

# Sadiq Khan is Mayor

**As predicted, Sadiq Khan has replaced Boris Johnson as mayor and we once more have a Labour leader of London. What will this mean for sustainable transport?**

Sadiq's most eye catching plan is to hold down the cost of public transport for four years. From September he is implementing the proposal championed by the Lib Dems in London for a one-hour bus ticket making it possible to make two or more short journeys at one fare, although he is not pursuing the other Lib Dem proposal to halve fares before 7.30. He says all this can be done without jeopardising investment in the tube system as Zac Goldsmith claims it would. He says there is great scope for improvements in TfL's finances to make it a more efficient and profitable organisation but he also proposes establishing a trading arm to sell TfL's expertise at home and abroad. This is a strategy pursued successfully by RATP, Paris' transport system, and erstwhile London Transport once had a successful trading arm doing this. He will avoid spending money on vanity schemes such as the cable car. It is not clear what he will do with the expensive New Bus for London.

Sadiq is conscious of the need to clean up London's air. He proposes that all new buses from 2020 are electric or use hydrogen. This might be a tall

order as reliable technology making this possible is not yet secure. He is not renewing Ken Livingstone's plans for new trams which are clean, at least at the point of use.

Like the other candidates Sadiq wants to expand cycling; 'continue the good work that has been done by the last two mayors', and establish safe walking routes. He wants to 'prioritise delivery of new river crossings in the east of the city' without specifically mentioning whether these crossings should be for cars or only for public transport, cycling and walking. Like the other major candidates he wants to pedestrianise Oxford Street. He wants to 'maintain the Congestion Charge at its current level' but makes no mention of other road user charges. He wants to reduce the number of heavy lorries

on the road but does not say how he intends to do this.

Like all the other major candidates for mayor he is against the expansion of Heathrow but, again like the other candidates except Sian Berry for the Greens, he is in favour of new runway capacity at Gatwick.

The plan to transfer the operation of London's commuter rail routes to TfL is unlikely to be jeopardised by the new mayor. He, like the other candidates is in favour of this change.

Looking at the manifestos for the major candidates it is noteworthy how alike they all are with only the occasional disagreement, such as transport fares. So it seems unlikely that there will be major changes to transport policy under this mayor.

Chris Barker



## Transport for All demands on the mayor

**Transport for All called on all of the mayoral and London Assembly candidates to sign up to their demands for a transport network that everyone can use. They are:**

- Improve the bus user experience for disabled and older Londoners including incentivising bus companies through stricter penalties to enforce wheelchair priority in the wheelchair bay,
- More investment into making the Tube and railway stations fully accessible,
- Door-to-Door transport services that meet the needs of London's growing older population including reliable and affordable door-to-door services that end the post-code lottery of trips and allow disabled and older Londoners to travel further than five miles.
- Ensure that at least 25% of London's minicabs are wheelchair/mobility scooter accessible.

Our Newsletter is sent out to our London members and other contacts. The group exists to campaign for sustainable transport solutions in London and to support the work of the Campaign nationally. If you have not already done so we would be pleased if you would also join our group and take part in our London based activities.

**Follow us on our website at:** [bettertransportforlondon.org.uk](http://bettertransportforlondon.org.uk) **and on twitter** @CBTransportLDN

To contact the group write to Chris Barker, Campaign for Better Transport, 46 Redston Road, London N8 7HJ. e-mail: [chrisbarker46@gmail.com](mailto:chrisbarker46@gmail.com) phone: 020 8347 7684.

**Regular meetings of the group are held in central London.**

The Newsletter is edited by Chris Barker. Contributors are welcomed. Opinions expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Campaign for Better Transport.

We welcome anyone to write articles and reviews, or contribute stories for publication on the website. To do this either send material directly to the editor Chris Barker or, if you would like to receive an invitation to be a direct contributor, please send a request to the site administrator Charles Martin [cmartin1713@gmail.com](mailto:cmartin1713@gmail.com).

Previous issues of the newsletter can be found at [bettertransportlondon.org.uk](http://bettertransportlondon.org.uk).

# Turning South Orange



South London today, above, South London as it might be, right

In January 2016, the Centre for London published a very welcome report. Turning South London Orange reforming suburban rail to support London's next wave of growth makes the case for adapting the successful Overground model to the suburban rail network in south London (where orange, of course, refers to the colour of the Overground livery). The proposals and recommendations detailed in the report focus on delivering the much-needed additional capacity on the suburban network south of the river. Here [Charles Martin](#) provides the detail whilst [Andrew Bosi](#) sounds a note of caution.

## Adapting the Overground model

**The premise is simple. London is growing fast, and experiencing growing pains in the process.**

Population and economic activity is up, but the housing supply and transport infrastructure is not keeping pace. 500,000 homes are needed across London over the next decade. In south London, the population is expected to grow by 270,000 by 2025. There is already considerable strain on the existing over-stretched rail network, so failure to provide for a doubling of rail demand would likely cause severe crowding and congestion and constrain housing and employment growth. Essentially, the capacity gap needs to be filled.

*Turning South London Orange* recognises that coping with London's next wave of growth, and associated increase in demand for rail, is an opportunity as well as a challenge. Much of the suburban rail network in south London remains infrequent, unpopular and, at times, greatly under-utilised (a theme explored in our September 2013 newsletter, see *Developing a south London Metro*). It is time to accommodate increased growth, and for the Overground to provide a 'second Underground'.

The Overground offer includes more frequent services (between four and sixteen trains an hour, at regular intervals), new rolling stock

(spacious, walk-through carriages), and refurbished stations (staffed during all hours of operation, greatly improved accessibility and step-free access in most cases). On lines where the Overground model has already been introduced, there has been a four-fold increase in the number of passenger journeys over the seven-year period 2007 to 2014. Clearly, the Overground model delivers.

An ambitious package of network wide upgrades is proposed, delivered through a strategic, staged series of investments. The upgrades include improved signalling and train management systems, track layout amendments and flying junctions, improved rolling stock, and better platform management. The creation of new stations and interchanges are also necessary, reflecting a fully holistic approach. The authors of the report are clear that major remodelling of the network is required in places too. A tunnelled flying junction, linking Streatham with Streatham Hill, is one such example.

The delivery of the Overground in south London will also require reform in the way in which the suburban network is managed. The report calls for the power to specify, let, and manage contracts to operate the trains, as well as control of the station assets, to be devolved from the Department of

Transport to Transport for London (TfL). Although this would extend TfL's remit beyond the Greater London Authority boundary, Kent and Surrey County Councils have signalled their support for such an arrangement on the condition that services beginning outside London are not negatively affected.

The benefits of orange standards across south London are clear. Quick wins would include upgraded stations, and these would be followed in the medium term by upgrades of rolling stock, signalling and track layout. The boost in service frequency and capacity would support employment growth. In the longer term, the Overground would change the connectivity and

lifestyles possible in south London, and stimulate significant new housing development. Although the costs of turning south London orange are high, somewhere between Thameslink (circa £6.5bn) and Crossrail 1 (circa £14.8bn), finding alternative options to accommodate a doubling in demand would likely be far higher.

This report makes the case, in a very compelling way, for adapting the Overground model to the suburban rail network in south London. It is long overdue, and any delay from the new Mayor to work on progressing its delivery could have repercussions for London well into the future.

[Charles Martin](#)

### Is this the end for New Southgate?

Crossrail 2 should be viewed as an investment of national significance and should be taken forward as a priority. So says a report from the National Infrastructure Commission. However, it goes on to say, the business case should include detailed options to reduce and phase the costs of the scheme paving the way for suggested cut-backs.

The largest suggested change is in the north east. There are no doubts about the importance of the Lea Valley line. '[T]he line will transform access to the Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area – one of the largest in London.' But there are doubts about the viability of the New Southgate branch and there is mention of deferring the delivery of this branch until a later phase. There is also a suggestion that the proposed eastern extension through Hackney would be considered when the second phase of the scheme is planned, unlocking housing and economic growth in the east of the capital.

# London



## The devil is in the detail

**Everyone agrees that the involvement of Transport for London has transformed the North London lines. Frequencies and train lengths have increased, and passenger numbers have increased still more so that overcrowding is a greater problem, but far more people are economically active.**

So everyone wants TfL to extend its influence over lines predominantly operating in London, and is well disposed to the recent announcement to that effect. As always, the devil is in the detail: how conflicting demands from Metro and Regional services will be resolved, what happens to the within London journeys made on longer range services, like Thameslink or on the Chiltern lines.

Changes will take effect as existing franchises come up for renewal. But the government announcement over-states its case, by claiming benefits which the existing franchisees have themselves wrought, e.g. new rolling stock on the Great Northern. C2c have just enhanced the within

London service it offers at Barking, West Ham and Limehouse: Chiltern continues to ignore the Sudburys.

The Shaw report into the future operation of Network Rail has diagnosed over-centralisation and an overly macho- male culture. Her solution is greater devolution to the regions, and the creation of a new region co-terminus with the jurisdictions of the soon to be appointed Northern Powerhouse mayors. She rejects going further in the Midlands or around London, in the latter case because taking territory from six existing regions is deemed to be too disruptive a change.

There is some ambiguity about the concept of 'partnership' between DfT and TfL. The potentially conflicting needs of different operators, eg. for track paths between those providing short and long distance services, is regulated by the Office of Rail and Road, so there is no reason why TfL sponsorship of the former should harm the interests of users of the latter. Even if some routes (notably Thameslink) did not lend themselves to accountability to a purely London authority, there was no reason why TfL should not manage all London stations, although accommodating the concerns of local authorities and Local enterprise Partnerships would be challenging

Andrew Bosi

## TfL to increase bus safety

Tom Kearney, whose campaigning was featured in these columns, has been awarded the Sheila McKechnie Foundation's 2016 Transport Campaigner Award.

As a result of his campaign TfL have agreed to take steps to decrease the toll of deaths and serious injury caused by London buses. These will include provisions in contracts with bus operators to incentivise safety and for more stringent training of drivers. New collision avoidance systems including sensors to warn drivers of potential danger and to trigger emergency brakes will also feature. More bus collision data will be collected and an incident support service will be introduced. TfL have also agreed to introduce the Confidential Incident Reporting and Analysis System (CIRAS) for TfL-contracted buses

## Room for buggies

The rule says that if a wheelchair user needs the wheelchair space on a bus then anyone occupying the space, including a buggy user, has to move. This can be difficult for a parent loaded with shopping and with a sleeping child in the buggy. Recent increases in the size of buggies is making the problem worse. As Christian Wolmar said recently: 'When I was a dad with young children, we had strollers that folded up and cost £15 or so. Now parents parade their children in something that is more a cross between a Sherman tank and a tractor'.

Despite this people are usually very reasonable and come to some accommodation but sometimes a row can ensue. TfL have recently conducted a customer satisfaction survey on this issue and, as a result, are to launch an 'etiquette guide' to promote harmony among passengers. One positive suggestion is a bus-friendly kitemark system for new buggies indicating those which are acceptable on buses.

## Brent Cross – latest plans

Hammerson's glossy PR announcement of its enlarged Brent Cross shopping centre is delayed but still expected. Now a shopping-only development, it is based around car use, not the low-carbon, multi-function town centre we deserve. A possible mix of housing, retail and small businesses has been abandoned.

Barnet council's strategic planning of 2005 just rubber-stamped Hammerson's 2002 masterplan, and predicts 29,000 extra cars per day in the area, requiring 8-storey car parks. There will be no update of the area's strategic plan until after 2031.

Hammerson value engineered its Section 106 contributions to cut costs, and Barnet published the new road plans. A replacement north-south Tempelhof Avenue bridge over the North Circular Road will now span an amazing 20 lanes of east-west traffic. The old bridge could have been retained for eventual tram-system use, to and from local stations and around north London.

Also proposed is a pedestrian/cycling bridge, the so-called 'living bridge'. It has little transport function, except to deliver people to the second floor of the shopping centre. Cyclists will find it has steps at its northern end if they want to go anywhere else.

Similar to the sloping ramp of an Inca temple, the living bridge will destroy Whitefield low-income housing if it is built. Although it is paid for from wider planning gain funds, it is actually integral to the bigger shopping centre.

Barnet has announced plans to borrow £171 million as its share of funding a Brent Cross Thameslink station. The current scheme ends forever the chance of platforms on the westernmost freight tracks for a TfL-proposed orbital London Overground service from Hounslow and Old Oak Common.



From left, secretary Chris Barker, Paul Prentice, with chair Andrew Bosi and Christian Wolmar at the Railway Chat meeting

### Railway Chat

CBT London hosted a well attended public meeting on 29th April to discuss railway issues. The meeting sprang from an invitation from Nigel Harris, managing editor of Rail magazine, to debate with Rail columnist Christian Wolmar. He and Christian are, says Nigel, firm friends but disagree on just about everything beyond the essential core truth that railways are an idea whose time has come. In the event Nigel unfortunately was ill but his place was ably taken by Paul Prentice, senior media officer for the Rail Delivery Group.

The debate and discussion ranged widely over railway issues. The changed perception of railways from anticipated decline at the time of privatisation to essential infrastructure with all-party support was touched upon and there were a number of ideas as to why this change has taken place. This being London a major topic of conversation was HS2. Christian and members of the audience were critical of many aspects of the scheme including its high cost, long term disruption for Euston and the lack of a link with HS1.

This was a really successful meeting and we hope it might one day be repeated.

### Legal moves against the third runway

Conservative councils are preparing to sue the government over a proposed third runway at Heathrow. Four Tory authorities close to the west London airport have issued a legal warning to David Cameron, saying that an escalation in the number of flights would be 'irrational and unlawful'.

Lawyers acting on behalf of Hillingdon, Richmond upon Thames, Wandsworth and Windsor and Maidenhead councils have told the prime minister that court proceedings will be launched unless he categori-

cally rules out expansion of Heathrow.

A legal letter to No.10 says that 'insurmountable environmental problems' around the airport mean it can never be expanded without subjecting residents to excessive pollution and noise. The government-appointed airports commission made a 'flawed assessment' of Heathrow's green credentials when it made a recommendation in favour of a third runway, it said.

### Driverless cars on a street near you

Transport consultancy TRL are proposing to carry out road tests with driverless cars, called connected and autonomous vehicles (CAVs), in Greenwich in May. Greenwich was chosen because of its varied traffic conditions. Cars will have a test driver on board who will be legally responsible for any incidents.

A University of Leeds report forecasts a substantial mode switch to cars and away from public transport as driverless cars become available, making car use possible for groups such as disabled or elderly people, and even people too young to drive. The outcome will be that, although automation and advances in vehicle design will result in greater fuel efficiency, the energy required by the transport sector will increase. The report says: 'Ultimately it is up to the government to set appropriate policies to manage these impacts'.

### Crossrail 2 consultation

Transport for London has published a detailed report on the results of the Crossrail 2 consultation. A wide range of comments are made; there is no official response although there has been speculation that the New Southgate branch might be put on the back-burner to reduce the headline cost (see below).

Inevitably readers of the report will focus on the two questions which drew an overwhelmingly large response. By far the most responses came from opponents of the station at King's Road Chelsea, though a significant number advanced sound arguments in favour of it.

The second most popular question was the one about Balham as the first stop south of Clapham Junction. A wide range of reasons were advanced for sticking with Tooting Broadway instead. No-one seemed convinced by the argument (advanced for Balham) of difficult ground conditions, as it seemed that expense was no object elsewhere along the proposed line.

The plans for Wimbledon, in par-

ticular, are ambitious and they too provoked a majority against. There was no great support for the shopping centre there, though some mourned its passing. Shoreditch Park, and the loss of Essex Road and Hackney Central were other areas of contention and there was a surprising level of opposition to Tottenham Court Road station, for which passive provision has already been made.

### Sharing the Space

Living Streets published a report on shared space in March following the rapid expansion of cycling in London. Shared space in this context means space shared by cyclists and pedestrians. Four sites were studied, St Bride Street and Queen Street in the City of London, and St Mary's Churchyard and Burgess Park in the London Borough of Southwark.

It is clear that shared use pathways cause anxiety and frustration for both people walking and cycling. They generally exist because space constraints make segregation difficult if not impossible. It is particularly difficult for disabled people. But the degree of dissatisfaction varies considerably according to the characteristics of the area. Shared space is most satisfactory where there is sufficient room for interaction between cyclists and pedestrians to be minimal. This might happen where there is a lot of room or where pedestrian and cyclist volumes are low. Where this is not the case conflicts are bound to occur. In St Bride Street cycle flows are lower than the three other sites and there appears to be a natural separation of people walking and cycling. Queen Street is much busier with pedestrians and cyclists and there were a larger

number of conflicts. It is suggested that the site would work better if cyclists and pedestrians were encouraged to stick to separate sides of the pathway. St Mary's church yard sees a higher proportion of cyclists to pedestrians which causes problems with cyclists able to cycle at a higher speed than in busier areas. Burgess Park presents different problems. There is enough space for pedestrians and cyclists to share but most people there on foot are there for leisure and recreation rather than for purposeful movement which makes their movements unpredictable. Here it is recommended that cycling should be restricted to certain paths.

The report concludes that, where feasible, it is usually better and more popular to reallocate or make safe carriageway space for cycling rather than mixing people walking and cycling together. Shared space, it admits, is a compromise.

### Lea Bridge station rises again

In September 2011 we reported on the campaign to reopen Lea Bridge station on the line between Stratford and Tottenham Hale. The campaign, led by Waltham Forest council and supported by Railfuture, has been crowned with success and the newly rebuilt station reopened on 16th May. It will kick-start ambitious regeneration plans for Leyton. Initially the train service will run every 30 minutes, being a new stop for the existing trains running between Stratford and Bishops Stortford or Hertford East. Future plans are for a 15 minute service using new track between Tottenham Hale and a rebuilt Angel Road to serve Enfield's Meridian development.

