

# Response to the Draft Mayor's Transport Strategy, replacement London Plan and the Draft Guidance on Developing the second London Local Implementation Plans

December 2009



**London TravelWatch** is the official body set up by Parliament to provide a voice for London's travelling public.

Our role is to:

- Speak up for transport users in discussions with policy-makers and the media;
- Consult with the transport industry, its regulators and funders on matters affecting users;
- Investigate complaints users have been unable to resolve with service providers, and;
- Monitor trends in service quality.

Our aim is to press in all that we do for a better travel experience all those living, working or visiting London and its surrounding region.

Published by:

London TravelWatch  
6 Middle Street  
London EC1A 7JA

Phone: 020 7505 9000  
Fax: 020 7505 9003

**Contents**

**Executive Summary ..... 1**

**1 Introduction ..... 3**

1.1 Overview of Transport in London ..... 3

**2 Public Draft – Mayor’s Transport Strategy ..... 6**

2.1 Introduction to London TravelWatch’s Response ..... 6

2.2 Vision ..... 6

2.3 Transport Proposals ..... 7

2.4 Conclusion ..... 29

**3 London Plan – Consultation Draft ..... 30**

3.1 Introduction to London TravelWatch’s response ..... 30

3.2 Spatial Strategy Chapter ..... 30

3.3 Transport Chapter ..... 31

**4 Draft Guidance on Developing the Second London Local  
Implementation Plans ..... 33**

4.1 Introduction to London TravelWatch’s response ..... 33

4.2 Questions ..... 34

**Appendix A – London TravelWatch Commentary on the 2009/10 TfL  
Business Plan Targets ..... 37**

**Appendix B – Small Rail Schemes ..... 51**

**Appendix C – Areas of Concern on the Road Network ..... 59**

**Appendix D – Glossary ..... 60**

---

## Executive Summary

In October 2009 the Mayor of London published the drafts for consultation for three documents:

- Transport Strategy – the plan for London’s transport over 20 years
- London Plan – an integrated plan for economic, environmental, transport and social strategy in London for the next 20 to 25 years
- Economic Development Strategy – policy for London’s economy.

Taken together these three documents form the basis for economic, transport, environment and social strategy in London for the next 20 to 25 years.

Additionally London Councils and Transport for London (TfL) are consulting on the updated guidance for the Local Implementation Plans (LIPs). This is a related document insofar as it details how the London boroughs are to implement the Mayor’s Transport Strategy (MTS).

This document is the London TravelWatch response to all three documents: the MTS: London Plan and the LIPs Guidance.

London TravelWatch supports much of the elements of the Transport Strategy and its six transport goals. While we support the schemes and investment suggested in the MTS, we have concerns about the scale and consequent funding requirement of these proposals, particularly for the railways, which will require considerable levels of investment. London TravelWatch seeks assurance that funding of the infrastructure investment requirements of the MTS is feasible in both the medium and longer term. In the final draft of the MTS we recommend that the investment schemes are prioritised by their benefits and value for money, including social benefits which are not easily quantified in monetary terms but which are nevertheless essential for the social cohesion of London as a whole. We are also concerned that the strategy and the London Plan do not pay sufficient attention to the transport accessibility of London’s healthcare and education facilities which will undergo rapid change during the plan period.

London TravelWatch is also concerned that there is too little commitment to delivering bus priority measures in the strategy. As congestion levels rise in London such schemes are vital to maintain the performance and reliability of bus services. The latest TfL Business Plan proposes cuts to bus services, whereas we believe that the MTS should have committed to the previously planned expansion of the London bus network.

The LIPs guidance to London boroughs under the previous system was too prescriptive in its approach. However, we are concerned that the new proposed LIPs guidance goes too far in the other direction. This is particularly the case in

relation to its lack of emphasis in the LIPs guidance on bus priority measures. A unified approach on this issue is necessary to ensure that the full benefits to bus network performance are realised.

## 1 Introduction

The Mayor of London is required by the GLA Act 1999 to have a transport strategy. In November 2008 the Mayor wrote a personal view of travel and transport in London entitled 'Way to go!' as a precursor to the statutory process. The Transport Strategy is one of three documents which set out Mayoral strategy. The other two documents are the London Plan, which provides planning policy for London and the Mayor's Economic Development Strategy, which sets out economic policy. All three of these documents have been published and are currently in a process of consultation.

All three documents along with the LIPs guidance are interrelated and for this reason London TravelWatch has responded to the transport issues in a single document. The Mayor's Economic Development Strategy has not been commented upon because it does not cover transport issues in detail.

### 1.1 Overview of Transport in London

#### 1.1.1 London's transport system is improving

Bus performance has improved immeasurably in recent years. There are more buses operating over a longer period of the day, more frequently and on more routes. Journey time has been maintained by a combination of:

- increased levels of bus priority;
- improved control by bus operators, facilitated recently by ibus and incentivised by the contractual arrangements between TfL and the operators;
- Oyster, which has led to reduced passenger loading times.

London has a bus fleet that is theoretically 100% accessible to those with limited mobility, the benefits of which are shared more widely by those with children, the elderly and passengers carrying heavy luggage.

The Underground, too, has seen improvements to capacity, performance and journey experience owing to improved management of services and significant investment in the infrastructure. More Underground stations are accessible to all.

The Docklands Light Railway(DLR) and London Tramlink are now firmly established parts of London's transport infrastructure and operate well. The DLR has expanded its services and capacity with more to come. Tramlink has seen some expansion in capacity and is now fully integrated within TfL.

London's overground railways are carrying more passengers than ever before. The London Overground concession and the new South Central franchise have raised the quality of station standards. The implementation of Oyster at all of London's National Rail stations is planned for January 2010.

A turn up and go overground rail network with station service standards to match the Underground has been an aspiration of London TravelWatch's Board and for many years.

Private motoring is, and will remain, a significant mode of transport, particularly in outer London. Congestion charging in central London has brought benefits to those who need or choose to use the car and are willing to pay the charge or have a dispensation because of disability.

Cycling has risen dramatically, albeit from a small base and concentrated in the inner London boroughs. The Mayor's championing of cycling has ensured cycling is seen, rightly, as an important transport mode in London.

Walking is now a mode that is recognised both as an integral part of the public transport trip and in its own right. Pedestrians are taken more account of when streets are redesigned. Significant recent progress has been made in removing barriers to walking, particularly on TfL's own road network. There are policies to improve the 'liveability' of the capital by improving the local pedestrian environment.

The system is becoming easier to navigate. There are better information systems, payment is easier to make, simpler to understand and more integrated. Access by mainstream transport modes is becoming easier for those with reduced mobility.

Road safety has improved with dramatic reductions in the numbers injured on London's roads.

### 1.1.2 However there are great challenges

The population is growing and the already overcrowded streets (carriageways and footways) and public transport systems will continue to come under pressure. Additional capacity is required, but cost and other constraints mean there are no simple answers. The analysis in the MTS demonstrates that even with huge sums invested in infrastructure, London's transport system will continue to be under pressure both in the short and longer term.

London's travellers will have increased expectations of the transport system which needs to be more comfortable, more reliable and better integrated. Londoners will demand increased accessibility for all.

Although beyond the competence of London TravelWatch to forecast the future of the economy and the probable investment in London's infrastructure, it is clear that there are challenges to public spending. The future external investment by Government at the level of the last decade must be in doubt.

The challenges are not just financial. Solutions to London's transport problems, even when agreed in principle, are difficult to apply in practice due to the politics of allocating road space and the many statutory and practical processes involved in delivering new infrastructure. Added to these pressures, there are targets of improved environmental performance to be met in terms of air quality and the reduction in greenhouse gases. Both will have a considerable influence on how London's transport system will develop.

Fares and charges for the use of transport will need to reflect both the desire on the part of passengers and users for value for money, but also to enable operators and authorities to plan, fund and develop the network. In recent years there have been various business planning policies that have assumed certain formula for changes to fares over a number of years. However, these have often been set aside to deal with the political and economic exigencies of the time. Users, however, value consistency in policy making in this area. We believe therefore that the MTS must contain a commitment to stability and consistency of how fares and charges are applied in practice.

The following response is based on the transport challenges faced by London and Londoners as outlined in our transport manifesto issued in January 2008. We called for:

- A Transport network accessible to all
- A fair deal for travellers on fares
- Health services that everyone can reach
- Room to breathe (reducing overcrowding on public transport)
- Priority for buses (on the road network)
- Transport systems that respect the environment
- Travelling with confidence (reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour)
- Walking with pleasure
- A road network that is fit for purpose

They also follow on from London TravelWatch's previous contributions to A 'Way to go!' and 'The Mayor's Transport Strategy, Statement Of Intent'.

## 2 Public Draft – Mayor’s Transport Strategy

### 2.1 Introduction to London TravelWatch’s Response

London TravelWatch’s response to the draft MTS follows the consultation questions. The questions relate to the following sections of the Strategy:

- Vision
- Transport Proposals

### 2.2 Vision

#### Vision

Please give your views on the Mayor’s vision for London’s transport system?

### London TravelWatch Response

London TravelWatch supports the six goals of the MTS:

- Support economic development and population growth
- Enhance quality of life of Londoners
- Improve safety and security of Londoners
- Improve transport opportunities for all Londoners
- Reduce transport’s contribution to climate change, and improve its resilience
- Support the delivery of the London 2012 Olympics and Paralympics Games and Legacy

We also support the associated challenges and outcomes outlined in figure 2 in the Strategy.

## 2.3 Transport Proposals

### Managing and enhancing the transport system

A range of proposals are set out in the draft strategy to manage and enhance London's transport system. For each of the areas below, please give your views on the measures proposed and the top priorities:

- National Rail, Crossrail, London Overground, DLR, Tramlink
- London Underground
- London's bus network
- Taxis, private hire, coaches, community transport
- Managing the road network
- The Blue Ribbon Network
- London's airports
- River crossings
- A more accessible transport system
- Integrating London's transport system and services

Please also describe any other measures that you think should be included in the strategy to manage and enhance our transport networks and services?

### London TravelWatch Response

- National Rail, Crossrail, London Overground, DLR, Tramlink
  - o National Rail and Crossrail

Much of the increase in transport capacity in both the medium and long term will be delivered by increases in National Rail capacity. Whilst we support the schemes and investment suggested we are nevertheless concerned that the scale of these proposals will require huge investment. We would want to be assured that funding of the infrastructure investment requirements of the MTS is feasible in both the medium and longer term.

As part of the analysis we want to see an assessment of broad costs and benefits of the various schemes in order that they can be prioritised should all the funding necessary not be forthcoming.

Station standards have been much improved as part of the London Overground concession and the new South Central franchise. As such we very strongly support proposal 13.

Providing additional capacity on the rail network is welcomed. London TravelWatch has long made the case for smaller scale infrastructure improvements<sup>1</sup> such as the East London Line extension, the Croyley Link, new platforms at Brockley, Brixton, West Hampstead (Chiltern Line) and Willesden Junction, new stations at Tufnell Park on the Barking to Gospel Oak Line, Lea Bridge and Ruckholt Road on the Stratford to Tottenham Hale line, and Park Royal on the Central and Piccadilly lines.

The Mayor's Transport Strategy, Statement of Intent introduced the concept of chordal links. These would facilitate orbital train journeys without the need to enter central London. We are disappointed that this concept has not been carried forward into this draft. London TravelWatch has previously promoted such links. New platforms at Brixton on the South London Line, Brockley, Park Royal, Tufnell Park and West Hampstead (Chiltern Line) would facilitate orbital journeys for example.

We would welcome an additional proposal by the Mayor to prepare a list of small scale infrastructure improvements such as those listed above to be progressed over the medium term. In Appendix B, London TravelWatch lists a range of small rail schemes, some of which are chordal links, which could be included in the MTS.

Passengers tell us that the local environmental quality of the railway is important to them. London TravelWatch has campaigned for many years on the issue of local environmental quality of the railway, particularly litter and rubbish on railway lands. There has been some recent progress with London Councils and Network Rail agreeing a memorandum of understanding to address this issue. However, the root of the problem is the lack of recognition of this issue in Network Rail's High Level Output Statement (HLOS) which means there is not enough priority or budget attached to this issue. We would welcome an additional proposal by the Mayor to work with the Department for Transport to have the local environmental quality of railway land recognised in the Network Rail HLOS. This could be as part of the current initiative to address the facilities and quality of national rail stations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Small is Beautiful – medium term rail improvements for the London area  
A consultation paper by the London Transport Users Committee, March 2004

o London Overground

London TravelWatch welcomes the improvement in standards of stations, rolling stock and services that London Overground has delivered. We see these standards as a benchmark for levels of service to the passenger for all rail services in London. We want to see the station standards of London Overground adopted more widely across the London rail network in future franchises.

o Docklands Light Railway

London TravelWatch would like to see a more explicit commitment to extensions of the DLR network. These extensions could relieve pressure on key tube corridors such as the Jubilee or District line.

o Tramlink

London TravelWatch has previously supported all of the proposed extensions to Croydon Tramlink. We would want to see these progressed as part of the strategy.

London TravelWatch is concerned that no other tram schemes have been considered to address gaps in strategic forecast demand. The West London and Cross River Trams are two past schemes which, could like the Crossrail 2, have been revaluated in the strategy.

We would welcome a further proposal by the Mayor to look again at the potential of tram schemes to provide public transport capacity where potential loading along transport corridors is such that schemes could be justified.

• London Underground

London TravelWatch supports the continued emphasis on the current upgrade programme for the Underground network. We are very keen that in the current negotiations with Tube Lines over the restated terms of the PPP, that an agreement is reached which sees the full level of investment delivered for passengers.

We welcome the inclusion of the Crossrail 2 and Bakerloo line extension, but see the key priority as the delivery of the full PPP upgrade programme. This applies both to the former Metronet programme and Tube Lines.

Our comments regarding the scale of investment in National Rail infrastructure and the need for a wider assessment of the costs and benefits would apply to both the Bakerloo and Crossrail 2 proposals.

- London's bus network

London TravelWatch raised the question of bus funding with TfL at our Board meeting on 10 October 2009. While we appreciate that the MTS does not rule out increased bus services, neither does it explicitly advocate it. In previous analysis by TfL contained in Transport 2025 it was suggested that prior to the opening of Crossrail 1 and other rail-based capacity, there would be a requirement for an additional 40% increase in bus services to meet passenger demand. The recently released TfL 2010/11 business plan shows bus kilometrage declining from 485.5 million in 2009 to 478 million km in 2018. In the previous business plan an increase of 3% was forecast between 2009 and 2018.

Whilst we accept that the recent fares increase and the fares proposal of RPI +2% would have the effect of reducing demand for bus services we nevertheless believe that the strategy should include an analysis of further bus demand. It does seem from Policy 32 that the level of bus services is to be determined on the basis of the size of subsidy rather than on passenger demand. We note that there is no equivalent policy associated with the funding of the Underground system.

We are concerned about the language used in the MTS to describe public funding of transport services in London. For bus service public funding is described as subsidy, whereas the funding of the Underground is described as investment. Both are important and have benefits both directly for passengers and more widely for Londoners.

Since the mid 1990s bus services in London have benefited from a series of bus priority programmes: the London Bus Priority Network; the London Bus Initiative and latterly the 3G programme. These all supported substantial increases in bus priority. The evidence is that these programmes of bus priority have protected bus service performance from delays caused by increasing congestion on London's roads. In addition to the performance benefits of bus priority schemes, the operational costs of running bus services can be reduced significantly by the implementation of bus priority. This latter point was reinforced in the recently TfL-commissioned report by KPMG.

Transport users do not recognise governmental or any other boundaries. They want a consistent level of service across London. It is important that the MTS sets out clear and consistent policies that will improve transport in London and both advocates for these policies and sets priorities. It is important that the borough Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) are consistent with the MTS and funding for the boroughs supports the MTS priorities. This is particularly important in promoting bus priority where there is most benefit from whole route priority across the different borough and highway authority boundaries, and where there are many local political difficulties in reallocating road space from its

present use. The new LIP guidance does not prioritise bus priority. Indeed it does not appear in the list of high profile outputs whereas street trees and electric cars, for example, do. This is a substantial weakness.

London TravelWatch is concerned that although bus priority is supported in the MTS, this support will not translate into bus priority on the ground as there is too little emphasis on the central role bus priority takes in improving bus services in London, nor is there a high profile project to deliver further bus priority. London TravelWatch does not accept that all modes are equal. The bus is clearly more space efficient than private vehicles in terms of people moving and this should be recognised in its priority use of road space.

In addition to the benefits that bus priority brings in terms of increased vehicle efficiency at peak times (and hence reduced costs) bus priority measures also give social benefits from the increased accessibility of bus stops, reduced journey times for emergency vehicles such as ambulances, fire engines and police vehicles, reduced overall journey times for all users and greater consistency of journey time.

London TravelWatch wants to see an additional policy specifically promoting whole route and other bus priority schemes on both the TLRN and the London borough's roads and a mechanism by which this may be delivered. This must be followed through in LIP guidance.

- Taxis, private hire, coaches, community transport

Taxis and private hire vehicles form part of the public transport system and such are variously accorded privileged access to the kerbside and bus lanes.

Though they are generally few in number, they are particularly inefficient users of the highway, and as such may well need to be excluded from such locations as very busy bus stops outside of the major rail termini and Oxford Street.

London TravelWatch would be concerned if parity of private hire vehicles (PHVs) with taxis meant them being allowed the same access to bus lanes.

Coaches are also public transport and use road space efficiently. As such, they should continue to be accorded privileged access to kerb space and some bus lanes. However, again in certain limited locations coaches can present difficulties to other road users. Therefore we support the work of the London coach forum.

Community transport fills a vital role in enabling many elderly and disabled Londoners to get to services and leisure activities.

- Managing the road network

Of all the transport challenges facing London and Londoners, managing the road network against a backdrop of increased demand will be the most difficult.

London TravelWatch has consistently supported congestion charging as a tool to manage demand and smooth traffic flow. We have specifically supported the Central London charging scheme and the Western Extension Zone, although we believed the latter should have been a separate zone to limit the number of short cross boundary journeys.

The income raised from congestion charging is significant and has funded some much needed increases in transport capacity, specifically increased bus services into the western and central zones funded from the western and central zone schemes.

It is remarkable for such a long term strategic document that there is almost no mention of any additional road capacity being provided during the plan period, other than by policies to make better use of existing capacity. It would be helpful if the strategy contained a specific list of schemes and proposals that could be openly commented upon. London TravelWatch's areas of concern are listed at Appendix C.

The MTS suggests that measures to smooth traffic flow will benefit travellers. This may be the case in the short term, but without complementary traffic management the benefits of smoothing traffic will be eroded if it encourages other additional journeys. Smarter travel initiatives are similarly suggested as a way of reducing demand on the road network. However, researchers into smarter travel insist that without complementary measures the benefits of smarter travel initiatives will be eroded by others using any released road capacity<sup>2</sup>.

In principle, we support measures to smooth traffic flow as long as they do not deter the slower (walking and cycling) modes or more space-efficient (mass transit) modes. We support awareness campaigns to change travel behaviour, however the MTS has to demonstrate how these initiatives can be implemented without the benefits being eroded over time by others using any released road capacity.

London TravelWatch has done much work to promote hospital travel plans, and improve the transport accessibility of all health care facilities. We see these as vital tools for hospitals to manage the travel they generate, but also as a means to understand the travel requirements of patients, visitors and staff.

---

2

<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/smarterchoices/ctwwt/smarterchoiceschangingtheway5769>

Unfortunately almost all of hospital travel plans we have looked at have been poor. Most are simply staff travel plans, although staff travel is a small part of travel to hospitals.

Hospital travel plans and, more generally, travel plans for schools, businesses and stations are a vital element in managing demand for travel in London. It is important that these are of good quality, and we would like to see an additional proposal to promote better travel planning in London.

In addition we would like to see greater value given to health related journeys by TfL, compared to the current planning guidance which give all trips an equal value. There are numerous examples of bus routes which terminate short of hospitals where a simple extension would reduce the need for passengers to interchange between one service or mode and another, as well as reduce journey times and increase the overall attractiveness of the public transport offer to these facilities.

- The Blue Ribbon Network

London TravelWatch supports proposals to make the most effective use of London's waterways for transport of goods and passengers.

- London's airports

London TravelWatch's remit does not extend to air travel. Our principal concern is therefore one of access to and from airports. The travel demand created by airports should be effectively served by additional public transport throughout London and not be at the expense of capacity presently used by Londoners on their everyday journeys. Our views on airport expansion are primarily upon the proposed links to the centres of London's population. The needs of travellers to the principal airports of Heathrow, Stansted, Gatwick and Luton should be factored into particularly rail and Underground strategy. The dispersal of airport travellers should not be only focused on main London termini but also consider a wider set of destinations. Airports can also act as regional transport interchanges for non-air related journeys – for example Heathrow Airport acts as a significant interchange point for coach services throughout the UK, to and from local services in and around West London, Surrey, Berkshire and Buckinghamshire. London TravelWatch therefore welcomes the increased connectivity to the existing airports that is provided by the following schemes:

- o Crossrail (Heathrow)
  - o Air Track (Heathrow)
  - o West Anglia Four Tracking (Stansted)
  - o Thameslink Programme (Luton and Gatwick)
- River crossings

Historically London TravelWatch has recognised that new river crossings will inevitably mean an increase in traffic that would impact on the local road system and particularly bus services.

If additional river crossings are promoted we would want to see traffic levels regulated by charging and facilities for public transport, cycling and walking integrated into any design. Protection for bus services, in the form of bus priority, would have to be included on the surrounding local bus network to ensure bus services are protected from any rise in congestion caused by additional general traffic.

- A more accessible transport system

Step-free access to transport is vital to provide an equitable level of accessibility to the entire population. The legacy of London's Victorian infrastructure has meant that much of the National Rail and Underground network is not accessible to people with disabilities. London TravelWatch sees it as a key priority to address this issue.

We welcome the recognition in the MTS that step-free must mean from street level to train level. There are stations where this has been interpreted as simply step-free to the platform without recognising the further height differential between platform and train.

Unlike the National Rail and Underground networks, buses play a unique role in providing a potentially accessible transport network available to all Londoners 24/7. All of London's buses are now fully accessible. However, not all bus stops are. This is being addressed by TfL, though we have some evidence that the conflicting demands for kerb space may mean boroughs are unwilling to allocate sufficient space to allow buses to fully pull into the kerb in order to properly deploy the ramps that wheelchair users need to access buses.

London TravelWatch wants to see an additional policy and associated targets, specifically promoting accessible bus stops on both the TLRN and the London borough roads. This would ensure the LIP process will deliver a fully accessible bus network in the medium term.

The TfL Business Plan 2009/10 slows the planned investment in transport accessibility on the bus and Underground network. In the 2008/9 Business Plan by 2017, 76% of bus stops would be accessible and have accessible footways. For the Underground 29% of stations would have step-free access by 2017/18. The 2010/11 Business Plan reduced these forecast values to only 65% and 26.7% respectively. London TravelWatch appreciates the constraints of public finance, but we think that this should be a priority for transport spending.

We would also reiterate previous comments that we would like to see an analysis of the costs and benefits of major accessibility schemes so that schemes can be properly prioritised.

Unlike on the Underground investment targeted at improving access at National Rail stations is to continue, but it is a programme that will have to continue into the foreseeable future.

We would want to see an additional proposal specifically supporting the continuation of the National Rail Access for All programme.

London TravelWatch supports the work of London borough mobility forums. They are an important element in highlighting some of the very detailed, local problems those with reduced mobility have. We would want to see an additional proposal that supports the continuation, and expansion of borough mobility forums.

- Integrating London's transport system and services

The integration of transport is paramount to achieving the most effective use of London's transport network. TfL, as a single organisation for much of public transport in London, is in a unique position to be able to integrate transport. The key priorities are the improvement of transport interchanges and the design of services to complement other modes of transport.

### Encouraging more cycling and walking

A range of proposals are set out in the draft strategy to bring about a cycling revolution. Please give your views on the measures proposed and the top priorities. Please also describe any other measures that you think should be included in the strategy which would encourage more cycling.

A range of proposals are set out in the draft strategy to make walking count. Please give your views on the measures proposed and the top priorities?

Please also describe any other measures that you think should be included in the strategy which would encourage more walking?

### London TravelWatch Response

- Cycling

London TravelWatch supports the Mayor's ambitious plans to increase the volume of cycling in London by 400% and welcomes the championing of cycling so that it is now regarded as a serious transport mode. However, we note that cycling is only ever likely to form a small part of the overall solution to the issues of congestion and capacity on the transport network. We have recently published our views which seek to promote cycling, reflecting both the views of cyclists and pedestrians. This is available at:

<http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/3765/get>

London TravelWatch's priority for cycling is training, education, and enforcement: we want cyclists to obey the rules and respect others. We are concerned about the blurring of the edges on the use of pavements. Cyclists may find it convenient or safer to use the pavements, traffic engineers are able to satisfy safety criteria by converting pavements to cycle tracks, but this often inconveniences elderly or vulnerable pedestrians. London TravelWatch wants to see cyclists on the carriageway and the carriageway, particularly at junctions, designed for safe cycling.

Whilst we support improvements to the roads cyclists use, which are often the main arterial roads, we have not yet seen the detailed proposals for Cycle Super Highways, and so do not yet know the effect of them on other modes.

We support the Cycle Hire scheme, with only one caveat. Care should be taken as to where cycle docking stations are located. Wherever possible they should be located on the carriageway or on very wide footways out of pedestrian flows.



- Walking

London TravelWatch believes that walking is an important mode in its own right, and integral to all other public and private transport journeys. Pedestrians want uncluttered, continuous and level footways, single stage, direct crossing on desire lines and a good ambience. However, clearly there are conflicting demands between the needs of motorised traffic and pedestrians. In town centres and at pedestrian crossings, we want to see pedestrians given priority.

We very much welcome the Better Streets initiative, as this has huge scope to create a civilised city and support public transport use. We believe more walking will benefit the social, environmental and economic development of the city. As part of this we support the removal of guard railing, clutter and gyratory systems, wider pavements, greening the streets and the creation of places pedestrians can linger.

### Improving safety and security

A range of proposals are set out in the draft strategy to improve safety and security. For each of the areas below, please give your views on the measures proposed and the top priority:

- Improving public transport safety
- Improving road safety
- Reducing crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour
- Responding to the threat of terrorism

Please also describe any other measures that you think should be included in the strategy to improve safety and security?

### London TravelWatch Response

Travel on public transport is generally safe, but the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour remains a problem.

London TravelWatch has welcomed the initiatives to increase station staffing at National Rail stations through the London Overground concession and the South Central franchise and we welcome the commitment within the strategy to replicate this initiative as other franchises are delivered.

We have welcomed the Mayor's initiatives to deploy more Metropolitan Police officers on London's bus network and British Transport Police (BTP) officers on National Rail and Underground services.

London TravelWatch has welcomed the development of neighbourhood policing as part of the BTP's new approach to policing and has encouraged the force to ensure they are joined up with the local police, particularly the Safer Neighbourhood police teams. We would welcome the Mayor's support for this.

London TravelWatch has discussed roads policing with the City of London who put considerable resources into enforcing the rules of the roads, particularly with respect to cyclists. We have heard from the Metropolitan Police Service about their work to remove uninsured vehicles from London's roads. We have supported TfL's 'share the roads' campaigns but believe educational campaigns need to be backed up with enforcement. We would like to see more roads policing in London generally.

Road safety in London has improved markedly due to a combination of engineering, enforcement, and education. We have supported the London Road

Safety Plan with one observation: we felt more emphasis needed to be placed on the inherent road safety benefits of modal switch to bus travel.

London TravelWatch has expressed its concerns regarding the re-introduction of open platform buses as we believe that there is historical evidence that this is an inherently unsafe design.

There would seem to be a contradiction between the policy of allowing the use of motorcyclists into bus lanes and the construction of cycle lanes designed to protect cyclists from motor traffic. We have seen some early analysis which seems to suggest this may not be an issue, but would nevertheless urge caution on this matter.

### Improving London's environment

A range of proposals are set out in the draft strategy to improve London's environment. For each of the areas below, please give your views on the measures proposed and the top priorities:

- Creating 'better streets'
- Improving noise impacts
- Enhancing transport's contribution to the natural environment
- Improving air quality

Please also describe any other measures that you think should be included in the strategy to improve London's environment?

### London TravelWatch Response

London TravelWatch's remit limits it to consideration of transport issues. That said, how Londoners travel clearly has a direct impact on the local and global environment. External targets, particularly reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> and other emissions will have a very important impact on policy choices.

London TravelWatch believes its core policies will have a beneficial impact on the environment.

It should be noted that although introducing ever cleaner buses (proposal 91) is a worthy aim the effect of this may well be to increase the fuel used and thus CO<sub>2</sub> emitted. Euro 5 engines are very clean. Euro 6 would be cleaner still, but at some cost in terms of fuel efficiency.

By far the best environmental benefit can be obtained by getting more car users onto buses and other forms of public transport, or walking or cycling, or a combination of modes.

### **Reducing transport's contribution to climate change and improving its resilience**

A range of proposals are set out in the draft strategy to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Please give your views on the measures proposed and the top priorities. Please also describe any other measures that you think should be included in the strategy which would reduce transport's contribution to climate change.

A range of proposals are set out in the draft strategy to increase the resilience of the transport system and adaptation to climate change.

Please give your views on the measures proposed and the top priorities?

Please also describe any other measures that you think should be included in the strategy which would improve resilience to climate change?

### **London TravelWatch Response**

London TravelWatch's remit limits it to consideration of transport issues. That said, how Londoners travel clearly has a direct impact on the local and global environment. External targets, particularly reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> and other emissions, will have a very important impact on policy choices.

London TravelWatch believes its core policies as will have a beneficial impact on the environment.

The MTS allows for the introduction of road user charging, indeed the implication of figure 58 in the MTS is that without road user charging, the Mayor will fall considerably short of the CO<sub>2</sub> target he has accepted.

Smarter travel initiatives are proposed (proposal 95). While we support initiatives to change travel behaviour we are concerned that over time the benefits will be eroded by others using any released road space. There needs to be complementary measures to ensure the benefits of travel change behaviour are not eroded over time.

### Managing the demand for travel

A range of proposals are set out in the draft strategy to manage the demand for travel. For each of the areas below, please give your views on the measures proposed and the top priorities:

- Better journey planning and information
- Smarter transport for both people and freight
- Fares and ticketing
- Parking and loading

Please also describe any other measures that you think should be included in the strategy to manage the demand for travel?

### London TravelWatch Response

- Better journey planning and information

London TravelWatch supports proposals designed to influence travel behaviour. However, there is a danger that too much emphasis is placed in this intervention alone. Researchers in the field suggest that while it is possible to change travel behaviour and influence modal choice, this is both limited and there needs to be mechanisms to ensure that any benefits are not eroded over time by others simply using up any released road space. Researchers suggest that complementary measures such as the reallocation of road space to other modes or the introduction of road user charging.

- Smarter transport for both people and freight

London TravelWatch's remit does not extend to freight and services transport. However we do broadly support proposals to improve freight services. The key issue is the balance between freight deliveries that use the highway to load and unload, and traffic movement on these roads, particularly on bus routes.

London TravelWatch believes there is much greater scope for smarter travel initiatives, particularly flowing from work place, school, station and hospital travel plans.

We have done much work on access to healthcare facilities and have been shocked by the poor quality of hospital travel plans. Many of hospital travel plans are simply staff travel plans, no account being taken of either patients or visitors. Once written they are ignored.

Both the MTS and the London Plan must promote better quality travel plans across a wider number of organisations that generate travel in London. We want to see quality travel plans for hospitals, schools, businesses and stations.

- Fares and ticketing

The balance between the contribution of fares and public investment is difficult to define and indeed these are not the only two methods of funding the transport network in London. Congestion charging has meant a huge additional income stream has been generated to fund transport in London.

There have been a number of attempts by both TfL and train operators to try and manage demand by the use of the price mechanism in recent years. However, these have been met with varying degrees of success, as often passengers do not have the ability to vary their travel significantly due to the demands of employment or family commitments. This has meant that often people on low incomes have found themselves having to bear significant rises in transport costs as a result of a change in regulation, whilst those on higher incomes and greater flexibility, have benefitted from cheaper fares. London TravelWatch believes that although there will be some relationship with fares to manage demand, that the scope for significant changes in behaviour by users is limited.

- Parking and loading

London TravelWatch believes that buses should take priority on bus routes and that loading and waiting restrictions should apply where and when congestion occurs so as to minimise inconvenience to passengers and in support of policies to make bus travel more attractive, even where it takes capacity away from other users. Legitimate loading requirements of businesses on these roads should be accommodated either in adjacent side streets or at hours when buses are least delayed by congestion.

London TravelWatch recognises that in some instances there will be a need to inset loading bays and that as a last resort this is allowed for in the TfL street design manual. However we are very clear that using the footways for loading should be the last resort.

### Road user charging for economic and environmental aims

Despite all the improvements outlined in the draft strategy, increasing population and demand for travel means congestion and CO2 emissions might still be a significant problem for London. The draft strategy proposes that in this case it may be necessary to introduce a fair system of road user charging to reduce congestion.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that a fair system of managing demand for road use should be used if necessary?

### London TravelWatch Response

London TravelWatch has consistently supported the implementation of road user pricing (congestion charging and charging for parking) in London both in principle and in practice. The central London scheme has demonstrated that road user charging has the benefit of both managing the demand on the road network and yielding substantial sums for investment in the transport system.

We recognise that the present forms of charging are crude and would like to see more sophisticated charging systems that charge at different levels for the time of day and part of the network being used, for example.

The analysis in the MTS demonstrates clearly that no amount of additional rail infrastructure, cycling, walking, better road management, electric cars and the many other initiatives (which are laudable) on their own or in combination will result in less congestion on London's roads given the level of growth forecast in both population and employment.

London TravelWatch acknowledges the role road user pricing may play in managing road congestion in London. However, we would want further work to be done and presented so that we and users can understand its scope and impacts if it were to be implemented more widely.

### Western Extension zone

The draft strategy proposes to remove the Western Extension to the Congestion Charging scheme and introduce measures (including improved traffic control systems and a roadworks permit scheme) to mitigate as far as possible the impact of its removal.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to remove the Western Extension?

### London TravelWatch Response

The Western Extension Zone has reduced the number of private vehicles inside the zone, reducing congestion, improving bus performance and enabling road space to be reallocated to pedestrians and bus services. It has provided a substantial income that has directly supported additional bus services into the zone. There will have been some additional journeys into the central zone, thus marginally reducing the benefits of that zone.

None of the suggested mitigation proposals will deal with the congestion caused by the return of an additional ten to 15% more vehicles if the zone is abolished.

London TravelWatch supported a separate Western Extension zone, which would have had the effect of limiting the number of short cross-boundary journeys and wants to see road user charging develop to be more sophisticated. Nevertheless, we support the retention of the Western Extension Zone.

### Priorities

Of all the different measures that are proposed, please give your views on what the top priorities are for London.

### London TravelWatch Response

There are many priorities we and the transport users we represent want to see in the short term:

1. A much greater support for bus priority both whole route and opportunistic management of parking and loading across the bus network to ensure buses have the priority that accords with their efficiency for moving people;
2. That the bus network continues to grow to cover greater areas of London and over longer hours of operation in accord with TfL's bus planning guidance.
3. That the bus stop accessibility programme is delivered on time.
4. We want further work to be done and presented so that we and users can understand the scope and impacts of the wider implementation of road user charging.
5. The Better Streets initiatives progressed.

In the medium term:

1. Delivery of the Underground PPP Programme in full
2. Delivery of National Rail HLOS projects

In the longer term:

1. Delivery of the proposed infrastructure projects

### Are there any areas proposed that you disagree with?

The Mayor's Transport Strategy sets out six strategic goals for London. Please give us your views on the extent to which you think the measures set out in the strategy will assist in meeting these.

### London TravelWatch Response

While we support the vision for transport in London, we are concerned that the proposals do not deal adequately with the very difficult choices that have to be made particularly:

1. How demand for road space is managed against a backdrop of rising demand and the desire to improve liveability – Better Streets;
2. How the major infrastructure proposed beyond 2018 will be funded;
3. The lack of emphasis for bus priority and a mechanism to deliver it. We believe this will translate into the lack of progress in implementing much needed bus priority on the TLRN and borough roads.

While we welcome additional infrastructure, more cycling and Better Streets etc. this does not properly quantify what transport users want from the transport networks they use. They are less interested in the means than the ends. What travellers want is more civilised, reliable, frequent journeys.

As such we would want to see quantified goals akin to those in TfL's business plan. For example passengers want low 'excess waiting times' and reasonable levels of crowding on public transport and less congestion on the roads. We think the 'excess waiting times' for buses and the Underground are acceptable in the TfL Business Plan and should be maintained, but overcrowding on some train services and congestion on the roads is unacceptable. The MTS should have quantified targets for these parameters.

Appendix A uses the TfL Business Plan targets as a basis for output targets and suggests some further targets on crowding and congestion. In each case we have commented on each target as either acceptable or in need of improvement.

We want to see these, or similar, targets included in the MTS.

The strategy highlights the importance of partnership working with the NHS to improve access to health, but no specific policies or proposals are promoted in the MTS. Five percent of all trips generated are by healthcare related journeys, London TravelWatch therefore recommends that more emphasis be placed on improvements in access to healthcare facilities.

## 2.4 Conclusion

London TravelWatch supports the vision for transport in London. However, we have concerns about the detail of the way in which difficult choices are approached. The strategy highlights the demand for transport but does not address how the major projects proposed to meet this demand will be funded. In particular the MTS does not prioritise the investments. We want to see targets, similar to those listed in Appendix A, included in the MTS to allow its implementation to be quantified.

London TravelWatch appreciates that road user charging is suggested as a solution to congestion and environmental impacts of road transport. However, no explicit commitment is made to timing of the introduction of a wider charging scheme or when it would be introduced. This is despite the importance the MTS attaches to road user charging in relation to the impact that it is forecast to have on the key issues of road congestion and the environment. We want to see more work done to understand the role of road user charging in the MTS.

Our key priorities in the short term are for much greater support for bus priority and that the bus network continues to grow to cover greater areas of London. In the medium term we want to see the delivery of planned levels of investment in the Underground PPP and HLOS. For the longer term, more substantial investments are needed according to the demand forecasts in the MTS. These investments should be ranked in terms of their benefits and value for money to the tax-payer.

## 3 London Plan – Consultation Draft

### 3.1 Introduction to London TravelWatch's response

The London Plan is the overall strategic plan controlling and promoting London's economic, social and environmental development.

The Plan contains chapters on spatial development, housing, employment, climate change and transport. Our comments will focus on the spatial development chapter (2) and the transport chapter (6)

Unlike the MTS it will be subject to independent inspection. It will therefore need to be both internally consistent and conform to national planning policy.

Members have noted at their 10 October 2009 Board meeting that there were some differences in the lists of proposed infrastructure schemes when comparing the London Plan to the MTS. We were assured that these were drafting errors and both lists would be aligned.

While London TravelWatch has no in-principle view as to how London develops it is vital that it does so in a way in which the needs of its travellers are met in a reasonably civilised manner and London develops to be a more tranquil place to live, work and travel around.

London TravelWatch's main concern is the credibility of a London Plan that relies so heavily on the external funding of so much radial infrastructure and a belief that a mixture of increased, cycling, bus and rail use can be encouraged without complementary restraint policies, such as road user charging. This flaw in the Plan is demonstrated well in Figure 63 of the MTS – no amount of mega rail schemes, better management of the road network nor increases in cycling etc. will reduce the forecast rise in road congestion with its consequences for the more liveable London to which the Mayor aspires.

### 3.2 Spatial Strategy Chapter

The Draft London Plan builds on its predecessor insofar as it seeks to intensify London's built form within London's existing boundaries. It directs development particularly to town centres and corridors that can be well served by public transport so as not to exacerbate already high levels of congestion.

We cannot give the Plan unqualified support, however as there is a fundamental lack of credibility of the Plan. It seeks to widen, rather than narrow the spatial

mismatch of jobs and housing, and relies on proposals for massive new public transport infrastructure projects to marry the two.

The Plan supports the Mayor's commitments to outer London by emphasising the needs of outer London centres. Though there are no new substantive proposals, this is welcome as it may well promote reverse commuting and so utilise presently empty transport capacity.

Many of the policies are welcome, however the Plan does not include policies to promote the introduction of road user charging preferring to hope that other policies will result in a reduction in congestion. The MTS demonstrates that this is unlikely.

London TravelWatch acknowledges the role road user pricing may play in managing road congestion in London. However, we want further work to be done and presented so that we and users can understand its scope and impacts if it were to be implemented more widely.

We note in chapter 6 the list of indicative schemes includes: "Continue to work with national Government on road pricing feasibility programme", however we would want to see an explicit policy in the Plan that promotes and plans for the extension of road user charging to tackle congestion on London's road network.

### 3.3 Transport Chapter

London TravelWatch supports spatial policies designed to reduce the need to travel and policies to promote public transport, cycling and walking. We want development only where adequate transport capacity is available or is planned.

We are therefore supportive of many of the policies in chapter 6.

However, we are concerned that the issue of road user charging is not promoted by this Plan.

While we are supportive of improving public transport, cycling and walking and initiatives such as smarter travel and highway works permitting, they will not, on their own address the issue of congestion given the backdrop of rising population and unemployment that the Plan forecasts. Smoothing traffic flow and smarter travel initiatives may result in more road network capacity and promote modal switch, but there is evidence that without road user charging any benefits will be eroded over time by others choosing to make additional journeys. There needs to be mechanisms to ensure the benefits of changing travel behaviour and traffic smoothing initiatives are not eroded over time.

Our other concern is the reliance in the Plan on the external funding and delivery of many major radial rail schemes.

Although beyond the competence of London TravelWatch to forecast the future of the economy and the probable investment in London's infrastructure it is clear that there are challenges to public spending. The external investment by Government at the level of this last decade must be in doubt for future years.

We know that major rail schemes often suffer from delays in receiving statutory approvals. Thameslink 2000 was planned as a new rail network for the year 2000. It will probably now not be complete until 2015 after the Olympic Games in 2012 and Crossrail 1 has been planned for a generation.

There are a number of smaller rail schemes that would improve reliability and deliver increased capacity such as the East London Line extension, the Croyley Link, new platforms at Brockley, Brixton and Willesden Junction, new stations at Tufnell Park on the Barking to Gospel Oak Line, Lea Bridge and Ruckholt Road on the Stratford to Tottenham Hale line. A full list of our aspirations is included in Appendix B. We would want to see these and other small schemes included in table 6.3.

## 4 Draft Guidance on Developing the Second London Local Implementation Plans

### 4.1 Introduction to London TravelWatch's response

The London boroughs' Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) are an important part of delivering the Mayor's Transport Strategy, without local knowledge and local delivery of schemes none of the objectives of the MTS can be achieved.

We recognise that the previous process was flawed. It was overly prescriptive, bureaucratic and most importantly, did not call for a programme of actual schemes over the life of the plan.

As well as the change to the guidance there have also been changes to the mechanism for dividing the funding 'pot'. Funding has now been devolved to the London boroughs. Previously, boroughs bid against many different themes: maintenance; road safety; bus priority etc. Now funding is allocated according to a formula and there is little prescription as to how the MTS should be achieved.

We understand this approach was promoted and developed by the London Councils.

Travellers in London take no interest in geographical or other boundaries. They want to see consistent policies to promote public transport, cycling and walking. London TravelWatch would clearly be concerned if this new guidance led to each of the London boroughs introducing contradictory proposals, particularly with respect to support for whole route bus priority across London .

There is some evidence (Ealing Council's recent proposals) that boroughs are removing bus priority for reasons other than improving bus service performance.

We are concerned that the guidance contains six 'high profile outputs': cycle highway schemes, cycle parking, electric parking points, better streets, cleaner local authority vehicles, net increase in street trees, but nothing on bus priority.

London TravelWatch wants to see bus priority supported and reported as a high profile output.

## 4.2 Questions

**Is it clear what is required of the boroughs in producing their second LIPs, in particular in relation to key changes since LIPs were first prepared in 2004 – 2007?**

### London TravelWatch Response

The guidance seems clear as to the requirements and key changes.

**Is it clear what is required in a LIP and what is discretionary?**

### London TravelWatch Response

The guidance seems clear.

**Do you have any views on whether this should change?**

### London TravelWatch Response

One of the key challenges for the London boroughs as described in the MTS is “delivering an efficient and effective transport system for people and goods”. One of the key outcomes is to “improve public transport reliability”. This will mean implementing bus priority schemes across whole routes and opportunistically. There is London Plan and MTS support for bus priority, but there is hardly a mention in the LIP guidance. It is particularly disappointing that the ‘high profile outputs’ do not specifically require reporting of the implementation of bus priority.

Improving bus performance is of strategic importance to London’s transport system. It is disappointing that London Councils do not recognise this.

A second outcome is “Smoothing traffic flow (managing road congestion and improving journey time reliability)” Again it is particularly disappointing that a ‘high profile output’ is not reporting on congestion levels on London’s roads.

A further outcome is “improving the physical accessibility of the transport system”. We would welcome reporting of progress with bus stop accessibility as a ‘high profile output’.

London TravelWatch commented on many of first LIPs. They were full of many worthy policy statements, but very weak on actual proposals and programmes beyond the first year. We would like to see the boroughs think ahead as to which, for example, corridors they were to address not just in the first year, but subsequent years.

In developing their corridor work London boroughs need to work proactively with neighbouring boroughs, particularly where corridors are part of whole route bus priority schemes. We do not want some boroughs putting in bus priority, whilst others take it out.

**What aspects of the second LIP process and Guidance are the boroughs and other organisations likely to find most challenging? How can TfL provide additional assistance to boroughs to better understand and**

### London TravelWatch Response

Tackling road congestion, against a backdrop of rising population and employment, will be the single most challenging aspect for the boroughs. Indeed without any commitment to promote and implement road user charging, it seems that congestion is likely to rise on London’s roads.

The second difficult challenge will be implementing bus priority. London boroughs have difficulties delivering bus priority due to the pressure from local vested interest. London TravelWatch has consistently urged TfL to advocate more strongly for bus priority. Historically, TfL has supported boroughs in this, but often only as a reaction to objections. We want TfL to raise the profile of bus priority and its importance as part of the MTS.

**Are the proposed mandatory performance indicators appropriate for boroughs?**

**London TravelWatch Response**

These are all welcome. An additional indicator of levels of road congestion would be welcome.

**Do you have any views on how best to measure and monitor the ‘output’ indicators?**

**London TravelWatch Response**

None

**Do you have any views on the proposed timetables for completing your LIPs?**

**London TravelWatch Response**

None.

## Appendix A – London TravelWatch Commentary on the 2009/10 TfL Business Plan

### Targets

London TravelWatch has commented on the TfL 2009/10 Business Plan Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to suggest quantified targets for the Mayor’s Transport Strategy. Our comments have been colour coded as follows:

- Red – unacceptable performance in need of revision, or an additional measure is required
- Amber – some concerns and need for revision
- Green – London TravelWatch supports this target

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
Quality of Life												
	London Underground: customer satisfaction overall	Score	79	79	80	81	82	82	83	83	84	We support the increase in the KPI for LU customer satisfaction
	Bus Customer satisfaction: overall	Score	80	79	79	78	78	78	78	78	78	London TravelWatch is concerned at the planned decrease in customer satisfaction for Buses

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
	Dockland Light Railway Customer satisfaction: overall	Score	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	While this is a high target we recommend consideration of an increase in the KPI to maintain high standards
	London Overground Customer satisfaction: overall	Score	73	75	76	78	80	80	81	81	81	We support the increase in the KPI for LOROL's customer satisfaction
	London Trams Customer satisfaction: overall	Score	85.5	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	We support the increase in the KPI for Tramlink's customer satisfaction
	Congestion Charging Customer satisfaction: overall	Score	76	84	84	85	85	86	86	87	87	We support the increase in the KPI for the Congestion Charging customer satisfaction
	Dial-a-ride Customer satisfaction: overall	Score	93	93	93	93	93	93	93	93	93	London TravelWatch is concerned about this KPI as D-a-r has been failing to reach this target

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
	Total NOx emissions	Tonnes	7,115	6,992	6,820	6,605	6,277	5,937	5,589	5,241	4,898	We support this KPI
	Total PM(10)	Tonnes	125	122	118	113	108	102	96	92	86	We support this KPI
	Crowding levels on LOROL											An additional Target is suggested by London TravelWatch
	Crowding levels on London Underground											An additional Target is suggested by London TravelWatch
	Crowding levels on London Buses											An additional Target is suggested by London TravelWatch
Safety and Security												
	Reduction in kill/serious injuries London wide 1994-1998 base	%	47.8	50								We support this KPI
	Reduction in kill/serious injuries London wide 2004-2008 base	%			4.7	9.4	14.1	18.9	23.6	28.3	33	We support this KPI

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
	London Underground: customer major injuries per million journeys	No.	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	We support this KPI
	London Underground: recorded crime per million journeys	No.	13.3	12.9	12.7	12.9	12.7	12.6	12.5	12.4	12.3	We are concerned that this target has worsened since 2008s Business Plan
	Bus: recorded crime per million journeys	No.	11	10.2	10.2	10.3	10.1	10	9.8	9.6	9.3	We are concerned that this target has worsened since 2008s Business Plan
	Londoners whose use of public transport is significantly affected by crime and disorder concerns	%	32.5	28	27	27	26.5	26	25.5	25	24	We support this KPI
Economic development and growth												
	London Underground: excess journey time	Mins	6.62	6.54	6.41	6.05	5.79	5.63	5.38	5.35	5.24	We support this KPI

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
	Bus: excess wait time - high frequency routes	Mins	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	London TravelWatch is concerned that Bus EWT is planned to increase by 2018
	London Overground: PPM MAA	%	93.4	93.2	94	94.2	94.2	94.2	94.2	94.2	94.2	We support this KPI
	Dockland Light Railway: on-time performance	%	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	We support this KPI
	London Underground: % scheduled service operation	%	96.3	96.6	96.8	97.6	97.6	97.3	97.8	97.8	97.8	We support this KPI
	Bus: % scheduled service operation	%	97.4	97.4	97.3	97.2	97.2	97.1	97.1	97.1	97	London TravelWatch is concerned at the reduction in this target
	Docklands Light Railway: % scheduled service operation	%	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	We support this KPI
	London Trams: % scheduled service operation	%	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	We support this KPI

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
	London River Services: % scheduled service operation	%	98.7	98.5	98.5	98.5	98.5	98.5	98.5	98.5	98.5	This KPI should not reduce over time
	*Surface transport: person journey time (roads)	Sec	264	265	265	265	265	265	265	265	265	London TravelWatch is concerned that road congestion is planned to increase
	Cycling journeys: TfL Road Network	Index	223	240	256	272	289	305	321	337	354	We support this KPI
Climate Change												
	Total CO2 Emissions	0,00 Tonnes	1,864	1,844	1,838	1,860	1,875	1,838	1,817	1,792	1,816	Not of direct concern to London TravelWatch's remit
	Improved environmental performance in Head Office portfolio	%	55.25	70.9	94.37	96.07	98.43	98.44	99.09	98.97	100	Not of direct concern to London TravelWatch's remit
Transport opportunity												

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
	London Underground: accessible step-free to platforms	%	21.9	23	24.1	24.1	24.1	24.4	24.4	25.2	26.7	London TravelWatch is concerned that the target has reduced since the last Business Plan
	London Overground: accessible step-free to platforms	%	39.3	35.9	44.9	44.9	44.9	47.4	47.4	47.4	47.4	London We support this KPI
	London Trams: accessible step-free to platforms	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	We support this KPI
	Bus stops: accessible with accessible footways	%	50	51	53	55	57	59	61	63	65	London TravelWatch is concerned that the target has reduced since the last Business Plan
	London Underground: stations enhanced (PPP programme)	%	60.1	67.7	68.8	70	71.1	72.6	73.8	75.3	76.8	London TravelWatch is concerned that the target has reduced since the last Business Plan
Economic development and growth												

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
	London Underground: lost infrastructure	Million Hrs	24.7	25.5	24.5	24.1	23.5	22.9	22	21.8	21.6	We support this KPI
	London Underground: increase peak capacity into central London	%	1.8	5.1	8	10.7	10.7	12.8	15.4	19.9	26.2	We support this KPI
	State of good - repair - % of road assets not in good repair	%	6.7	6.7	7.1	7.1	7.2	7.3	7.7	8	8.2	We are concerned that this target is planned to get worse by 2018
	Freight services: sing-up to Freight operators recognition scheme	No.	500	1,550	2,075	2,575	3,075	3,575	4,050	4,525	5,000	Not of direct concern to London TravelWatch's remit
	London Underground: Train km	Million	70.8	71.9	73.3	76.7	81.7	81.5	81.9	81.9	81.9	We support this KPI
	Bus: bus km	Million	485.5	482	482	484	480	478	477	478	478	London TravelWatch is concerned that the number of bus kilometres will reduce by 2018

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
	Docklands Light Railway: train km	Million	4.4	5.6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	London TravelWatch is concerned that the number of bus kilometres will reduce by 2018
	London Overground: train km	Million	2.3	4.1	4.9	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	We support this KPI
	London Trams: train km	Million	2.5	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	We support this KPI
	London Underground: Passenger Journeys	Million	1,047	1,037	1,057	1,100	1,132	1,180	1,220	1,237	1,229	Volume forecast therefore not commented upon
	Bus: Passenger Journeys	Million	2,250	2,183	2,181	2,204	2,227	2,252	2,268	2,277	2,278	Volume forecast therefore not commented upon
	Docklands Light Railway: Passenger Journeys	Million	67.5	75.6	83.4	89.7	99.9	107.1	114.4	120.8	122.2	Volume forecast therefore not commented upon
	London Overground: Passenger Journeys	Million	27.1	51.5	64.9	71.5	75.2	77.7	80	81.8	83.3	Volume forecast therefore not commented upon

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
	London Trams: Passenger Journeys	Million	27.3	27.8	27.9	28.3	28.9	29.5	30.1	30.7	31.3	Volume forecast therefore not commented upon
	Delivery of signal modernisation	No. of sites	N/A	150	148	191	189	184	200	186	195	We support this KPI
	Traffic signal availability	%	99.1	99.1	99.1	99.1	99.1	99.1	99.2	99.25	99.3	We support this KPI
Climate Change												
	London underground traction energy per passenger journey	Watts	944	982	979	1,052	1,095	1,053	1,022	1,007	1,002	Not of direct concern to London TravelWatch's remit
Transport opportunity												
	Dial-a-ride: number of journeys	Million	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	London TravelWatch is concerned by this target because d-a-r has failed to achieve this level of journeys
Quality of Life												

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
	London Underground: customer satisfaction - safety and security	Score	83	83	83	83	83	83	83	83	84	We support this KPI
	Docklands light railway: customer satisfaction - safety and security	Score	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	We support this KPI
	London Underground: customer satisfaction - Information	Score	81	81	82	83	84	84	84	84	84	We support this KPI
	Bus: customer satisfaction - Information	Score	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	London TravelWatch has concerns because the overall customer satisfaction is forecast to fall
	Docklands Light Railway: customer satisfaction - Information	Score	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	We support this KPI
	Journey planner - number of solutions offered	Million per year	900	990	1,089.00	1,197.90	1,197.90	1,197.90	1,197.90	1,197.90	1,197.90	Volume forecast therefore not commented upon

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
	Successful online customer interactions											
	* Successful completions of Congestion Changing transactions	%	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	Volume forecast therefore not commented upon
	* Successful completions of Oyster purchases	%	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	Volume forecast therefore not commented upon
	* Successful completions of Journey planning enquiries	%	68	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	Volume forecast therefore not commented upon
	LEZ - compliant vehicles phase 2	%	94	95	96	97	98	99	99			We support this KPI
	Reduction in car use across participating schools	%	N/A	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	We support this KPI
	Buses at Euro III and above	%	76.4	78	83	88	93	98	100	100	100	The implementation of this target has been delayed
Safety and Security												

		Units	Forecast	Plan Projections								London TravelWatch Commentary
			2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	
	Reduction in killed/seriously injured (TfL Road Network) from 1994 - 1998 base	%	46	50								We support this KPI
	Reduction in killed/seriously injured (TfL Road Network) from 2004-2008 base	%			4.7	9.4	14.1	18.9	23.6	28.3	33	We support this KPI
	Reduction in Children killed/seriously injured (London Wide) from 1994 - 1998 base	%	68	70								We support this KPI
	Reduction in Children killed/seriously injured (London Wide) from 2004-2008 base	%			4.7	9.4	14.1	18.9	23.6	28.3	33	We support this KPI
	Street Lights Operating	%	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	We support this KPI
	Dangerous carriageway defect repaired in 24 hours	%	N/A	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	We support this KPI



## Appendix B – Small Rail Schemes

The table below lists a series of small schemes which could be implemented to improve connectivity on London’s National Rail network. London TravelWatch would like to see the inclusion of such small rail schemes and chordal links in the Mayor’s Transport Strategy.

Location	Project	London TravelWatch commentary
Brockley	New platforms on Nunhead – Lewisham line	<p>Dartford – Victoria trains currently pass over the London Bridge – Forest Hill – Croydon / Crystal Palace metro route at Brockley station.</p> <p>Platforms on this line would provide the locality with new direct services via Lewisham and Peckham, and open up new connectional opportunities between the two routes.</p>
Camberwell	New station between Elephant & Castle and Loughborough Jct. / Denmark Hill (Thameslink / South Eastern services)	<p>Camberwell is a major area of south London without access to the tube or to National Rail.</p> <p>Construction of a new station may be relatively expensive, as the railway runs on a four-track viaduct and is closely hemmed in by buildings.</p>
Park Royal / Hangar Lane	Replacement station for Park Royal (Piccadilly line) and Hangar Lane (Central line) stations.	This would enable greater connectivity of these two lines in north west London and also open up the area for redevelopment.

Location	Project	London TravelWatch commentary
Brixton	New platforms on South London line tracks	<p>South London line trains (London Bridge – Victoria) presently run through Brixton without stopping because there are no platforms on its tracks. Construction of platforms would enable the line to serve this busy town centre, and provide interchange with the Orpington – Victoria via Bromley and Herne Hill service.</p> <p>The TfL study shows that construction costs would be high. However there has not yet been any public debate and it may be that costs could be cut if the project scope could be reduced.</p> <p>The benefits will increase when East London line extension trains operate over the route from Highbury to Clapham Junction, opening up travel opportunities from Brixton and stations on the Orpington line to wide areas of south-west, east and north London.</p>
Ealing Broadway	Enlarge booking hall and improve all passenger facilities	<p>The number of passengers using Ealing Broadway – a National Rail station but one where the majority of passengers use the Underground’s Central and District lines which terminate there – has totally outgrown the cramped and non-accessible booking hall and associated stairways.</p>

Location	Project	London TravelWatch commentary
Acton Central	Provide direct footpaths between the station and Acton High St.	<p>The North London line crosses the main road through Acton just south of Acton Central station. However the station entrance is in a back street and invisible to many potential users. Provision of footpaths to the High St. either side of and parallel to the tracks would improve the visibility and general accessibility of the station and would improve the interchange with local bus services.</p> <p>The land in question is owned by Network Rail or LB Ealing.</p>
Willesden Junction	New platforms	<p>Willesden Jct. presently offers interchange between the North &amp; West London lines and the Euston – Watford, London Overground and Bakerloo lines.</p> <p>It has the potential to become the ‘Clapham Jct. of north-west London’, but for this to be realised new platforms are needed to enable the London Midland service (Northampton line) and Southern’s West London Line services.</p> <p>Signalling alterations would be needed to enable London Midland trains to call without reducing line capacity.</p>

Location	Project	London TravelWatch commentary
West Hampstead	New platforms on Chiltern and Metropolitan lines.	<p>There have been proposals for many years to create an integrated interchange between Jubilee line, North London line and Thameslink at West Hampstead.</p> <p>London TravelWatch advocates that all Thameslink Bedford – Luton Airport – Gatwick Airport – Brighton services, plus some Midland Main line semi-fast services, should call at West Hampstead to further enhance the interchange benefits.</p> <p>The project has strong local support and it needs to be brought to a successful conclusion as quickly as possible.</p>
Junction Road (Tufnell Park)	New station on Barking – Gospel Oak line between Upper Holloway and Gospel Oak	<p>This site is very close to the Northern line station at Tufnell Park – only 2 min. walk.</p> <p>It would provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) an additional public transport service in a densely populated area – including connection to east, north-west and south-west London via interchange with the North London line at Gospel Oak.</li> <li>b) a useful interchange between the radial Underground route and the orbital Barking – Gospel Oak line, in a segment of London where connections between radial and orbital routes are presently poor.</li> </ul>

Location	Project	London TravelWatch commentary
Lea Bridge and Ruckholt Road	New stations on line between Stratford and Tottenham Hale	<p>Longstanding suggestions for stations on this line had been hampered by the absence of a clear strategy for the future use of this section of the National Rail network.</p> <p>National Express, re-introduced all day passenger services on the line from December 2005 and have indicated in the past that it is willing to consider its trains calling at new stations.</p>
Northumberland Park	Construct station at LUL Victoria line train depot	<p>This proposal has been considered from time to time by LUL. It would provide an additional northern terminus on the Victoria line, utilising existing tracks presently used only for empty trains going to and from the line's train depot.</p> <p>As well improving transport and catering for regeneration in the immediate area, it could contribute to solving capacity problems on the adjacent West Anglia Lea Valley line.</p>
Walthamstow Queens Road - Walthamstow Central	Interchange footpaths linking Queens Road station with Central station, the bus station and the town centre	<p>These links have been discussed for several years, but have stalled for lack of a sponsor.</p>

Location	Project	London TravelWatch commentary
Chingford Hatch	New station on Chingford line between Highams Park and Chingford	To be located near junction of Larkshall Road and New Road. Would break up the two mile gap between Chingford and Highams Park, which is a long distance for a fully built up area within eight miles of central London
Euston – Euston Square	Direct interchange subway connecting Euston main line station with Circle / Hammersmith & City / Metropolitan lines at Euston Square (double-ending of Euston Square station)	A direct interchange to Euston Square, which has long been desirable for the convenience of many passengers, would be additionally valuable in reducing congestion at Euston Underground station.
Euston to St Pancras walking route	A signed and step-free access route from Euston Station to St Pancras international avoiding the Euston Road	London TravelWatch has been discussing this scheme with Boroughs and operators and has received strong support for the proposal which would create an effective link for this Olympic gateway. Currently, many passengers unfamiliar with the stations either do not consider interchange or use the Underground. The latter adds to the congestion on this key Underground line.

Location	Project	London TravelWatch commentary
Watford	Croxley link	<p>The Croxley link would divert the Metropolitan line from its present remote terminus in the Watford suburbs to link with National Rail at Watford High St. and Watford Jct.</p> <p>It would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) improve access to Watford town centre from a large area of north-west London, Herts and Bucks</li> <li>b) allow interchange between these areas and the west coast main line without the need to travel via central London, and thus contribute to congestion reduction at Euston.</li> </ul> <p>The Croxley link is a long-standing project (20+ years) which has made excruciatingly slow progress.</p> <p>London TravelWatch is pleased to see this schemes inclusion in the draft Mayor’s Transport Strategy.</p>
Throughout London TravelWatch area	<p>Station improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilities – toilets, seating, buildings</li> <li>• Accessibility – step free access</li> <li>• Staffing and customer services – staffing levels and training</li> <li>• Security – adequate lighting</li> <li>• Commonality of standards between National Rail and LUL</li> </ul>	<p>Stations are the first and last part of the railway network that a passenger sees during their rail journey. While they may be treated as secondary, in reality to improve the passenger experience their facilities and standard of maintenance is vital. For example, inadequate lighting causes serious concerns for security after dark at many stations. Provision of toilets at stations is a major issue for many passengers, particularly women, the elderly and young children.</p>

Location	Project	London TravelWatch commentary
		<p>We welcome the 'Better Rail Stations' Report attempts to set a policy for stations in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.</p> <p>Whilst London TravelWatch recognises that provision of step-free access at all stations will be a very long-term project, there are many smaller improvements (e.g. colour contrasting, automatic doors, more and better designed seats, low level phones) which can be introduced at little cost.</p> <p>Several stations have level access from the street to one platform but not the other. Such stations may require only a new or modified footbridge, or at worst one new lift, to become fully accessible.</p> <p>It may often be the case that accessibility can be improved by replacing just three or four steps with a ramp.</p>

## Appendix C – Areas of Concern on the Road Network

London TravelWatch would like the Mayor to explore options for reducing peak time delays on the Transport for London Road Network in areas such as Catford, Forest Hill, Tulse Hill, Streatham, Tooting Bec, Wimbledon, Sutton, Yeadon, Northolt and Ealing Common. This would be of benefit to bus users, cyclists and pedestrians in addition to car users.

The Mayor should also consider the acceleration of the programme to remove gyratory systems.

The Mayor should consider working with adjacent local highway authorities such as Surrey County Council on improving through and orbital routes such as the A21/A232/A240/A3/A309 between the M25 in Kent and the M3 in Surrey, where these would provide alternative routes for traffic which would otherwise travel through London.

We also believe that the Mayor should do further exploratory work on the possibilities for road user charging throughout London as a means of restraining and reducing traffic congestion.

## Appendix D – Glossary

Term	Definition
BTP	British Transport Police
DfT	Department for Transport
DLR	Docklands Light Railway
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon Dioxide
GLA	Greater London Assembly
HLOS	High Level Output Statement
HS2	High Speed 2
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LIPs	Local Implementation Plans
MTS	Mayor's Transport Strategy
NHS	National Health Service
PHV	Private Hire Vehicle
PPP	Public Private Partnership
RPI	Retail Prices Index
TfL	Transport for London
TLRN	Transport for London Road Network
WEZ	Western Extension Zone
3G	Third Generation bus priority programme