

Mayor of London's draft Transport Strategy 2017 consultation

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 1 – THE CHALLENGE

1) London faces a number of growing challenges to the sustainability of its transport system. To re-examine the way people move about the city in the context of these challenges, it is important that they have been correctly identified.

Please provide your views on the challenges outlined in the strategy, and describe any others you think should be considered.

Railfuture broadly agrees with the challenges identified in the subject and geographic areas in which it takes an interest and seeks to influence change. Developing and sustaining the broad base of public and stakeholder support for the changes required to meet the challenges will be a major challenge in itself.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 2 – THE VISION

2) The Mayor's vision is to create a future London that is not only home to more people, but is a better place for all of those people to live and work in. The aim is that, by 2041, 80 per cent of Londoners' trips will be made on foot, by cycle or using public transport.

To what extent do you support or oppose this proposed vision and its central aim?

Railfuture supports the proposed vision and its central aim, with the suggestion that the latter be subject to interim targets at 4-year intervals to which the Mayor can be held accountable by the GLA's Transport and other Committees and the London electorate, and also expressed as a % increase on current mode share ie 80% by 2041 with matching steps at the intermediate 4-year intervals.

3) To support this vision, the strategy proposes to pursue the following further aims:

- by 2041, for all Londoners to do at least the 20 minutes of active travel they need to stay healthy each day*
- for no one to be killed in, or by, a London bus by 2030, and for deaths and serious injuries from all road collisions to be eliminated from our streets by 2041*
- for all buses to be zero emission by 2037, for all new road vehicles driven in London to be zero emission by 2040, and for London's entire transport system to be zero emission by 2050*
- by 2041, to reduce traffic volumes by about 6 million vehicle kilometres per day, including reductions in freight traffic at peak times, to help keep streets operating efficiently for essential business and the public*
- to open Crossrail 2 by 2033*
- to create a London suburban metro by the late 2020s, with suburban rail services being devolved to the Mayor*
- to improve the overall accessibility of the transport system including, by 2041, halving the average additional time taken to make a public transport journey on the step-free network compared with the full network*
- to apply the principles of good growth*

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the aims set out in this chapter?

Railfuture broadly supports these aims, in particular points 5-8 of the 8 above.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 3 – HEALTHY STREETS AND HEALTHY PEOPLE

4) Policy 1 and proposals 1-8 set out the Mayor's draft plans for improving walking and cycling environments (see pages 46 to 58).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve an improved environment for walking and cycling? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture's primary interest in this subject is improving environments for walking and cycling to and from train [using the draft Strategy's own definitions, Rail, London Underground, London Overground, Tram, DLR] stations. We therefore agree in particular with Proposal 1 c) and d). We should however caution that improved environments for walking and in particular cycling can disadvantage other road users by bus who may make up a significant proportion of a station's catchment, so each pro-walking and cycling intervention will have to be judged on an evidence-based case-by-case assessment to secure the most appropriate balance of benefit.

5) Policy 2 and proposals 9-11 set out the Mayor's draft plans to reduce road danger and improve personal safety and security (see pages 62 to 67).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would reduce road danger and improve personal safety and security? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture agrees that for people walking and cycling and using public transport to travel to and from stations, these plans should reduce road danger and improve personal safety and security.

6) Policy 3 and proposals 12-14 set out the Mayor's draft plans to ensure that crime and the fear of crime remain low on London's streets and transport system (see pages 68 to 69).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would ensure that crime and the fear of crime remain low on London's streets and transport system? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture agrees that these plans should ensure that crime and the fear of crime remain low on London's streets and transport system. In particular we urge that every station with ticket gates must have those gates staffed at all times during the service's operational hours. Our opposition to any form of discrimination or segregation eg by gender on what should be a universal-access transport system is absolute and unqualified.

7) Policy 4 and proposals 15-17 set out the Mayor's draft plans to prioritise space-efficient modes of transport to tackle congestion and improve the efficiency of streets for essential traffic, including freight (see pages 70 to 78).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would tackle congestion and improve the efficiency of streets? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture has no particular reason to disagree with these plans.

8) Proposals 18 and 19 set out the Mayor's proposed approach to road user charging (see pages 81 to 83).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposed approach to road user charges? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture has no particular reason to disagree with this approach.

9) Proposals 20 and 21 set out the Mayor's proposed approach to localised traffic reduction strategies (see page 83).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this approach? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture agrees with this approach as one way in which to advantage travel by walking, cycling and public transport to and from stations.

10) Policies 5 and 6 and proposals 22-40 set out the Mayor's draft plans to reduce emissions from road and rail transport, and other sources, to help London become a zero carbon city (see pages 86 to 103).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would help London become a zero carbon city? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture has no reason to disagree with the plans, and has a particular and specialist interest in Policy 6 in relation to rail transport, noting the absence of any specific Proposal to address this (unless part b) of Proposal 36 is meant to be it). Many central London main line rail termini are still used by diesel trains:- Paddington, Marylebone, Euston, St. Pancras, King's Cross, London Bridge, Waterloo. Electrification schemes and new rolling stock are still likely to leave this situation broadly unchanged for many years, and including the continued diesel haulage of freight and infrastructure trains across London. In view of recent central government decisions it may be optimistic and unwise to assume and plan on the basis that "by 2050, all rail lines in London should be electrified." [page 100] although we affirm our solid support for the aim. It should also be noted that while "Rail electrification will reduce CO2 emissions" [ibid] emissions of the pollutant NO2 are also a matter of public health concern, especially in enclosed stations.

Railfuture therefore suggests that an additional Proposal should be framed such that the Mayor, through TfL, DfT, Network Rail, and potential third party funders of rail electrification infrastructure and rolling stock will seek to ensure a good rate of progress is maintained to reduce emissions and airborne pollutants from all main line rail transport in London.

11) Policies 7 and 8 and proposals 41- 47 set out the Mayor's draft plans to protect the natural and built environment, to ensure transport resilience to climate change, and to minimise transport-related noise and vibration (see pages 104 to 111).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve this? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture agrees that these plans should achieve their objectives, and notes that the new Proposal suggested above would assist with Proposal 47's measure b).

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 4 – A GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT EXPERIENCE

12) Policy 9 and proposal 48 set out the Mayor's draft plans to provide an attractive whole-journey experience that will encourage greater use of public transport, walking and cycling (see pages 118 to 119).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would provide an attractive whole journey experience? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture agrees that these plans would contribute to providing an attractive whole-journey experience.

13) Policies 10 and 11 and proposals 49 and 50 set out the Mayor's draft plans to ensure public transport is affordable and to improve customer service (see pages 121 to 125).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would improve customer service and affordability of public transport? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture agrees that these plans would improve customer service and affordability of public transport. In particular the devolution of more rail services to the Mayor and TfL would improve the clarity of the fares structure across London.

14) Policy 12 and proposals 51 and 52 set out the Mayor's draft plans to improve the accessibility of the transport system, including an Accessibility Implementation Plan (see pages 127 to 129).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would improve accessibility of the transport system? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture agrees that these plans would improve accessibility of the transport system.

15) Policy 13 and proposals 53 and 54 set out the Mayor's draft plans to transform the bus network; to ensure it offers faster, more reliable, comfortable and convenient travel where it is needed (see pages 133 to 137).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve this? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture has no reason to disagree with these plans.

16) Policy 14 and proposals 55 to 67 set out the Mayor's draft plans to improve rail services by improving journey times and tackling crowding (see pages 140 to 166).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve this? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture broadly agrees that these plans would achieve improved rail services. We suggest however that the statement "an increase in capacity of at least 80% by 2041" needs to be disaggregated into smaller percentages in shorter timescales, eg whatever the realistic figures are for 2020 and 2024, to feel real to today's and tomorrow's passengers, and to key stakeholders whose support is vital.

Railfuture strongly advocates the economic and transport case originally developed by east London Boroughs and Essex authorities for the East London Riverside Route of Crossrail 2, and seeks an addition to Proposal 56, or an additional Proposal, to commit the Mayor through TfL to work with DfT, Network Rail and other key stakeholders to develop, design and deliver the full scheme for opening by 2041.

Railfuture supports Proposal 59 and would add that a key part of achieving it will be working with the ORR and Network Rail to release unused freight paths for use by passenger services and in particular to challenge, if necessary with legislation to amend existing statute, the allocation of paths on the West London Line.

Railfuture wholeheartedly endorses Proposals 60 and 61. We have long-since and shall continue to advocate the advantages to passengers and to local communities and their economies of devolving from the DfT to TfL though the Mayor powers over rail services in London. We very much regret the recent decision to bypass the opportunity presented by the next South Eastern franchise and believe that the next opportunity is likely to be the successor arrangements for the current GTR franchise. Our experience points to the need for clear communication of the proposition to an often-sceptical audience beyond London.

Railfuture welcomes Proposal 62 and in particular notes with approval the inclusion in Figure 29 of the West Hampstead-Houslow route as a potential orbital connection.

Railfuture supports Proposals 63 and 64 and reiterates the above point concerning the importance of releasing of unused paths for passenger services.

Railfuture endorses Proposal 67, and in the case of the Stratford Strategic Interchange shown in Figure 31 advocates a new island or two side platforms on the High Meads Loop in the heart of Stratford City for both West Anglia and London Overground services to achieve the following:

- ~ relieve worsening passenger congestion in the existing Stratford regional station
- ~ add robustness and resilience to the operations of both operators [following increased North London Line frequencies, each station might serve one of the two south-west London destinations]
- ~ afford easy interchange with HS1 and DLR services
- ~ become the interchange with Crossrail 2's East London Riverside Route, with direct links to those four other operators' services.

Finally, Railfuture endorses Proposals 55, 57, 58, 65, 66 without additional comment.

17) Policies 15 to 18 and proposals 68 to 74 set out the Mayor's draft plans to ensure river services, regional and national rail connections, coaches, and taxi and private hire contribute to the delivery of a fully inclusive and well-connected public transport system. The Mayor's policy to support the growing night-time economy is also set out in this section (see pages 176 to 187).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would deliver a well-connected public transport system? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture has no particular reason to disagree with Policy 15 and the plans in proposals 68-69.

Railfuture supports Policy 16 and the plans in Proposal 70, adding two specific examples for consideration:-

~ in the Gatwick/Brighton corridor, we have already developed and continue to advocate the concept of 'Thameslink 2' <http://www.railfuture.org.uk/Thameslink+2> as a new direct route between East Croydon, Lewisham, Canary Wharf, and Stratford for links into the West Anglia and Great Eastern Corridors, to be developed, designed and delivered in collaboration with Network Rail, Gatwick Airport, Canary Wharf Group and other key stakeholders including potential private sector contributors such as the London & Southern Counties Railways Consortium;

~ in the West Anglia corridor, to achieve a step-change improvement in journey-times between London Liverpool Street/Tottenham Hale and Stansted Airport by bypassing the circuitous and slow route via Stansted Mountfitchet, work with Network Rail, Stansted Airport and the County and District Councils to see the development, design and delivery of a new direct route straight to Stansted Airport station from the Harlow Mill/Sawbridgeworth area. This is capable of achieving time-savings on a scale unmatched by four-tracking for Crossrail 2 further south.

Railfuture endorses Proposal 71, subject to adequate provision being made at Old Oak Common for a new Chilterns corridor as advocated in Network Rail's recent West Midlands and Chilterns Route Study.

Railfuture has no particular reason to disagree with Proposal 72.

Railfuture agrees with Policy 17 but notes the absence of any Proposal. We suggest a reference to the roll-out of 'Overnight Overground' [using that brand name, too].

Railfuture has no particular reason to disagree with Policy 18 and Proposals 73, 74.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 5 – NEW HOMES AND JOBS

18) Policy 19 and proposals 75 to 77 set out the Mayor's draft plans to ensure that new homes and jobs are delivered in line with the transport principles of 'good growth' (see pages 193 to 200).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve this? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture endorses Policy 19 and supports Proposals 75 and 76.

Railfuture has no particular reason to disagree with Proposal 77.

19) Proposals 78 to 95 set out the Mayor's draft plans to use transport to support and direct good growth, including delivering new rail links, extensions and new stations, improving existing public transport services, providing new river crossings, decking over roads and transport infrastructure and building homes on TfL land (see pages 202 to 246).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would ensure that transport is used to support and direct good growth? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

Railfuture supports Proposals 78 to 80. In relation to Proposal 79, we have made reference in response to Question 16 to the East London Riverside Route of Crossrail 2, as the potential for housing delivery in the Thames Gateway Essex corridor is on a scale equivalent to or even greater than the whole of Crossrail 2 as currently planned for delivery by 2033. We remain to be convinced of the merits of extending the 'BakerLew' line beyond Lewisham, as espoused in Proposal 81.

Railfuture supports Proposals 82 and 84, and warmly endorses Proposal 83; it reflects our response to Proposal 62 in answer to Question 16. We believe that West Hampstead Thameslink station is the natural northern destination, to secure maximum connectivity benefits.

Railfuture agrees with Proposals 85 to 87 and 89. We have no particular view on Proposal 88 other than to welcome application of the principle of user charging as an important tool in demand management.

Railfuture endorses the criteria-based approach in Proposal 90. We note with approval the inclusion in Figure 48 of a potential London Overground extension from Barking Riverside, and a potential Thames crossing between Beam Park and Belvedere which we suggest should include in the assessment the option for some form of rail link.

Railfuture is supportive of Proposals 91-93, subject to the caveat that possible future public transport use of land must not be jeopardised by an absence of firm proposals, and mis-aligned development planning timescales and horizons between different authorities and agencies. In relation to Proposal 93 another opportunity may present itself with Crossrail 2's East London Riverside Route via Barking.

Railfuture endorses Proposals 94 and 95. We have given two clear examples of practical support for Proposal 95 in our response to Question 17 in relation to Policy 16 and Proposal 70.

20) Policy 20 and proposal 96 set out the Mayor's proposed position on the expansion of Heathrow Airport (see pages 248 to 249).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this position? Is there anything else that the Mayor should consider when finalising his position?

Railfuture agrees with Policy 20 and Proposal 96. We hold no position on the merits or otherwise of Heathrow expansion per se, but do have concerns about the implications for surface transport access and its impacts and mitigation measures. We do not subscribe to the implied view that the western and southern rail access schemes are only necessary to enable expansion; no expansion does not destroy their justification. They are being advocated for additional reasons to do with improving capacity and connectivity for existing airport users [workers as well as travellers] and thereby improving the airport's public transport mode share and its related environmental footprint. Although they are both outside London the Mayor should also consider his complementary role in advocating the two schemes we have mentioned in our response to Question 17 in relation to Policy 16 and Proposal 70 for improving London's rail access to Gatwick and Stansted airports.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 6 – DELIVERING THE VISION

21) *Policy 21 and proposals 97 to 101 set out the Mayor's proposed approach to responding to changing technology, including new transport services, such as connected and autonomous vehicles (see pages 258 to 262).*

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposed approach? Is there anything else that the Mayor should consider when finalising his approach?

Railfuture broadly endorses Policy 21 and supports Proposal 97. We have no particular reasons to disagree with proposals 98-101.

22) *Policy 22 and proposal 102 set out the Mayor's proposed approach to ensuring that London's transport system is adequately and fairly funded to deliver the aims of the strategy (see pages 265 to 269).*

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposed approach? Is there anything else that the Mayor should consider when finalising his approach?

Railfuture agrees with Policy 22 and Proposal 102.

23) *Policies 23 and 24 and proposal 103 set out the proposed approach the boroughs will take to deliver the strategy locally, and the Mayor's approach to monitoring and reporting the outcomes of the strategy (see pages 275 to 283).*

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposed approach? Is there anything else that the Mayor should consider when finalising his approach?

Railfuture agrees with Policies 23 and 24 and proposal 103.

24) *Are there any other comments you would like to make on the draft Mayor's Transport Strategy?*

The draft Strategy sets out a case for change; it should also clearly and simply spell out the consequences of not making the changes it is proposing.



Our mission: to be the number one advocate for Britain's railway and rail users

Websites: www.railfuture.org.uk www.railfuture.org.uk/London+and+South+East
www.railwatch.org.uk

Follow us on  **twitter** @Railfuture and @RailfutureLSE and @Railwatch

The Railway Development Society Limited is a not-for-profit Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England & Wales no.5011634.

Registered Office: 24 Chedworth Place, Tattingsstone, Suffolk IP9 2ND