

Committee(s)	Date(s):
Planning & Transportation Committee Policy & Resources Committee	30 April 2019 2 May 2019
Subject: City of London Transport Strategy	Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment	For decision
Report author: Bruce McVean – Department of the Built Environment	

Summary

This report seeks approval of the City of London Transport Strategy for onward submission to the Court of Common Council.

The Transport Strategy sets out the City of London Corporation's approach to investing in and managing the City's streets over the next 25-years and aspirations for improved transport connections. The Transport Strategy and supporting three-year Local Implementation Plan (LIP) Delivery Plan will together form the City Corporation's third LIP.

Consultation on the draft Transport Strategy ran from 12 November 2018 to 13 January 2019. The consultation generated almost 2,900 individual responses and 6,900 comments through the consultation website, with a further 70 submissions by email. Over 60 organisations also responded to the consultation.

Most respondents supported the draft proposals. Of all responses received through the website 77% were supportive of the proposals, with 15% opposing.

43 organisations provided separate written responses to the consultation. Of these, 21 expressed general support for the Transport Strategy as well commenting on individual proposals, including the Barbican Association, City Property Association, Landsec and St Paul's Cathedral School.

Four organisations expressed general opposition – Alliance of British Drivers, Brewery Logistics Group, Road Haulage Association and Motorcycle Action Group.

Over 500 people submitted template responses through the Unblock the Embankment website and more than 1500 people submitted template responses via the Square Mile Cycling Campaign.

The response to individual and organisational concerns and suggestions raised during the consultation are set out in the Phase 3 Engagement Report (Appendix 2, available on request and in the Members' Reading Room).

The positive response to consultation on the draft Transport Strategy means that no significant changes have been made. Changes to the Transport Strategy are shown as tracked changes in Appendix 4, these include:

- Making clearer the commitment to maintain appropriate vehicle access when delivering pedestrian priority.

- Indicating that we will seek to deliver the Strategy as quickly as possible and that milestones represent the latest date by which we expect proposals and projects to be fully delivered.
- Making the aim of a 25% reduction in motor traffic by 2030 a minimum aspiration.
- Making it clearer that no major changes will be made to the use of the kerbside without adequate assessment of current use and engagement with users and stakeholders.
- Accelerating the delivery of the core cycling network from 2044 to 2035 and delivery of the first sections of the core cycling network (Bishopsgate to Bank Junction and Liverpool Street to Monument) by 2025.
- Clarifying that the proposed measures to reduce the number of freight vehicles in the Square Mile do not uniformly apply to all types of deliveries.
- Adding an additional requirement for transport innovators to ensure that the needs of disabled people are accommodated in emerging transport technologies.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Approve the Transport Strategy for onward submission to the Court of Common Council (Appendix 4 – see separate appendixes pack)

Main Report

Background

1. Over the last 15 months the City of London Corporation has developed and consulted on its first ever long-term Transport Strategy. The Transport Strategy has been finalised following consultation and, subject to approval, will be submitted to the Court of Common Council on 23 May for adoption.
2. The Strategy sets out the City Corporation's approach to investing in and managing the City's streets over the next 25-years and aspirations for improved transport connections.
3. Delivering the Strategy will help facilitate the forecast growth of the City and accommodate the increased numbers of people travelling to and around the Square Mile. It will improve the experience of spending time on the City's streets with the aim of ensuring the Square Mile remains a healthy, attractive and easy place to live, work and visit.
4. The Transport Strategy will be supported by a series of short-term and regularly updated delivery plans, including the City Corporation's Local Implementation Plan (LIP) Delivery Plan.

5. Together, the Transport Strategy and LIP Delivery Plan form the City Corporation's third LIP. The LIP is a statutory document that sets out how the City Corporation will deliver the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy.
6. The development of the Transport Strategy has been informed by extensive engagement with the public and organisations with an interest in transport in the Square Mile. The first phase of engagement, held in February and March 2018, included:
 - **City Streets survey:** Almost 2,000 people accessed this survey which included questions on perceptions of the City's streets, priorities for the use of streets and kerb-side space, and ideas and suggestions for future street and transport improvements.
 - **City Streets exhibition:** A supporting exhibition held at the City Centre on Basinghall Street.
 - **Stakeholder workshops:** 77 representatives from City businesses, transport user groups and other organisations with an interest in transport in the Square Mile attended workshops to share their views on the transport challenges and opportunities.
7. The key themes emerging from this first phase of engagement were that:
 - Motor traffic levels on the City's streets are too high
 - People walking in the Square Mile are not given enough priority or space
 - Conditions for cycling in the Square Mile need to be improved and made safer
 - More greenery and seating should be provided on streets and the quality of the public realm improved
 - Air quality in the Square Mile needs to be urgently improved
 - There is potential to use streets more flexibly to accommodate the various demands on them at different times of the day
 - The City's streets are not accessible to all
 - The management of freight needs to be improved
8. A second phase of engagement, in June and July 2018, consulted on the proposed vision, aims and outcomes for the Strategy. Over 500 people and organisations responded to this consultation. The draft vision, aims and outcomes received high levels of support, with each being supported or supported with changes by between 77% and 92% of respondents.
9. An independently recruited panel of City workers and residents met three times during the development of the Strategy. This panel, which was facilitated by Populus, provided an opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of residents and workers' transport needs and concerns.
10. A Strategy Board made up of City business representatives, representatives from the Greater London Authority and TfL, and transport experts, met four times during the development of the Strategy. This Board provided advice and acted as a sounding board for emerging proposals.

Integrated Impact Assessment

11. Land Use Consultants have been appointed to undertake an independent Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) for the Transport Strategy. The IIA brings together Strategic Environmental Assessment, Equality Impact Assessment and Health Impact Assessment into a single assessment.
12. The IIA identifies the potential for significant positive effects under all the Transport Strategy outcomes. No significant negative effects have been identified. The non-technical summary of the assessment report for the Transport Strategy is provided in Appendix 1.

Draft Transport Strategy consultation

13. The draft Transport Strategy was approved for consultation by the Planning and Transportation Committee on 30 October.
14. Consultation ran from 10 November 2018 to 13 January 2019. The consultation was widely promoted, including through Ward newsletters, social media, the Transport Strategy and Active City Network mailing lists, flyers and the City of London website home page.
15. The main consultation activities were:
 - **Consultation website:** A bespoke consultation website allowed people and organisations to indicate their level of support for and comment on all proposals. To maximise the volume of feedback received and cater for all interest levels, the website allowed users to tailor the level of detail by choosing one of the following options:
 - Ten 'key proposals' that are likely to be of most interest and will result in some of the most significant changes
 - Proposals grouped by topic or topics, e.g. transport mode
 - All proposals, organised by outcome
 - **Stakeholder briefings:** 47 representatives from stakeholder organisations attended briefing sessions at the Guildhall Art Gallery on 30 November.
 - **Drop-in sessions:** Eight public drop-in sessions were held over the consultation period in the City Corporation's libraries and in Guildhall reception.
16. Almost 2,900 individual responses and 6,900 comments were received through the consultation website, with a further 70 submissions by email. Over 60 organisations also responded to the consultation.
17. Levels of support for the Transport Strategy key proposals are summarised in Table 1. These scores were generated through the consultation website, with respondents indicating their level support on a scale of 1 (oppose) to 5 (support).

Proposal	% scores in support
2: Put the needs of people walking first when designing and managing our streets	76%
11: Take a proactive approach to reducing motor traffic	71%
14: Make the best and most efficient use of the kerbside and car parks	69%
17: Keep pavements free of obstructions	71%
20: Apply the safe system approach and the principles of road danger reduction to deliver Vision Zero	74%
24: Apply a minimum cycling level of service to all streets	78%
29: Support and champion a central London Zero Emission Zone	77%
38: Reduce the number of freight vehicles in the Square Mile	83%
41: Reduce the impact of construction and streetworks	85%
43: Establish a Future Transport Programme	78%

Table 1: Summary levels of support for key proposal

18. The headline results from the consultation website are:

- Of all responses received through the website 77% were supportive of the proposal, with 15% opposing
- Levels of support were similar for people who live in the City, work in the City, travel through the City, and visit the City for business or leisure. This contrasts with professional drivers, who tended not to support proposals
- People who reported that their mobility is limited a little or a lot were less likely to support proposals. This may be due to concerns over access outlined below
- 20 organisations used the website to respond to the consultation. The average score across all proposals for these organisational responses was 4.5 – on a scale of 1 (oppose) to 5 (support).

19. 43 organisations provided separate written responses to the consultation. Of these, 21 expressed general support for the Transport Strategy as well as commenting on individual proposals, including the Barbican Association, City Property Association, Landsec and St Paul's Cathedral School.

20. Only four organisations expressed general opposition – Alliance of British Drivers, Brewery Logistics Group, Road Haulage Association and Motorcycle Action Group.
21. The response to recurring comment themes and comments on the key proposals are set out below. Further details of the consultation results and responses to concerns and suggestions raised during the consultation are set out in the Phase 3 Engagement Report (Appendix 2, available on request).

Response to recurring comment themes

22. Recurring comment themes that cut across proposals and the response to them are summarised below. Responses were discussed and approved at Local Plans Sub (Planning & Transportation) Committee on 6 March 2019.

Concerns over congestion and air quality impacts of delivering the Strategy

23. Concerns that Transport Strategy deliverables will lead to an increase in congestion and emissions were raised across a number of proposals, particularly those relating to:
 - Providing greater priority for people walking (Proposal 2)
 - Providing protected space for people cycling (Proposal 24)
 - Implementing a 15mph speed limit (Proposal 20)
24. No changes to the Strategy are proposed as a result of these concerns. It is recognised that reallocating space to walking, cycling and public realm will reduce capacity for motor vehicles. However, proposals to reallocate space from motor vehicles need to be considered alongside proposals to reduce motor traffic and improve air quality. Collectively the Strategy proposals are not expected to increase congestion and will result in reduced emissions from motor vehicles.
25. The traffic and air quality impacts of individual interventions and projects, including the potential introduction of a 15mph speed limit, will also be assessed and addressed during project development.
26. Proposals 11 and 38 seek to reduce general motor traffic and the number of freight vehicles. These reductions will help prevent unreasonable impacts on remaining essential journeys as a result of reallocating street space. Several other proposals will also support efforts to reduce motor traffic, including support for improved public transport and cycling connections to the City.
27. The Strategy includes ambitious proposals to reduce emissions from motor vehicles. These will be in addition to improvements that will be delivered by the Ultra-Low Emission Zone from April 2019. The intended shift to more electric vehicles will mean that slower speeds do not result in increased emissions, and smoother flows at lower speeds should mean less impact from braking and accelerating.

Concerns over access impacts of delivering the Strategy

28. Approximately 80 people and a number of organisations, including the City of London Access Group, the Barbican Association, Royal Mail and the Brewery Logistics Group, raised concerns that measures to deliver pedestrian priority would adversely impact on access for people with disabilities and for deliveries.
29. The principle of pedestrian priority streets, as set out in Proposal 2, is to provide priority to people walking while still allowing access for essential vehicles, including delivery and servicing vehicles with a destination in the Square Mile. This approach recognises the need to maintain some access by motor vehicles to most addresses in the City.
30. Proposal 2 has been updated to make clearer the commitment to maintain appropriate vehicle access and to highlight that access requirements will be assessed as part of the project development process. Vehicle access requirements will also be considered during the development of the City of London Street Accessibility Standard (COLSAS, Proposal 16).
31. The work to develop the COLSAS will explore how to best balance the varied access and transport needs of disabled people. Most disabled people do not have limited mobility or are able to walk short distances or use a wheelchair, mobility scooter or cycle. This group may benefit from access restrictions and reallocation of street space to walking and cycling, while those with such limited mobility that they require door-to-door transport and assistance might potentially disbenefit.

Requests to increase the pace of delivery

32. Requests to increase the pace of delivery were made across a range of proposals, particularly in relation to milestones for:
 - Delivering the cycle network (Proposal 24)
 - Reducing motor traffic (Proposal 11)
 - Improving air quality (Proposal 29)
33. The milestones in the Transport Strategy reflect the relatively long-term nature of delivering significant changes to the City's streets, including the requirement for extensive stakeholder engagement as projects are developed.
34. The Strategy has been updated to indicate that we will seek to deliver proposals as quickly as possible and that milestones represent the latest date by which we expect proposals and projects to be fully delivered. We will also indicate the expected year of delivery for projects and proposals that are due to be delivered by 2022. The pace of delivery will be kept under review to take account of available resources and priorities, any changes to milestones will be included in the annual update of the Transport Strategy Delivery Plan.
35. It is difficult to commit to faster timescales for proposals to proactively reduce motor traffic (Proposal 11) and introduce additional emissions related restrictions (Proposal 29) as these are largely dependent on actions by the Mayor of London and TfL.
36. The milestone for delivering the second phase of the cycle network (Proposal 24), currently 2044, have been brought forward to 2035. While this remains a relatively

long-term milestone it reflects the connection between the delivery of the network and related projects, such as St Pauls Gyrotory and the transformation of Fleet Street, and major developments. It also reflects the need for general traffic reduction to reduce the volume of motor vehicles on some streets where protected space for cycling is not possible or appropriate.

The treatment of taxis in the Strategy

37. Responses from taxi trade representatives along with some organisational and individual comments requested that taxis be treated the same as buses, particularly when any access restrictions are introduced. Comments also included suggestions that taxis should be exempt from measures to reduce motor traffic. The City of London Access Group and others highlighted the role of taxis in providing a fully accessible door-to-door service.
38. Comments were also received that suggested taxis should not be treated any differently to private cars and private hire vehicles, and that measures to actively reduce the number of taxis in the City should be introduced.
39. No changes to the Strategy are proposed in response to these comments, which are most relevant to Proposals 2, 11, and 12.
40. It is recognised that there will always be a need for taxis in the Square Mile, but it is not considered appropriate for taxis be exempt from consideration in terms of traffic reduction. Reductions in all types of motor traffic will be required to meet the Strategy's traffic reduction target, and taxis currently make up approximately 21% of motor vehicles on the Square Mile's streets.
41. The exemption of taxis from any future access restrictions is best addressed on a case-by-case basis during project development. This will include the consideration of accessibility requirements and take account of the fact that the Transport Strategy defines taxis being used by people with access needs as essential traffic.

The treatment of motorcycles and mopeds in the Strategy

42. The Motorcycle Action Group, Motorcycle Industry Association, British Motorcyclists Federation and almost 250 individuals suggested the Transport Strategy should seek to encourage greater use of motorcycles and mopeds. Suggestions included providing more free on-street parking and giving motorcycles and mopeds equal priority to cycles.
43. Respondents also suggested that motorcycles and mopeds should be exempt from future access restrictions and road user charges, including emissions related charges.
44. No changes to the Strategy are proposed in response to these comments, which are most relevant to Proposals 2, 11, 12, 14 and 29. However, further analysis on the current use and potential role for motorcycles and mopeds, both private and commercial, will be undertaken before implementing any proposals.
45. It is recognised that there is a role for motorcycles and mopeds for certain journeys where a non-motorised or public transport alternative is not available. In these instances, travelling by motorcycle or moped is likely to have a lower impact

on congestion and air pollution than using a private car. However, motorcycles and mopeds do still emit NOx and particulate matter and contribute to noise pollution.

46. There is likely to be limited potential for modal shift to motorcycles and mopeds from private cars, taxis and private hire vehicles. Actively encouraging travel by motorcycles and mopeds may also result in some shift away from walking, cycling and public transport (currently 93% of commuter travel).
47. The Transport Strategy currently takes a relatively neutral position on motorcycles and mopeds. It does not seek to further encourage or actively discourage their use beyond overall measures to reduce motor traffic. No changes to this approach are proposed, including maintaining existing proposals on reviewing the potential for reallocation of on-street parking to space for walking, cycling and public realm.
48. As with taxi access, exemptions from restrictions are best decided on a case-by-case basis during project development. Any exclusions to future road user or emissions-based charges will be considered during development of more detailed policy or future schemes.

Suggested removal of the Cycle Superhighway on Upper and Lower Thames Street

49. Over 500 people submitted template responses via the Unblock the Embankment website suggesting that the existing Cycle Superhighway on Upper and Lower Thames Street should be replaced by the Aldgate to Blackfriars route proposed in the Transport Strategy (Proposal 24). The template mirrored the formal Unblock the Embankment response. Members of the Unblock the Embankment campaign are the Licensed Taxi Drivers Association, Royal Jersey Laundry, Canary Wharf Group, the Confederation of Passenger Transport and the British Motorcycle Federation.
50. Proposal 24 outlines the proposed core cycle network for the Square Mile, which builds on the existing cycle network in central London and aims to create a network of safe, attractive, and accessible cycle routes across the City. It also allows the existing east-west Cycle Superhighway to continue to provide a relatively quick route through the City while reducing potential conflicts with the very high volumes of people walking in the Square Mile.
51. Proposal 24 was supported by 78% of people who responded through our consultation website. It was also supported fully by 12 organisations and in part by 6 more; including the Federation of Small Businesses, City Property Association and St Paul's Cathedral School. 1,500 people also submitted template responses prepared by the Square Mile Cycling campaign, which expressed support for an enhanced Aldgate to Blackfriars route in addition to the existing Cycle Superhighway.
52. No changes to Proposal 24 are proposed in response to the Unblock the Embankment request.

Responses and updates to key proposals

53. The major comments on and updates to the key proposal are summarised below. Further details on comments and responses to all proposals are provided in the Phase 3 Engagement Report (Appendix 2).

Proposal 2: Put the needs of people walking first when designing and managing our streets

54. The average score for this proposal was 4.1 out of 5. Of those who provided comments, 355 people and 25 organisations supported the proposal and made no suggestions for changes, including the City Property Association, Cross River Partnership and the Barbican Association. 84 people and three organisations (Alliance of British Drivers, Brewery Logistics Group and Smithfield Market Tenants' Association) opposed the proposal without making any suggestions for change.
55. The majority of comments expressed support for the proposal because of the benefits it would bring, such as helping to alleviate crowded pavements, improving the Square Mile as a place to live and work, and encouraging people to walk. A number of comments supported the proposal but asked for it to be more ambitious in its pace of delivery or in the number of pedestrian priority streets.
56. The main areas of concern from individuals and organisations were the potential impact on vehicle access (particularly for disabled people who require the use of motor vehicles) and whether the proposal would increase congestion, which in turn would impact air quality.
57. The proposal has been updated to make clearer the requirement to maintain appropriate vehicle access and to highlight that access requirements will be assessed as part of the project development process.

Proposal 11: Take a proactive approach to reducing motor traffic

58. The average score for this proposal was 3.9 out of 5. Of those who provided comments, 222 people and 19 organisations supported the proposal and made no suggestions for changes, including Transport for London, Sustrans and Centre for London. 42 people and the Alliance of British Drivers and Unblock the Embankment opposed the proposal without making any suggestions for change. The 500 template responses sent via the Unblock the Embankment website raised concerns about increased traffic on the A3211 as a result of implementing this proposal.
59. Respondents expressed support for the proposal because it would help to reduce air and noise pollution, make the City a more pleasant place and improve road safety. A significant number of people supported the proposal but requested it went further by either delivering at a faster pace, reducing the number of certain types of vehicle or removing on-street parking spaces.
60. A significant number of comments were received suggesting the proposal should seek to encourage greater use of motorcycles and mopeds. Concerns over the impact of the proposal on vehicle access were also raised.

61. Reflecting the requests for a more ambitious target, the aim of a 25% reduction in motor traffic by 2030 has been updated to a minimum aspiration. However, the rate at which traffic volumes are reduced is largely dependent on actions by the Mayor of London and Transport for London and it is difficult to commit faster timescales.
62. As noted above, the proposal will not be updated to actively encourage travel by powered two wheelers, but further analysis will be undertaken to understand their use and potential as part of proposal 14.

Proposal 14: Make the best and most efficient use of the kerbside and car parks

63. The average score for this proposal was 3.9 out of 5. Of those who provided comments, 148 people and 18 organisations supported the proposal and made no suggestions for changes, including Transport for London, Centre for London and Cross River Partnership. 45 people and four organisations opposed the proposal without making any suggestions for change, including the British Motorcyclists Federation and Motorcycle Action Group.
64. Respondents expressed support for the proposal because too much space is currently given to vehicles and on-street parking spaces are a poor use of public space. Some respondents supported the proposal but asked it to go further by removing more or all of on-street parking or to deliver the proposal faster.
65. A number of respondents opposed the proposal because of a specific measure. Most of the opposition was related to powered two wheelers; either regarding the potential reductions in on-street parking or the potential introduction of variable charging by size and emissions. A number of organisations also expressed opposition to the potential reduction in the maximum loading period for freight vehicles.
66. The proposal has been updated to make it clearer that no changes have been made to use of the kerbside without adequate assessment of current use and potential impact and engagement with users and stakeholders.

Proposal 17: Keep pavements free of obstructions

67. The average score for this proposal was 4.0 out of 5. Of those who provided comments, 156 people and 19 organisations supported the proposal and made no suggestions for changes, including Transport for London, Sustrans and the City of London Accessibility Group. 34 people opposed the proposal without making any suggestions for change.
68. Support for the proposal referred to provision of designated parking spaces for dockless cycles and removing A-boards and other street clutter.
69. A significant number of comments were concerned that proposals to manage outside drinking and seating would prevent people spending time outdoors and result in a 'sterile' environment. Other concerns included undermining dockless cycle schemes or the impact of removing A boards on small businesses.
70. No changes are proposed. In line with existing licensing policies this proposal seeks to manage rather than ban or unduly restrict outdoor drinking and seating.

We recognise that eating and drinking outside, especially in summer months, is an important part of the City's culture. However in places this can result in access or safety issues due to pavement crowding.

Proposal 20: Apply the safe system approach and the principles of road danger reduction to deliver Vision Zero

71. The average score for this proposal was 4.0 out of 5. Of those who provided comments, 156 people and 13 organisations supported the proposal and made no suggestions for changes, including Transport for London, City Property Association and Brake. 17 people opposed the proposal without making any suggestions for change, but 5 organisations opposed and suggested changes, including the Alliance of British Drivers, the Brewery Logistics Group and the Motorcycle Action Group.
72. Overall, proposal 20 received strong support from both individuals and organisations. Comments referred to supporting a 15mph speed limit, encouraging safer road user behaviours, need for strong enforcement of speed, vehicles and poor behaviours and Intelligent Speed Adaption (ISA).
73. Most comments from individuals and organisations opposing the proposal related to the 15mph speed limit – noting that this was too slow a speed and may result in increased congestion and vehicle emissions.
74. While we understand that there are concerns relating to the impact and suitability of a 15mph speed limit, safer speeds is a core component of the safe systems approach to reducing road danger. We do not expect the 15mph speed limit to have a significant impact on air quality or congestion, particularly as it will be delivered alongside measures to reduce vehicle numbers and emissions. All impacts of the limit, including increased journey times and specific impacts to motorcyclists will be considered as part of scheme development.

Proposal 24: Apply a minimum cycling level of service to all streets

75. The average score for this proposal was 4.2 out of 5. Of those who provided comments, 177 people and 11 organisations supported the proposal and made no suggestions for changes, including the City Property Association, London Living Streets, and Transport for London. 32 people and the Alliance of British Drivers and Motorcycle Action Group opposed the proposal without making any suggestions for change.
76. Support for this proposal covered many themes, including the introduction of a minimum cycling level of service on all streets, improving safety for people cycling through the development of the core cycling network, or enabling more non-standard cycling in the City. There was also significant support for accelerating the delivery of the core cycling network.
77. Opposition to this proposal was focused on the reallocation of street space from vehicles to people cycling, negative behaviours of people cycling, conflicts between street users arising from shared space and contraflow cycling lanes, the lack of inclusion of powered two wheelers in our plans, and general opposition towards more people cycling in the City.

78. Key changes to this proposal include accelerating the delivery of the core cycling network overall from 2044 to 2035 and delivery of the first sections of the core cycling network (Bishopsgate to Bank Junction and CS1 to Monument) by 2025. Other minor changes have been made to the proposal for clarification or to points of detail.

Proposal 29: Support and champion a central London Zero Emission Zone

79. The average score for this proposal was 4.1 out of 5. Of those who provided comments, 275 people and 25 organisations supported the proposal and made no suggestions for changes, including Barbican Association, City Property Association, Living Streets and Transport for London. 56 people opposed the proposal without making any suggestions for change. The Motorcycle Action Group (MAG), Alliance of British Drivers (ABD), Smithfield Market Tenants' Association opposed the proposal and made suggestions for change.
80. There was a high level of support for this proposal with many people asking for it to go further than the two local Zero Emission Zones (ZEZ) proposed for the City Cluster and Barbican and Golden Lane.
81. Concerns expressed were predominantly around the need to manage implementation timescales for any ZEZ with a realistic approach to access for residents and restrictions that reflect the availability of zero emission capable vehicles, particularly for freight.
82. No changes are proposed as a result of consultation comments. The need to consider phasing for vehicle class/type and possible exemptions for certain users is reflected in the proposal and will be considered during the development of local ZEZs. Residents, businesses, the freight industry and other street users will be engaged as part of this process.

Proposal 38: Reduce the number of freight vehicles in the Square Mile

83. The average score for this proposal was 4.4 out of 5. Of those who provided comments, 129 people and 15 organisations supported the proposal and made no suggestions for changes. 34 people and the Alliance of British Drivers, La Fromagerie and the Smithfield Market Tenant's Association opposed the proposal without making any suggestions for change. The 500 template responses sent via the Unblock the Embankment website raised concerns about increased traffic on the A3211 as a result of implementing this proposal.
84. Proposal 38 received very strong support from individuals and good support from organisations, including supportive responses from the City Property Association, Landsec and the Chancery Lane Association.
85. Opposition to this proposal was predominantly from organisations concerned that that not all types of delivery are suitable for retiming or consolidation.
86. The proposal has been updated to clarify that the proposed actions do not uniformly apply to all types of deliveries.

Proposal 41: Reduce the impact of construction and streetworks

87. The average score for this proposal was 4.4 out of 5. Of those who provided comments, 223 people and 25 organisations supported the proposal and made no suggestions for changes, including Federation of Small Businesses, Living Streets, City of London Access Group. 6 people and none of the organisations opposed the proposal without making any suggestions for change.
88. Comments included requests for higher penalties for overrunning works and for better notification of diversion routes, including for people walking, cycling and using buses.
89. Commenters also highlighted the need to protect residents. Some comments were made regarding the hierarchy for traffic management plans, particularly with respect to taxis and freight. The proposal has been updated to consider access for taxis alongside buses and to include essential freight.

Proposal 43: Establish a Future Transport Programme

90. The average score for this proposal was 4.2 out of 5. Of those who provided comments, 67 people and 17 organisations supported the proposal and made no suggestions for changes, including the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders, Barbican Association and Tideway. 23 people and the Brewery Logistics Group opposed the proposal without making any suggestions for change.
91. Support for this proposal was broadly related to our proactive approach to planning for and incorporating emerging transport technologies and innovations into the Strategy and the approach we have taken to vet those technologies and innovations, including our list of requirements.
92. Opposition to this proposal was focused on the role of Connected and Autonomous Vehicles (CAVs) and technology more widely in the City and an overall scepticism about whether the City can proactively plan for and integrate innovation into the Strategy.
93. Changes to this proposal include adding an additional requirement for transport innovators to ensure that needs of disabled people are accommodated by emerging technologies and for a Future Transport Action Plan to be published in 2020.

Other changes to the draft Transport Strategy

94. The IIA for the draft Transport Strategy recommended changes to five proposals. The response to these recommendations is set out in the table below.

Proposal	LUC recommendation	Response
4: Enhance the Barbican high walks	To reduce the impact on heritage assets it was recommended that the proposal be modified to require that any enhancements to the Barbican will ensure that its heritage significance is respected.	The proposal has been amended to include: <i>Any enhancements made to the high walks will be in line with the special architectural and historic interest of the Barbican and the requirements of the Barbican Listed Building Management Guidelines SPD.</i>
30: Install additional electric vehicle charging infrastructure.	To reduce the impact on the built environment and public realm it was recommended that additional text is added to the proposal which requires the design of charging points to be sensitive to the streetscape and public realm.	The proposal has been amended to include: <i>Where it is essential to locate on-street, charge points will be installed in the carriageway rather than on the pavement and in a way that is sensitive to the streetscape and public realm.</i>
38: Reduce the number of freight vehicles in the Square Mile	To further reduce the negative effect on economic growth a caveat could be added to the text allowing for certain types of businesses, who can justify the need, to retain agreed bespoke servicing arrangements on an exception basis where this can be clearly justified.	The proposal has been amended to include: <i>These solutions are not uniformly applicable to all types of deliveries and we will work with the freight industry to target interventions at the most appropriate types of delivery.</i>
38: Reduce the number of freight vehicles in the Square Mile	To reduce the negative impact on environmental protection it was recommended that text is added to the proposal which states that as far as possible adverse effects on the water quality and biodiversity of the river will be avoided.	The text already references working with the Port of London Authority to ensure that river fleets meet their air quality standards, which includes impacts to water and surrounding environment. The proposal has been amended to include: <i>Working with river freight operators to ensure that their fleets meet Port of London Authority air quality standards and avoid adverse impacts on water quality and biodiversity.</i>

Table 2: Response to LUC recommendations

Proposal	LUC recommendation	Response
40: Allow some local access streets to function as city access streets during significant disruption	To monitor potential negative effects on the built environment, heritage assets and pollution it was recommended that text be added to the proposal which requires monitoring of the Local Access streets to ensure any negative effects are appropriately recorded and mitigated.	The proposal has been amended to include: <i>Monitoring of any uses of Local Access streets in this way will ensure management arrangements are working well and identify and mitigate and negative effects on the built environment and air quality.</i>
48: Support the increased use of the Thames for passenger services	It was advised that negative effects on environmental pollution could be further reduced through text added to the proposal which requires as far as possible that adverse effects on the water quality of the river be avoided.	The proposal has been amended to include: <i>Working with river passenger service operators to ensure that their fleets meet Port of London Authority air quality standards and avoid adverse impacts on water quality.</i>

Table 2 (contd.): Response to LUC recommendations

95. Following discussions with the City of London Police a number of minor changes have been made to highlight the role that they can play in supporting the delivery of the Transport Strategy and the relationship between the Transport Strategy, the City of London Police Corporate Plan and the Secure City programme.
96. Proposal 12: Design and manage the street network in accordance with the City of London Street Hierarchy, has been updated to include a fourth Healthy Streets Plan covering Fleet Street and the Temples. This has been added to support the delivery of the new combined court and City of London Police headquarters and enhancement of Fleet Street and the Temples area.
97. In response to comments from Historic England the second aim for the Transport Strategy has been updated to read: Support the development of the Square Mile as a vibrant commercial centre and cultural destination, *and protect and enhance its unique character and heritage.*

Corporate and Strategic Implications

98. The delivery of the Transport Strategy will support the delivery of the Corporate Plan outcomes 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12. It also indirectly supports the delivery of Corporate Plan outcomes 2 and 4. The relationships between Transport Strategy and Corporate Plan outcomes are mapped in Appendix 3.

99. It will help the City contribute to a flourishing society by:

- Making streets safer and reducing the number of traffic related deaths and serious injuries.
- Enabling people to walk and cycle and reducing the negative health impacts of transport.
- Ensuring streets are accessible to all and provide an attractive space for the City's diverse community to come together.

100. A thriving economy will be supported by:

- Enabling the City to continue to grow and accommodating the associated increase in demand for our limited street space.
- Improving the quality of streets and transport connections to help attract talent and investment.
- Helping create a smarter City, that supports and enables innovative transport technology and other mobility solutions.

101. The Strategy will help shape outstanding environments by:

- Advocating for improved local, national and international transport connections.
- Reducing motor traffic levels to enable space to be reallocated to walking, cycling, greenery and public spaces.
- Improving air quality and reducing noise from motor traffic.
- Ensuring streets are well maintained and resilient to natural and man-made threats.

Financial implications

102. Delivery of the Transport Strategy will primarily be funded through developer contributions (S106, S278 and CIL) and the On-Street Parking Reserve (OSPR). Funding will also be provided by Transport for London, including the City Corporation's annual LIP allocation.

103. The Corporation is currently undertaking a fundamental review of its services and projects. This is expected to be completed by September 2019. Ahead of this a prioritisation exercise for transport and public realm projects has been completed. This includes capital projects emerging from the Transport Strategy, some of which are already programmed. This exercise took account of both Corporate Plan and Transport Strategy outcomes and was conducted in discussion with the Chamberlain and with support from Corporate Strategy. This work will help inform the overall fundamental review of services and projects.

104. A costed Delivery Plan outlining the projects that will be delivered or initiated in the first three years of the Strategy will be prepared once the fundamental review has been completed. The Delivery Plan will include a funding strategy and be updated on an annual basis.

105. Transport schemes related to the delivery of the approved Major projects (i.e. Markets Relocation, New Museum at Smithfield and Fleet Street combined courts), other projects not put on hold and any schemes wholly funded from

restricted sources (LIP, S106 and S278) will be able to progress, subject to Member approval.

Public sector equality duty

106. The IIA includes an Equalities and Inclusion Assessment. The assessment of the draft Transport Strategy found that overall the proposals will have positive effects in relation to equality and inclusion.
107. Equalities and Inclusion Assessments will be undertaken for all relevant delivery projects.

Conclusion

108. The City of London Transport Strategy represents a radical and ambitious approach to tackling the transport challenges and opportunities facing the Square Mile. The delivery of the Transport Strategy will help support the City's growth and ensure the Square Mile remains an attractive place to work, live, learn and visit.
109. The consultation on the draft Transport Strategy indicated a high level of support for proposals from both individuals and organisations. The Transport Strategy has been updated following consultation and is provided in Appendix 4. Updates are shown as tracked changes for ease of reference. Members are asked to approve the Transport Strategy for onward submission to the Court of Common Council.

Appendices (contained within separate appendices pack)

- Appendix 1: Integrated Impact Assessment Non-Technical Summary
- Appendix 2: Phase 3 Engagement Report ([available online](#) and on request)
- Appendix 3: Corporate Plan outcome mapping
- Appendix 4: City of London Transport Strategy (tracked changes)

Background Papers

Draft Transport Strategy <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/transport-and-streets/Documents/draft-transport-strategy.pdf>

Phase 1 Engagement report <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/transport-and-streets/Documents/transport-strategy-phase-1-engagement-report.pdf>

Phase 2 Engagement report <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/transport-and-streets/Documents/transport-strategy-phase-two-engagement-report.pdf>

Bruce McVean

Department of the Built Environment

T: 020 7332 3163

E: bruce.mcvean@cityoflondon.gov.uk