA
Robin Brown, Just Space
Anneka Lawson, RAC Foundation
Roy Ormsby, London Borough of Tower Hamlets
Rachel Carlill, London Assembly Green Group

Let us begin by highlighting the key issues. All of you have gathered public transport experience.
From transport crowding in inner London, particularly in terms of the London underground network, overcrowding is a real issue. How do we alleviate any of these concerns?
In terms of a healthy street discussion we have discussed, how do we achieve this modal shift?
What does that influence?

This clearly links with the air quality discussion.

And in terms of growth, with the London planned discussion, with a million additional homes-,
This is intensive development; how do we better capture the space in there?

I think inner London is quite a challenging environment.

Does anyone have any initial thoughts?

Crossrail can alleviate some of this though what is still apparent is that there are still periods that are going to suffer congestion.

It appears to be the challenges that are set up in the plan we know. It's about how do we then deliver that. How do we practically encourage people to walk and cycle more? This is likely increasing and is a challenge of street typologies, a real balance.

Do you think the challenges are given equal priorities? Air quality or loss of noise pollution and mental wellbeing. It is not a long list but it is more of a balanced act.

They should have to go hand in hand. If we have to make more efficient use of our network but get people physically active; the obvious solution is to get people more active by reducing unnecessary car journeys. By, one, making it less attractive to do small journeys in cars. Two, make parking more difficult. Three, make streets more attractive, allocating space, reducing speeds, and increasing side stalls. They are known measures in the political world, the balance of reducing vehicle use at a time of increasing freight and population.

I kind of buy what you are saying, the headlines you have here are capacity, healthy human environment, and another million homes. My concerns are our response, night delivery for freight, air pollution. I know from the Olympics that the biggest impact was small wheels on the base of trollies that caused the most noise in the middle of the night and had people complaining to their local council. There is the unforeseen, a whole long list of the priorities to check that we're not doing harm in other areas, it does come down to the solutions.

Should we start to look at the solutions and key opportunities increasing the shift from car based private transport to public transport?

One of the big barriers is about what is politically acceptable, certainly, in the borough that I'm working in, we can look at the parking policies, and increased parking costs, car free developments and all those things, but the barrier is what is politically acceptable. There are mechanisms, politically to drive some of these policies though for the politicians to make it acceptable, there needs to be a drive there. Will it be acceptable in communities and will people vote for that?

There is no silver bullet. They got behind for cycling, 20 miles an hour, the whole of central of London. There can be a shift; they can sway the public that this is health for everyone. It is less divisive; this is for cyclists, drivers, pedestrians etc. Trying to persuade everyone, air pollution is coming up, individually it has an impact, and people will project that.

How do we sell that to the public and communicate this?

Similar to the conversation on the last table. Expert views don't matter anymore. We should drip feed campaigns about air quality, and in two years, we might get progressive air quality acceptance.

What role does the Mayor's strategy have?

That is the driver, if that can be seen as politically acceptable

You have been looking at clear policy-,

As a catalyst.

Freight deliveries are increasing, but what about TFLs own stock? Do they have facilities for that to happen.

I agree completely, there is the type of person that goes 'the man has told me to do this, I'm gonna do this'. There is more acceptance to do that as long as it is not from the local authority.

The alignment to the Mayor's Strategy according to the report and impact assessment of transport strategy draft is to be published is for spring and we will have to wait till autumn for the plan which informs the spatial strategies, but there seems that transportation will be out there, on the shopping list before we will have an available opportunity to debate the planning of London.

That shouldn't mean that the conversations are only happening between GLA and London.
Perhaps the question is how should we use the transport strategy considering land densification and the underground network perhaps?

The potentially heavier emphasis of inner London as a destination, more efficient use of the transport capacity.

I mean, I agree. There is potential, we need to build more houses, we need to go denser, good for shorter journeys, if done right. It has to link to public transport.

If you think of housing, it is priority for the transport change. That must be supported so that we aren't trying to retrofit to housing. Inner London should challenge outer London.

Looking at development area wide, freight accommodation centres might be a panacea for this world.
But if you don't have the infrastructure around that, then there is a requirement to find these spaces in inner and outer London and they should be pushed forward as planning requirement and not just transport infrastructure.

If you're doing masterplanning and regeneration, geo fencing is an idea that people quite like at the moment. Those kind of things need to be put in the masterplans of areas with capacity and air quality to help to manage the infrastructure much better. We are putting in super cycle highways but not enough cycle storage so you can't park at A or B. A review of such things will be a key aspect.

Roll out in London or parking control residents or in town centres. It is the majority, but borough by borough is a different approach. Camden is high while in Haringey, it is two-thirds.

There might be scope for more uniformity

There might scope but that is why it is a challenge. There might be a dictate from the TFL, but the Mayor says we have to do this for this reason.

I'm interested in a road user perspective, what key challenges and opportunities are there?

So for inner London, there are short trips that are possible by cycling and walking. There are people that will and the people that won't. Coming from my background, I did a PhD in cycling safety, people walk and cycle. It is the perception of cycling and how dangerous they perceive it.

Walking is often lumped with cycling.

Walking is different, cycling perceived is different. Safety is a major concern. Coming from Dublin, the facilities for walking are different. For an older cyclist the streets are narrower, getting a buggy down the road is quite difficult, you have to keep ducking onto the road. I find myself ducking on the road too. Perceived danger with walking in a city is real.

The corporation of London-, pedestrianising streets-, they just hate cars. But maybe that is a ripple effect in London; we will see certain streets in London, the success or failure will have taken up.
There can be local authorities to trial street design to create a safer street design and remove the barriers we are seeing.

With things like pedestrianisation, public transport has to come with it. The alternative has to be created for shorter routes. But if it is their through route, public transport has to be supported.

Pedestrianisation has to be careful.

It is about rebalancing the street and allocating pedestrians. Stopping rat running.

It is different to different areas. Where are we going to park our cars?

In the policy context, to facilitate centre for adaption on streets in a very incremental way, that is carefully rolled out, so that we gain political and community support, over time there will be a critical mass and Inner London will resolve its own problems.

That's right; it would be a challenge to the boroughs to come forward with a scheme, to have a smarter streetscape to the Mayor. Say here is a competition, with funding to design a kilometre and the communities identify the areas they want to do, people come up with schemes.

But the challenge is that it is done one street at a time.

Though perhaps with a different emphasis like a mini Holland.

Because they focus on cycling.

I can think of some streets in Haringey that would be perfect, but that would be a bit of a challenge, but some groups might lead it formally.

I wouldn't have to get involved if certain streets do it on their own and get it done in a certain way that they want.

Mini Hollands. Health focused. Around centres that people can walk and cycle too that would be really useful to grow our housing.

In terms of priorities, talking about Feet First, road user hierarchy, Boris got rid of it. I heard talk about bringing that back, that might be a useful tool, for people, walking first and then cycling.

What about the expansion of congestion charge?

Depends on what you're doing. Most of the charging schemes in London are carbon emission based and not NOX (Nitrous Oxide) emissions. There is no reliable date on NOX. My concern is that it will have to affect all users. I looked at geo fencing in Woodbury High Street, 20% cars, 40%, buses, motor vehicles and white vans contribute to the rest. I wasn't allowed to go further because, I can't touch TFL and their bus fleet. There is this other part of the organisation.

We sit down with TFL at 50 of the worst junctions, and talk through the options but they say that Option one, two, three, four, does this on the traffic modelling and we can't do it. Unless there is a way to reduce vehicle capacity.

A broader question around that is how willing are people to reduce that road space to increase cycling space. Is that acceptable?

I don't think that can happen. Car ownership is going down. Buses are going up.
Home deliveries are increasing which is a challenge for the next few years.

Cars going down, white vans are going up with home deliveries.

I have a question about the introduction of the congestion charge.

30% of the capacity has gone out, not because there are more vehicles.

Do we just make it more difficult to drive and access?

The office I work in looks over the Blackwall tunnel which is just always at a standstill. Did introducing the charges reduce cars initially but then it crept up again?

The challenge is that in central London the residents affected are quite small and could afford the inconvenience of congestion charge. It is those in outer London that can't afford it though they have to use private vehicles for work.

The electrification of cars is important. I agree charging stations as well.

Some of them are the same price as a second hand Jaguar.

Who pays for them as well?

There is not a strategic approach to the electrification of vehicles; I fear they will be given to the public authorities who won't have the finance to do it well.

Road pricing has to feature in it, how much they use of it. Lots of things cities are doing in the world, because it's so politically different, not enough scrutiny from TFL.
There should be a mandate for TFL with what should be smart usage, elements, work place levies.

Waltham forest new developments charge new car parking spaces because of the air quality. Nottingham does car parking space charging too. They are very crude though.

How do you retrofit such policies?

Wasn't Nottingham just a straight forward tax car parking a year?

Only with companies with over ten employees.

Part of the problem is hugely complicated, that is why it needs TFL to install a work place levy and that's what you need to do it. There is no space.

Is this the general consensus that the transport strategy needs to have some hard measures that include more sensitivities? I mean just trying to change tack, the main issue is mass movement of people commuting in central London. How do we deal with the demands of commuting? Are there other things we should be looking at?

Superhighways are used super efficiently for the radial highways. Two million lost journeys-, highways to tap-, Black friars bridge, if you build it it, we will use it. Though until there are alternatives-,

Assess who are the capacity blockers. School kids. My current gripe. With Freedom Passes, they take the bus for two stops to school or Greggs. You are pushing people off the bus. They are not walking to school. Why are they getting on the bus? It might be worth looking at some areas, financially saving, improving health and reducing capacity.

Is the focus in London to shift shorter journeys to walking?

Cyclists suffer the worst congestion. I will like to cycle into London, I just have to put up with what is in central. If the infrastructure could be twinned, I would be more prepared to make that jump.

A lot of good work has been done at the Olympics. Management that really works, and a lot of learnings to get people to travel at different times of the day. They can do work from home and it is
Not just a transport infrastructure thing. TFL are having those conversations dealing with people coming in and out.

TFL has innovation for funding, perhaps one or two outer hubs in an office environment. I can't work at home as I get distracted but I will go to office even though it's just down the road.

More of those co-working spaces.

Based in North Acton, there is remote and shared working. It is not just random people that get to go in. It is a good opportunity.

There must be public sector and academic funding, free membership to trial it to see if it works.

Reducing the need to travel, densification and multiple uses. Are there any particular opportunities to look about?

Developers who have mixed developments are happy. As discussed in the past, retirement neighbourhoods are also something to think about.

My understanding is that in the 50s and 60s when manufacturing was in London, there were factories that had to work with fixed hours. But now even with more service oriented jobs, they also start at nine. There should be new scopes to encourage these described different or flexible hours to avoid traffic. Trying to stagger working hours.

We have been talking about this the past 20 years, nothing has really changed. We talk about technology and home, but how do we get moving. All of us are still nine to five.

Travelling at half peak to outer London, working in Epping Forest I used to travel in an empty carriage. If that got halved or quartered, to travel in zone one, it would encourage them.

What are practical ways for schools to modify this, on average traffic is caused by being driven to school which can make a huge difference. Tick healthy boxes, but also remove traffic at a key time, thinking about timings moving from the peak times.

On my previous table, this is discussed, schools are not willing to change their times.

Get people to walk to school.

What are the barriers preventing people from walking to school? Perception of safety in inner London?

There is quite a lot of work in schools, but there is a lot of perception.

We have a lot of evidence of the barriers, distance from the school and safety. It is now much harder to liaise with schools now that they are now all independent from boroughs, there is no co-ordination.

We have done behavioural change studies, things improve 23% without infrastructure. 20 miles per hour limits, street closures. There are really practical things. In the Mayor manifesto, it mentions cleaner routes to school.

Definitely, school travel zones, we kind of touched on this. Given the residential size are there any particular interventions we should be looking at which we haven't been looking at?

Most data on inner most London of the air quality is based on modelling. In Haringey it is from a monitor in the park and one on the main road. It will show people in the area and close areas around the school.

Again, experts aren't trusted anymore.

But if people see it for themselves thy might trust it.

Global action plan have these very nice maps that they give out to people that map the exposure in the areas. But they are very static with information. But if we are able to be able to make it interactive,
People can decide if it is a phone app.

There are such mobile applications that exist.

People need to be aware of these things.

It has to be integrated into city mapper that everyone is using instead of some other app.

TFL harnesses data from the population that can inform policy and program.