

Committee(s): Streets & Walkways sub-committee Planning & Transport Committee	Dated: 9 July 2024 23 July 2024
Subject: Transport Strategy – Revised Draft and Consultation Report	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	- Providing excellent services - Diverse Engaged Communities - Dynamic Economic Growth - Leading Sustainable Environment - Vibrant Thriving Destination - Flourishing Public Spaces
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?	N/A
Report of: Bob Roberts, Interim Executive Director Environment	For Decision
Report author: Samantha Tharme, Head of Transport Strategy, Environment Department	

Summary

This report seeks approval to recommend the revised Transport Strategy to the Court of Common Council for adoption at Appendix 3.

The Transport Strategy was adopted in May 2019 and was scheduled to be reviewed every three years. The current review period has been extended to autumn 2024, in part due to the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic and to allow it to better align with the review of the City Plan. In April 2021, the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee agreed that the Transport Strategy Vision, Aims and Outcomes are still considered relevant and fit for purpose and that an update, rather than a wholesale revision of the Transport Strategy was appropriate.

A first phase of engagement took place in early 2023, with analysis of any changing trends, helping inform changes and revisions to the Strategy. In October 2023, the Planning and Transportation Committee approved draft changes to the Strategy for consultation. Consultation then took place between November 2023 and January 2024.

This report sets out the responses received during the consultation period, in appendix 2. Feedback from that consultation is outlined in this report, concluding that no further significant changes to Strategy Outcomes and Proposals are recommended.

The Engagement Plan for the Strategy Review is attached as Appendix 1. This provides details of the different stages of engagement during the Strategy Review and who has been involved.

The Commonplace online consultation received responses from over 430 individuals, across the 13 elements of the consultation (some individuals made more than one contribution, totalling over 750 contributions).

In addition, more than 50 residents and visitors attended the local drop-in sessions. A further 26 stakeholders attended the Stakeholder Workshop, eight attended the City of London Access Group (CoLAG) workshop, business representatives and interest groups provided some very detailed individual comments and 1-1 meetings held. Adding these to the Commonplace contributions resulted in total, more than 800 contributions to the consultation were received.

13 organisations provide responses to the consultation. 11 of these expressed overall support for the focus of the Strategy and supported the changes. These included, City Property Association, City of London Business Improvement Districts, Members of the City of London Access Group (CoLAG), St Bartholomew's Hospital and NHS Trust and Transport for London (TfL).

Most key changes received overall majority support, and for the two that didn't the consultation response was closely split with only 1 or 2 percentage points difference. These were the proposal to include new forms of micromobility which is attracting a lot of attention and changes to the freight proposal to no longer provide a City Corporation funded consolidation centre. Comments received across all the changes are responded to in the Consultation Summary in detail.

There were general themes, the main positive feedback focused on our ambitions to reduce motor traffic, accompanied by endorsement enabling active and sustainable travel and movement, with an anticipated reduction in air pollution.

The majority thought that a strong focus on the prioritisation of people, rather than vehicles was also important, together with public realm and safety improvements for people who walk/wheel and cycle. Comments were received asking us to go further with changes that prioritise people walking and wheeling and not to undermine this with responding to minority needs.

There was support overall for removal of the 15mph mandatory speed limit from the Strategy, and agreement that a more targeted approach would be appropriate with some streets benefiting from advisory slower speeds to fit the nature and use of the streets. The wording in the Strategy has been updated to reflect the advisory targeted approach.

The most common theme in the negative feedback received was on a perceived failure to recognise a practical need for motor transport by some people due to age, mobility issues or circumstance, although these were in the minority compared to those supporting prioritisation of people walking and wheeling. This linked to the second theme relating to inequality as a result of restricted motor vehicle access. The third most frequent theme was a perceived failure to address inconsiderate and dangerous cycling, predominantly from City residents.

The largely positive response to consultation on the changes in the draft Transport Strategy means that no significant changes have been made. Changes to the Transport Strategy are shown as tracked changes in Appendix 3, these include:

- Including further wording to underline our commitment to working with TfL and neighbouring boroughs, on designing safer streets that are on or just beyond the City boundaries.
- Updates to promote the use of advanced driver assistance systems (ADAS) which includes telematics, intelligent speed assistance (ISA) etc, in place of solely ISA.
- Proposal 21 has been updated to include reference to crime against women and girls.
- Updates to relevant proposal and Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Plan to include consideration of mobility scooters in provision of EV charging.

The principles of the proposals will be embedded in future schemes and initiatives where some of the broader concerns about accessibility can be addressed on a case by case basis. We recognise that access for some who cannot walk or wheel, needs to be possible and will use the EQIA process to ensure essential needs are met.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Approve the changes to the Transport Strategy

Main Report

Background

1. The Transport Strategy was adopted in May 2019 and was scheduled to be reviewed every three years. The current review period has been extended to 2024, in part due to the need to understand the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic and to allow it to better align with the review of the City Plan.
2. The review has focussed on ensuring that the Strategy remains relevant and fit for purpose. This included understanding changes in how people are travelling and the pattern of travel post Covid-19 pandemic.
3. The Streets & Walkways Sub Committee agreed in April 2021 that the Transport Strategy Vision, Aims and Outcomes are still considered relevant and fit for purpose and that an update, rather than a wholesale revision of the Transport Strategy is appropriate.
4. In October 2023, the Planning & Transportation Committee approved draft changes to the Strategy for consultation.
5. The Engagement Plan for the Strategy Review is attached as Appendix 1. This provides details of the different stages of engagement and of who has been involved.

Transport Strategy Review consultation, November 2023 to January 2024

6. Using the Commonplace engagement platform, a seven-week consultation on the proposed changes to the Strategy ran from Thursday 16 November 2023 to Sunday 7 January 2024 (inclusive). The consultation was open to anyone (group or individual), whether a resident, business owner, worker or visitor, with an interest in the City.
7. A stakeholder workshop was also held in late November as part of the consultation. This was attended by representatives from businesses, interest groups, neighbouring London boroughs and Transport for London (TfL).
8. Drop-in sessions were held in a number of public buildings (the Guildhall, libraries etc) throughout November and December 2023. These were attended mostly by residents. Officers also attended the City Residents' meeting in the Old Bailey in December 2023.

9. Earlier, pre-consultation engagement included joint workshops with the City Plan team, given the relationship between both documents. More details on the earlier engagement stages are included in Appendix 1 (Engagement Plan).
10. The Commonplace online consultation received responses from over 430 individuals, across the 13 elements of the consultation (some individuals made more than one contribution, totalling over 750 contributions).
11. In the workshops and on the Commonplace consultation platform we drew attention to the key changes, while also allowing people to review and feedback on the detailed changes to proposals. The Commonplace website allowed people to access the full draft text and proposed changes and comment directly on the changes under each outcome. Free text allowed people to provide additional comments.
12. In some instances respondents commented on proposals in the Strategy with no proposed changes. For completeness, we have included these comments in our analysis in the Summary consultation report.
13. This report summarises the consultation feedback and the response to this, with the consultation report provided in Appendix 2. The full final draft of the Transport Strategy is provided in Appendix 3. This includes tracked changes for any amendments made following the consultation to the draft that was approved by the Planning & Transportation Committee in October.
14. Note that responses received through the Commonplace platform are included as percentages with the number of respondents included in brackets. Consultation questions the detailed changes tend to receive low response rates.
15. The sections below cover feedback received on:
 - a. the overarching focus of the Strategy
 - b. the ' proposed changes under each of the ten Outcomes, including those highlighted as 'key changes' which received the most responses.

a. Focus of the Strategy

16. Other than changes to the cycling outcome to include other micromobility modes, changes to the overall approach and focus of the Strategy were limited. However, we still asked for feedback on the Transport Strategy continuing to focus on:
 - Prioritising the needs of people walking and wheeling, make streets more accessible and deliver high quality public realm
 - Making the most efficient and effective use of street space by reducing motor traffic, including the number of delivery and servicing vehicles

- Ensuring that no one is killed or seriously injured while travelling on our streets, including through measures to deliver safer streets and reduce speeds
 - Enabling more people to choose to cycle by making conditions for cycling in the Square Mile safer and more pleasant
 - Improving air quality and reduce noise, including by encouraging and enabling the switch to zero emission capable vehicles.
17. 58% (198) of consultation respondents agreed that the activity described above should remain the focus of the Strategy. 33% (113) of respondents disagreed..
18. The main positive feedback focused on our ambitions to reduce motor traffic, accompanied by endorsement for the ethos of enabling active and sustainable travel and movement, with an anticipated reduction in air pollution. A strong focus on the prioritisation of people, rather than vehicles was also mentioned, together with public realm and safety improvements for people who walk and/or cycle (creating a more pleasant, healthy and ‘people-based’ environment in which to move through and spend time in). Comments were received asking us to go further with changes that prioritise people walking and wheeling and not to undermine this with responding to minority needs.
19. The most significant theme in the negative feedback received was on a perceived failure to recognise a practical need for motor transport by some people due to age, mobility issues or circumstance. This linked strongly to the second theme relating to inequality as a result of restricted motor vehicle access. The third most frequent theme was a perceived failure to address inconsiderate and dangerous cycling, predominantly from City residents.

b. Feedback on the key changes

20. This section summarises the feedback received through the Commonplace website, responses from organisations and stakeholder workshops.

Vision and the addition of Proposal 1b: Embed inclusion in our approach to transport planning and delivery

21. The online consultation attracted responses from 384 people. More than half (53%, 203) agreed with revising the Vision and including Proposal 1b to take a more inclusive approach. 108 respondents (28%) disagreed.
22. The ethos of promoting greater inclusivity through revisions to the Vision (*Streets that inspire and delight, world class connections and a Square Mile that is inclusive and accessible to all*) and the new Proposal 1b (Embed inclusion in our approach to transport planning and delivery) was welcomed by a number of stakeholders who regarded this as an important and forward-thinking step. It was felt that Proposal 1b showed clear alignment with the ambitions and the promotion of equality.

23. Some comments related to concerns that the Transport Strategy's ambition to reduce motor traffic was not achievable or inclusive. Respondents noted concerns that street closures and restrictions have negative impacts on accessibility (and do not strengthen inclusivity), especially for disabled people and those who need motorised access.

24. Mitigating this impact will be covered in decisions through the EqlA process. Whilst recognising there may be negative impact for some people, the overall approach to reduce traffic while maintaining access creates a safer, more comfortable environment for people moving around and spending time in the City, including older and disabled people.

25. Following detailed comments and engagement, we have **updated** the introductory text for this section with context on:

- Our Inclusivity Action Plan and how we will develop our understanding of inclusivity
- How Proposal 1b will support corporate Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) objectives, the Corporate Plan other City Corporation Strategies and Policies

26. We have **updated** the wording of Proposal 1b and the Inclusion Principles to:

- Clarify accountability mechanisms for championing and monitoring progress
- Acknowledge the diversity of our communities and make reference to specific personal experiences
- Take the opportunity to name protected groups where possible, so that everyone recognises themselves in our Inclusion Principles and ambitions.
- Simplify the language and use plain English wherever possible
- Review the language in the Strategy to follow the Social Model of Disability
- Name all protected groups in the Proposal text, and take the opportunity to identify benefits to specific groups where appropriate
- Provide more references to Equity
- Provide definitions of terms, in a glossary.

Outcome 1: The Square Mile's streets are great places to walk, wheel and spend time

27. For the key change flagged in this Outcome, almost 190 people (60% of 315 respondents) agreed with the proposal to extend 'walking' language to include 'walking and wheeling', 21% (66) disagreed. On the key change flagged in this Outcome, almost 60% (189) of 315 respondents to this question agreed with the proposal to extend 'walking' language to include 'walking and wheeling'. disagreed.

28. Given the importance of proposals in this outcome to delivering other strategy commitments we also asked questions on three key proposals:
- 65% (30) of respondents agreed with the proposal to reallocate more street space to people walking and wheeling, alongside the improvement of pedestrian routes (Proposal 2)
 - Public realm improvements, together with the renewal and rejuvenation of spaces proved a particularly popular proposal – welcomed by 75% (34) of respondents (Proposal 7)
 - Greening and tree planting – in the context of meeting the Climate Action Strategy ambition –received a positive response from 74% (33) of respondents (Proposal 8).
29. Further comments included support for concentrating tree planting and greening on streets where needed most for their cooling effect. Comments noted that the introduction of greening and small parks provides a significant boost to wellbeing.
30. Most negative comments received challenged the level of priority given to walking and wheeling, and expressed concern that there is a continued need for motor vehicles to move around city streets.
31. The priorities set out in the strategy that put those walking and wheeling first reflects the fact that these are the main ways that people travel around the City. This view, on the whole, was supported by consultation responses. We are making no further changes to proposals under this outcome.

Outcome 2: Street Space is used more efficiently and effectively

32. In the 'key changes' section, we asked for feedback on our approach to road user charging in the Strategy, removing the commitment to developing a road user charging mechanism specific to the City of London (a local 'congestion' charge), and instead committing to support the Mayor of London and Transport for London on the development of a new London wide charging system. 352 people responded to this question. 42% (148) were in agreement with the proposed change, compared to 40% (140) against.
33. Comments included support for a uniform charge across all central London, rather than having a separate road user charge in the Square Mile. However, some respondents supporting the principle felt that there was a lack of certainty regarding the Mayor's approach. Many of those disagreeing did not agree with any form of road user charging.
34. A collective response from the Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) was supportive of the approach to achieve change, including traffic reduction, through the Healthy Streets Plan approach, recommending working in partnership with them.
35. Traffic reduction measures are key to delivering the elements of the Strategy, including creating more space for walking and wheeling, greening and public

realm improvements. No further changes will be made to the proposals in this outcome.

Outcome 3: The Square Mile is accessible to all

36. To ensure inclusive engagement on the Strategy we held workshops with accessibility groups which elicited a lot of detailed comments. The majority of stakeholders that engaged in the Transport Strategy review acknowledged the importance of accessibility for all. Those who supported the changes to the Accessibility Outcome included City residents, employees of City businesses, members of the City of London Access Group (CoLAG), and the City Property Association (CPA).
37. 25 responses were received through the online consultation, attracting support for the proposed changes from 48% (12) respondents, with 40% (10) disagreeing.
38. Respondents, through the CoLAG workshop felt that the Strategy should prioritise access for disabled people through slowing traffic, including wheelchair buttons on pedestrian crossings and allowing more time for people to cross, and providing more places to stop and rest for disabled people. Comments also included the importance of improving wayfinding and ensuring lifts, escalators and pavements are well maintained.
39. Representation was made to include electric vehicle charging for mobility scooters within our plans, therefore proposal 30 (provision of Electric Vehicle infrastructure) has been **updated** to include wheelchairs / mobility scooters in the list of users to be considered in the Electric Vehicle Charging Action Plan.
40. There were no comments disagreeing with the Proposals within this Outcome, but there were comments strongly urging the City Corporation to do more to improve accessibility and consider the needs of disabled people.

Outcome 4: People using our streets and public spaces are safe and feel safe

41. Feedback in the 'key change' section, on removing the commitment to 15mph as a mandatory speed limit across the Square Mile, received mixed views. 45% (157) of respondents agreed with this while 39% (136) disagreed.
42. 191 comments were received that supported removing the commitment to a mandatory 15mph speed limit. Themes included that the 15mph limit was too slow (61), unnecessary (24) and that 20mph was sufficiently low already (23).
43. Comments disagreeing with the removal of 15mph speed limit, included stating that 15mph limits were necessary for improving safety (91), and further that there would be benefits for the environment (9).
44. A number of comments were made in workshops and through the detailed points in consultation responses, that have been addressed in the updates described below.

45. We have updated proposal 20 to note that we will explore the introduction of lower advisory speed limits on specific streets across the Square Mile where they would help support efforts to prioritise people walking and wheeling and reduce road danger. This approach will focus on creating low speed environments where appropriate, that are self-enforcing.
46. We have updated proposal 20 to include further wording to underline our commitment to working with TfL and neighbouring borough on safer streets that are on or just beyond the City boundaries, reflecting that TfL and other neighbouring London boroughs have a commitment to Vision Zero.
47. We have updated proposal 20 to promote the use of advanced driver assistance systems (ADAS) which includes telematics, intelligent speed assistance (ISA) etc, for our own fleet and suppliers, in place of solely ISA. This revision allows more flexibility in the type of system we support and promote.
48. We have updated proposal 21 to include reference to crime against women and girls, following representation on the importance of this.

Outcome 5: Improve the experience of riding cycles and scooters in the City

49. The proposed change to the cycling Outcome and Proposals to include micromobility (e.g. scooters and electric scooters) were included in the 'key change' section. This change was responded to by 386 people. 35% (135) people agreed with inclusion of scooters, their view was countered by 37% (143) who disagreed.
50. Support for this change was received from TfL, City of London BIDs and the CPA.
51. Detailed comments in support of this change were related to the following themes: support for the change but request to be more ambitious (21); promotes a practical alternative to motor vehicles (16); promoting inclusivity (12); and a need to segregate routes (4).
52. The 143 respondents who did not support the change commented on the following themes; danger posed by people riding cycles (52) and scooters (91), only providing for a minority group (14); and it representing anti motorist policy (12).
53. Much of the negative feedback was around the relationship between people riding scooters and cycles and other street users. We will continue to work on providing a network which addresses these issues where possible. Comments also reflected a view that tackling anti-social e-bike and scooter parking is essential, as well as regulation of scooters in future.
54. There were a number of comments raising concern on the changes to the delivery timetable for the cycle network, some sections of which are being implemented later than originally planned.

55. The new programme for delivery of cycle infrastructure is considered to best reflect funding available and feasibility to deliver changes within other major traffic management schemes. Some sections of routes have been delivered earlier than planned through pandemic response schemes being retained. There will be no changes to the programme on this basis.
56. We are committed to working with the City of London Police to address illegal behaviour of all street users, particularly where it impacts on road danger for others. Many comments also related to poor management of rental e-bikes, impacting safety and space. The Strategy already includes lobbying for regulation to allow us to manage operators better.

Outcome 6: The Square Mile's air and streets are cleaner and quieter

57. The proposal to remove the commitment to local Zero Emission Zones (ZEZ) covering parts of the City of London was included in the 'key change' section of the consultation. A total of 297 people responded, 37% (110) agreed with this change, 36% (107) disagreed.
58. Of those who agreed with the change, a number considered ZEZs a money-making scheme (15) and that providing a ZEZ in the City was unnecessary and unachievable (29).
59. Other respondents made positive comments (32 in total) that pursuing alternatives as now proposed is appropriate.
60. The combined BIDs response supported the changes to this outcome and welcomed the action to engage with SMEs to accelerate the transition to zero emission capable vehicles, but also called for an increase to charging infrastructure by the City to assist with this aim. London Cycling Campaign supported; and TfL noted the progress on reducing nitrogen oxides since the introduction of the ULEZ.
61. Concern was expressed that the reliance on the next generation of road user charging to control traffic levels and vehicle related pollution was at risk, as this was not a firm commitment from the London Mayor. Concern was also expressed about over reliance on electric vehicles.
62. Respondents had concerns that the removal of the ZEZ proposal failed to tackle air pollution and that we should pursue alternatives (63 comments).
63. Our EV Charging Infrastructure action plan will be updated in 2024 to reflect targets to 2030, therefore the future number is likely to increase. The EV charging infrastructure plan will also be updated to reflect a consideration of charging for larger vehicles, and awareness of innovative approaches where possible.
64. Proposal 30 has been **updated** to include consideration of mobility scooters in provision of EV charging.

Outcome 7: Delivery and servicing needs are met more efficiently, and impacts are minimised

65. Feedback on the change to remove the commitment for the City of London Corporation to provide a consolidation centre, was flagged as a 'key change'. 25% (84) agreed with this proposed change while 27% (90) disagreed. The remainder neither agreed or disagreed.
66. Respondents, including the Port of London Authority (PLA), CPA and Network Rail, expressed support for more goods and services being delivered by cargo bike, rail and river. TfL supported the aim to increase the use of cargo bikes and encourage freight travel on foot for local deliveries.
67. Concerns were expressed around reducing our direct commitment to providing a consolidation centre, and the slow progress on providing last mile logistics hubs.
68. We are committed to reducing freight traffic on the City's streets and support the use and promotion of consolidated deliveries and consolidation centres. However, as consolidation centres are already satisfactorily provided by the market, there is no longer a need for the City Corporation to invest or develop its own consolidation operation.
69. We continue to promote and encourage consolidation as set out in the Strategy (Proposal 38). This includes encouraging occupiers of existing buildings to operate consolidated delivery, and voluntary area-based consolidation, being developed in partnership with the BIDs.
70. No changes will be made to the proposals in this outcome.

Outcome 8: Our street network is resilient to changing circumstances

71. Proposals to make streets more resilient received support. 10 of the 18 respondents agreed with the changes, compared to only three that disagreed. Five respondents were neither agreed or disagreed about changes to the proposals.
72. Positive comments included welcoming:
- the approach of embedding resilience within design
 - the acknowledgement of increasing issues with flooding, particularly in the context of continued development of ground space in the City
 - tree planting
 - increased drainage.
73. The only negative comment was challenging that we were over-prioritising climate polices at the expense of transport and other issues such as crime.
74. No changes will be made to the proposals in this outcome.

Outcome 9: Emerging technologies benefit the Square Mile

75. Feedback was received on the Proposals and proposed changes within the 'Emerging technologies benefit the Square Mile' Outcome. One of the proposals (Proposal 44) is being deleted and merged into the Proposal 43, as setting up an active board is a significant commitment and not considered the most productive approach to achieving the outcome.
76. 18 people responded to this online, with nine people and the CPA expressing support with the Proposal changes. Five people disagreed with the proposed changes.
77. The CPA expressed support for finding app-based solutions that would allow disabled passengers to use taxis in instances where traffic restrictions would otherwise prevent access. Comments from the CPA included welcoming and utilising future technology, including driverless vehicles for deliveries/freight consolidation, whilst recognising the need for effective management of electric and driverless vehicles.
78. Most of the negative comments raised were concerns about how this Outcome will manage the challenges, rather than opposition to the proposal.
79. Reflecting the need for effective management of driverless vehicles, the Strategy already states that we will ensure emerging technology will be adopted in line with delivering Healthy Streets. We have stipulated a number of requirements in proposal 43 to ensure that technology supports and does not undermine our core Vision and Aims.
80. Proposal 43 has been **updated** to reflect the need to accommodate every user where possible, adding those with sensory impairments, to expand the definition and attention to different requirements.

Outcome 10: The Square Mile benefits from better transport connections

81. Nine respondents agreed with the outlined approach while seven disagreed.
82. The PLA supported working with TfL and river boat operators to improve or intensify passenger services on the Thames. The CPA welcomed the aim to prioritise buses and expects this will improve journey reliability for their users.
83. CoLAG welcomed better transport connections, including river passenger transport, but stressed the need for them to be accessible and inclusive. CoLAG also noted the importance of bus stops and bus routes to the City, as this is the only fully accessible public transport at present.
84. No changes will be made to the proposals in this outcome.

Managing Traffic Movement and Access

85. We are proposing a framework for how we will manage traffic movement and access to enable delivery of the Transport Strategy (under Outcome 2: Street space is used more efficiently and effectively).

86. 11 people agreed with the approach, but this was exceeded by 13 people who disagreed with the approach.
87. Comments included that it is positive to see a street hierarchy in the Strategy; and it is important to prioritise those who walk and those who cycle.
88. Further comments were received that supported the proposed approach to traffic movement and access but encouraged us to go further. These included, that it is important to legalise private e-scooters; and that the approach should ensure signage clarifies where service vehicle access is allowed.
89. Negative comments were largely around access for different vehicle classes expressing concern that the approach affects access for Blue and Red badge holders and for taxis.
90. The Motorcycle Action Group (MAG) challenged the proposed approach on the basis that powered two wheelers were included within general traffic, and that they merit different consideration in that 'licenced PTWs are a part of the two wheeled transport continuum from bicycles to e-bikes and e-scooters and e-cargo bikes'.
91. We have **updated** the different types of traffic on the City's streets, to include an additional category, of L category vehicles, which includes powered two wheelers, mopeds, motorbikes. We consider that although vehicles in this classification are still private transport, there may be some circumstances where we wish to differentiate locally for the purposes of access.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

92. Delivery of the Transport Strategy supports the delivery of Corporate Plan outcomes.

The Transport Strategy will help contribute to Flourishing Public Spaces and a Vibrant Thriving Destination and Provide Excellent Services by:

- Reducing motor traffic levels to enable space to be reallocated to walking and wheeling, cycling, greenery and public spaces
- Making streets safer and reducing the number of traffic related deaths and serious injuries
- Enabling people to walk, wheel 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

Providing a Leading Sustainable Environment will be supported by actions in the Transport Strategy to:

- Improve air quality and reducing noise from motor traffic
- Ensure streets are well maintained and resilient to natural and man-made threats

Dynamic Economic Growth will be supported by:

- Enabling the City to continue to grow and accommodating the associated increase in demand for our limited street space
- Helping create a smarter City, that supports and enables innovative transport technology and other mobility solutions
- Advocating for improved local, national and international transport connections

Diverse Engaged Communities will be supported by:

- Ensuring that the City's streets and public spaces are places where no one is excluded or feels excluded
- Building trust with local communities through transparency, accountability and demonstrating how engagement has developed our processes and plans.

93. The Transport Strategy will support and help deliver the objectives of the City Plan. Work is in progress on the City Plan review which is being undertaken in parallel with work and recommendations to inform the Transport Strategy Review.

94. Delivery of the Transport Strategy also helps mitigate departmental risk ENV-CO-TR 001 – Road Safety and corporate risk CR21 – Air Quality.

95. The strategy review has ensured that alignment with other Corporate priorities and areas of work is identified and addressed. These include health and wellbeing, crime prevention and community safety and air quality.

96. The Strategy review has also considered how to best support the Destination City programme.

97. The City Corporation is required to demonstrate how it is delivering the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS), which is done through submission of the Local Implementation Plan (LIP). The Transport Strategy forms part of our LIP. The vision, aims, outcomes and proposals of the Transport Strategy are in line with the MTS.

Financial implications

98. We will continue to provide a costed 5-year Delivery Plan. This will be updated annually and reported to the Planning & Transportation Committee.

99. Approval for funding for projects within the Delivery Plan will be sought as necessary through the capital bidding process for funds from CIL, OSPR and other sources as appropriate.

100. Data collection, engagement and consultation costs associated with the review are funded through local risk budget and TfL - LIP funding.

Resource implications

101. Staff resource is required to deliver the Transport Strategy the Delivery Plan sets out the 5 year commitments for schemes and initiatives, programme dates and funding agreed for implementation. Monitoring of progress and the impact of delivery will be reported on an annual basis. Teams within the Environment department are in place to undertake this work.

Equalities implications

102. A full EQIA for the review has been carried out, the first stage report was included with committee report in October 2023. The second and final report is available as a background paper, as listed below.
103. The EqIA identified that the review of the Strategy had provided an opportunity to improve our approach with a broader group of people and to be more inclusive; particularly recognising that the new overarching Proposal 1b has brought in a number of improvements which are now explicit in the Strategy.
104. The report also noted that as the majority of journeys in the City of London involve walking, improving walking routes will significantly benefit those travelling with babies and small children, and disabled people or elderly people walking or wheeling who may find it difficult to negotiate crowded and narrow footways.
105. It recognised that reducing traffic sets out principles to reduce road danger, measures which will beneficially impact older, disabled people, young people and BAME groups who are more likely to be victims in traffic collisions (average across London rather than the City specifically, as these groups are under represented in the City at present).
106. The EqIA noted a number of positives for disabled people who are dependent on motor vehicles including that vehicles used by disabled people are recognised in the list of 'essential traffic', and that whilst some vehicle journeys may become more indirect due to restrictions on through traffic, any necessary access will be retained to those streets. It noted that any remaining concerns should be addressed by the commitments to community engagement and EQIAs which are undertaken when considering traffic restrictions.

Climate implications

107. Delivery of the Transport Strategy contributes to carbon reduction through reduction in motor vehicle use, a switch away from fossil fuel vehicles and to building climate resilience. The review includes changes to support the delivery of the adopted Climate Action Strategy, which provides more specific actions and targets for delivery since adoption in 2020.

Security implications

108. As the Transport Strategy is relevant to the management of public space and the transport network, security implications are relevant at a detailed level and inform decision making at a scheme level.

Conclusion

109. The consultation results do not suggest that any significant changes to the proposed revisions to the Transport Strategy are necessary.
110. Levels of support for and numbers of responses to the proposed changes varied. However, the survey responses suggest that proposals are either supported by most respondents, or that levels of support are largely equally split between those that agree or disagree.
111. This is also reflected in the comments gathered online and through direct stakeholder engagement, through workshops and direct responses from City organisations, which include both positive and negative feedback.
112. It is recommended that Members agree the revisions to the Transport Strategy (Appendix 3).
113. The report is due to be considered by Planning & Transportation Committee on the 23 July 2024.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Engagement Report
- Appendix 2 – Summary of Consultation feedback
- Appendix 3 – Draft Transport Strategy (for approval)
- Appendix 4 - Addendum Report

Background Papers

- [City of London Transport Strategy](#)
- [Transport Strategy Review - Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee 29 April 2021.](#)
- [Transport Strategy Review - Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee 8 November 2022.](#)
- [Transport Strategy Review - Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee 23 May 2023.](#)
- [Transport Strategy Review – Planning and Transportation Committee 3 October 2023](#)
- [Transport Strategy Equalities Impact Assessment – City of London Corporation May 2024.](#)

Samantha Tharme, Head of Transport Strategy

Environment Department

T: 07542 228918

E: Samantha.tharme@cityoflondon.gov.uk