

BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)

REPORT TO: BLTB

DATE: 20 July 2017

CONTACT OFFICER: Roger Parkin, Interim Chief Executive Slough Borough Council, lead Chief Executive to the BLTB

PART I

Item 7: Response to Mayor of London's Draft Transport Strategy

Purpose of Report

1. To consider a formal response to the Mayor of London's draft Transport Strategy.
2. The draft Strategy is relevant to Thames Valley Berkshire in two main respects: its policies towards Heathrow expansion and the proposals for transport links which cross the GLA boundary into Thames Valley Berkshire, and the Transport of the South East area.

Recommendation

3. You are recommended to approve the detailed response set out in Appendix 1.

Other Implications

Financial

4. There are no direct financial implications for BLTB.

Risk Management

5. There are no significant risks for BLTB arising from this report

Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

6. Slough Borough Council will provide legal support for the BLTB, should any questions arise.

Supporting Information

7. The Mayor of London published his draft Transport Strategy for consultation on 21 June 2017. The consultation period runs for 14 weeks and closes on 2 October 2017.
8. This report sets out the LEP's approach to responding to the consultation and invites further contributions from members of the Berkshire Local Transport Body.
9. The Mayor has published four separate documents:

- a. an [Executive Summary](#)¹
- b. the full (300 pages) [Draft Mayor's Transport Strategy](#)²
- c. [Evidence base](#)³ (47-page summary with further detailed documents to come)
- d. the [Integrated Impact Assessment](#)⁴ which incorporates
 - i. Strategic Environmental Assessment
 - ii. Habitats Regulations Assessment
 - iii. Equality Impact Assessment
 - iv. Health Impact Assessment
 - v. Assessment of Economic Impacts
 - vi. Community Safety Impact Assessment

10. The Executive Summary sets out the vision and aims of the Strategy as follows:

"This draft strategy is the start of an ambitious plan that will reshape London over the next 25 years. 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 those people to live in. At the heart of this vision is the aim that, by 2041, 80 per cent of Londoners' trips will be made on foot, by cycle or using public transport." (pp22-23)

It goes on to set out the following high-level statements:

Vision	Aims	Outcomes
Healthy Streets and healthy people	• All Londoners to do at least the 20 minutes of active travel they need to stay healthy each day	• London's streets will be healthy and more Londoners will travel actively
	• 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 the streets by 2041	• London's transport system will be safe and secure
	• All taxis and private hire vehicles to be zero emission capable by 2033, 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	• London's streets will be clean and green
	• Reduce freight traffic in the central London morning peak by 10 per cent on current levels by 2026, and to reduce total London traffic by 10-15 per cent by 2041	• London's streets will be used more efficiently and have less traffic on them
A good public transport experience	• Open Crossrail 2 by 2033	• More people will travel on an expanded public transport network
	• Create a London suburban metro by the late 2020s with local train services devolved to the Mayor	• Public transport will be affordable and accessible to all
	• Improve the overall accessibility of the transport system including halving the average additional time taken to make a public transport journey on the step-free network compared to the full network	• Journeys by public transport will be pleasant, fast and reliable
New homes	• Incorporate the transport principles of	• Sustainable travel will be the

¹ https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/policy/mayors-transport-strategy/user_uploads/mts-exec-summary.pdf

² https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/policy/mayors-transport-strategy/user_uploads/mts_main-1.pdf

³ <https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/policy/9b28c200>

⁴ <https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/policy/19e4ca4f>

and jobs	'good growth' in regeneration and new developments	best option in new developments • Transport investment will unlock the delivery of new homes and jobs
-----------------	--	--

11. The Mayor of London's draft Transport Strategy is ambitious document and should be welcomed for its focus on promoting health, improving facilities for public transport and active travel and for its focus on using transport investment to support new homes and new jobs.
12. There are large sections of the draft Strategy which do not concern TVB LEP, mainly because there is no interaction between the Mayor's ambitions and those of the LEP.
13. There are two specific areas where the agendas of the two organisations overlap. They are in respect of the future of Heathrow Airport, and the concerns of what the documents calls the "Wider South East" of which TVB is one small part.

Heathrow

14. The LEP supports Heathrow expansion subject to suitable mitigation of the adverse impacts: the Mayor's draft Strategy opposes Heathrow expansion unless suitable mitigation of the adverse impacts can be secured.
15. The difference between the two positions is one of emphasis: there is enough common ground to allow cooperation on identifying the adverse impacts and assessing what would be appropriate mitigation.
16. In respect of Western Rail Link to Heathrow and Southern Rail Access to Heathrow, the LEP holds (as did the Davies Commission) that both schemes are justified on the basis of a two-runway airport. The Mayor's draft strategy does not include either scheme in its list of enhanced surface access projects initiated to meet current demand; instead it mentions them in connection with the expansion proposals.
17. There is no mention of a further scheme which has been supported by the LEP, which is Slough MRT, which has ambitions to extend its bus-based project over the Slough boundary and terminating at the main central terminal area on the airport.
18. The consultation response suggested in Appendix 1 below includes references to all these points.

Wider South East

19. The Mayor's draft Strategy refers to the need to work with other public bodies in order to coordinate transport proposals in the "Wider South East". However, there is not yet a strong and consistent strain of language through the strategy that refers to partnership or cooperation.

20. Further the draft Strategy's support for the need to acknowledge the impact of London's transport provision on its neighbours could be much stronger throughout. For example, there are many references to the benefits that the Elizabeth Line services will bring within London, but no references to its impact on commuters, nor the Transport Strategies of authorities outside London.
21. The consultation response suggested in Appendix 1 below includes references to these points.

Conclusion

22. The detailed response proposed at Appendix 1 sets out an appropriate response to the Mayor of London's draft Transport Strategy

Background Papers

All the relevant background papers have been referenced in the text of this report.

Appendix 1

The 24 questions set out in the full consultation are reproduced below, with an outline of the planned LEP responses, where a response is appropriate. No response is offered to questions on which TVB LEP has no standing or no reason to offer detailed comments.

Heading	Question	Response
CHAPTER 1 – THE CHALLENGE (pp 9-16)	<p>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.</p> <p>– Please provide your views on the challenges outlined in the strategy, and describe any others you think should be considered.</p>	<p>London is a world-class city, and both its influence and economic impact are felt well beyond its electoral boundary. In common with other Local Enterprise Partnerships that border London, Thames Valley Berkshire acknowledges the advantages of being located close to London.</p> <p>We agree that the challenges identified are all relevant; in addition we suggest that the themes that are covered in the section: “LONDON’S LINKS WITH THE WIDER SOUTH EAST AND BEYOND” (pp 178-181) should be brought into the “Challenges” chapter, with particular emphasis on the idea expressed in Proposal 70 “<i>The Mayor, through the GLA and TfL, will work with relevant stakeholders to seek to ensure that transport investment on corridors in the Wider South East supports the realisation of any associated economic and housing growth potential.</i>”</p>
CHAPTER 2 – THE VISION (pp 17-38)	<p>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.</p> <p>– To what extent do you support or oppose this proposed vision and its central aim?</p>	We support this statement of the vision
CHAPTER 2 – THE VISION (pp 17-38)	<p>3) To support this vision, the strategy proposes to pursue the following further aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	We support these aims

Heading	Question	Response
	<p>traffic at peak times, to help keep streets operating efficiently for essential business and the public</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>– To what extent do you agree or disagree with the aims set out in this chapter?</p>	
CHAPTER 3 – HEALTHY STREETS AND HEALTHY PEOPLE (pp 39-114)	<p>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).</p> <p>– To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve an improved environment for walking and cycling?</p>	No comment
CHAPTER 3 – HEALTHY STREETS AND HEALTHY PEOPLE (pp 39-114)	<p>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).</p> <p>– To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would reduce road danger and improve personal safety and security?</p>	No comment
CHAPTER 3 – HEALTHY STREETS AND HEALTHY PEOPLE (pp 39-114)	<p>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).</p> <p>– 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?</p>	No comment
CHAPTER 3 – HEALTHY STREETS AND HEALTHY PEOPLE (pp 39-114)	<p>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).</p> <p>– To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would tackle congestion and improve the efficiency of streets?</p>	No comment
CHAPTER 3 – HEALTHY STREETS AND HEALTHY PEOPLE (pp	<p>8) Proposals 18 and 19 set out the Mayor's proposed approach to road user charging (see pages 81 to 83).</p> <p>– To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposed approach to road user charges?</p>	No comment

Heading	Question	Response
39-114)		
CHAPTER 3 – HEALTHY STREETS AND HEALTHY PEOPLE (pp 39-114)	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?	No comment
CHAPTER 3 – HEALTHY STREETS AND HEALTHY PEOPLE (pp 39-114)	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?	No comment
CHAPTER 3 – HEALTHY STREETS AND HEALTHY PEOPLE (pp 39-114)	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?	No comment
CHAPTER 4 – A GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT EXPERIENCE (pp 115-190)	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?	No comment
CHAPTER 4 – A GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT EXPERIENCE (pp 115-190)	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?	No comment
CHAPTER 4 – A GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT EXPERIENCE (pp 115-190)	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?	No comment
CHAPTER 4 – A GOOD PUBLIC	15) Policy 13 and proposals 53 and 54 set out the Mayor's draft plans to transform the bus network; to ensure it	No comment

Heading	Question	Response
TRANSPORT EXPERIENCE (pp 115-190)	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?	
CHAPTER 4 – A GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT EXPERIENCE (pp 115-190)	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?	<p>We support Policy 14 and the associated proposals.</p> <p>We suggest that appropriate recognition should be given to the need to develop partnership and cooperation with transport authorities and other relevant bodies outside London where rail services also serve areas outside London.</p> <p>Proposal 56 refers specifically to Crossrail 2, including to "<i>finalising the route alignment and stations</i>." There is an opportunity to revisit the extreme south-western alignment, including giving further consideration to using Crossrail 2 to deliver Southern Rail Access to Heathrow Airport. Figure 52 on page 251 shows a possible alignment for Southern Rail Access to Heathrow running alongside Crossrail 2 at Kingston and again on the South West mainline to the south-west of Wimbledon.</p> <p>Proposal 57 refers to "<i>opening the Elizabeth Line in 2019</i>". We strongly support this proposal, as this service will provide important local services in Thames Valley Berkshire (serving Reading, Twyford, Maidenhead, Burnham, Slough and Langley in Berkshire as well as Taplow and Iwer in Buckinghamshire).</p> <p>We suggest further commitments should be made to exploring the opportunities for coordinating Elizabeth Line services with the proposed Western Rail Link to Heathrow services in order to eliminate turn-back services and promote through running at Heathrow.</p> <p>We further suggest that consideration be given to allowing outer-suburban services on the Great Western Line (originating in, say Newbury, Didcot or Oxford) access to the Elizabeth Line tunnels, thus allowing more commuting journeys to be completed without the need for interchange at Paddington, Old Oak Common or other intermediate stations.</p>

Heading	Question	Response
		<p>Proposal 59 refers to “<i>encourage the DfT to increase the capacity of the national rail network in London to manage crowding on both local and longer distance services.</i>”</p> <p>We suggest that this be amended to include a reference to undertaking this task in partnership and cooperation with transport authorities and other relevant bodies outside London.</p> <p>Proposal 61 refers to “<i>devolution from DfT to the Mayor/TfL of the responsibility for local stopping rail services</i>”. In effect the decision to operate the Elizabeth Line as a TfL concession has already achieved this proposal for a large number of local stopping services on the Great West Mainline. The logic of the service means that the concession includes services outside London. We suggest that it is important to develop further proposals for devolution in partnership and cooperation with transport authorities and other relevant bodies outside London.</p> <p>Proposal 64 refers to the upgrade of “<i>rail freight routes outside London</i>”. We suggest that this be amended to include a reference to undertaking this task in partnership and cooperation with transport authorities and other relevant bodies outside London.</p>
CHAPTER 4 – A GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT EXPERIENCE (pp 115-190)	<p>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).</p> <p>– To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would deliver a well-connected public transport system?</p>	<p>Policy 16 says “<i>The Mayor, through TfL, will support improvements to public transport to enhance travel between London and the rest of the UK, and require regional and national public transport schemes to be integrated into London’s public transport system wherever practical.</i>”</p> <p>We welcome the Mayor’s support for transport improvements outside London.</p> <p>We suggest that this Policy should be amended to include words reflecting the spirit of “partnership and cooperation with transport authorities and other relevant bodies outside London”.</p> <p>We welcome Proposal 70 “<i>The Mayor, through the GLA and TfL, will work with relevant stakeholders to seek to ensure that transport investment on corridors in</i></p>

Heading	Question	Response
		<p><i>the Wider South East supports the realisation of any associated economic and housing growth potential.</i>" In particular we welcome the commitment to working with relevant stakeholders, and we acknowledge that dialogue already established in the Wider South East Group.</p> <p>We suggest that Local Enterprise Partnerships should continue to be considered as relevant stakeholders, and that your engagement with us and our partners could usefully be directed via the emerging sub-national transport body, "Transport for the South East".</p> <p>Proposal 71 refers to the development of a "<i>new gateway station at Old Oak Common</i>" which will be served by the Great Western Mainline, Elizabeth Line, HS2 and Overground services. While the main impact of this will be local to West London, the full potential of this new interchange will have an impact far beyond London. We look forward to the development of "partnership and cooperation with transport authorities and other relevant bodies outside London" in order to realise the full potential of this investment.</p> <p>Proposal 72 refers to working "<i>with stakeholders</i>" in connection with long distance coach services.</p> <p>We suggest that Local Enterprise Partnerships should be considered as relevant stakeholders, and that your engagement with us and our partners could usefully be directed via the emerging sub-national transport body, "Transport for the South East".</p>
CHAPTER 5 – NEW HOMES AND JOBS (pp 191-254)	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?	We support Policy 19 and the associated proposals 75 to 77.
CHAPTER 5 – NEW HOMES AND JOBS (pp 191-254)	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	We welcome Proposal 86 " <i>The Mayor, through TfL and the boroughs, will pilot bus transit networks in outer London Opportunity Areas with the aim of bringing forward development, either ahead of rail investment or to support growth in places without planned rail</i>

Heading	Question	Response
	<p>over roads and transport infrastructure and building homes on TfL land (see pages 202 to 246).</p> <p>– To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would ensure that transport is used to support and direct good growth?</p>	<p>access.”</p> <p>We suggest that reference be made to extension of such networks outside the GLA boundary where appropriate. We draw attention to the ambition of the Slough MRT system to better connect Heathrow Airport with Slough, which is promoted by Slough BC and supported by Thames Valley Berkshire LEP.</p> <p>There is a reference on p203 to “<i>working with willing partners to support development along the strategic corridors</i>” in the Wider South East.</p> <p>We welcome the commitment to partnership working contained in Proposal 94 and look forward to specific proposals for how this might be achieved.</p> <p>We welcome Proposal 95 “<i>The Mayor will promote the improvement of surface links to London’s airports, with airport operators contributing a fair share of the funding required.</i>”</p> <p>We suggest that the accompanying text make specific reference to three new routes currently proposed for improving public transport access to Heathrow: Western Rail Link to Heathrow; Southern Rail Access to Heathrow; and Slough MRT (referred to at Proposal 86 above). We believe that investment in these three schemes is justified on the basis of a two-runway airport. We do not regard any or all of them as appropriate mitigation for any expansion proposals.</p>
CHAPTER 5 – NEW HOMES AND JOBS (pp 191-254)	<p>20) Policy 20 and proposal 96 set out the Mayor’s proposed position on the expansion of Heathrow Airport (see pages 248 to 249).</p> <p>– To what extent do you agree or disagree with this position?</p>	<p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP supports the expansion of the airport subject to appropriate mitigation measures in respect of noise, pollution, surface access and other adverse impacts⁵. Therefore, we support Policy 20 which allows for the Strategy to support expansion as long as robust safeguards about mitigation of adverse impacts are secured.</p> <p>We regard both the Western Rail Link and the Southern Rail Access schemes</p>

⁵ “The strength of feeling against Heathrow expansion cannot be ignored by the LEP. The current operational environment at Heathrow causes considerable impact in respect of noise, pollution and local congestion. Any proposals for expansion will need to be accompanied by a full range of mitigation measures that acknowledge and respond to these issues.” TVB LEP 20 September 2012

Heading	Question	Response
		<p>to be justified on the basis of a two-runway airport. This position was also adopted by the Davies Commission. We suggest that Proposal 96 is amended to reflect this position.</p> <p>We suggest that the possible alignment of Southern Rail Access to Heathrow is amended to show other potential alignments which have been reviewed by Network Rail and others.</p>
CHAPTER 6 – DELIVERING THE VISION (pp 255-285)	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 connected and autonomous vehicles (see pages 258 to 262). – To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposed approach?	No comment
CHAPTER 6 – DELIVERING THE VISION (pp 255-285)	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?	No comment
CHAPTER 6 – DELIVERING THE VISION (pp 255-285)	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?	No comment
GENERAL	24) Are there any other comments you would like to make on the draft Mayor's Transport Strategy?	No comment