

1. This response has been prepared by the London Forum of Amenity & Civic Societies, the umbrella group for over 130 civic societies across London.
2. The Societies are broadly supportive of evolution which respects existing communities. We recognise the need for housing in the capital, that it requires good transport links, and that these are competing priorities for space.
3. We are concerned that recent developments have lessened the efficiency of buses in central London particularly, resulting in a decline in bus use after years of growth. There is no single explanation but the causes include an increase in congestion resulting from construction work (some of it designed to facilitate movement around the capital), the loss of bus lanes on parts of the Cycle superhighway, and an increase in road traffic resulting from changes in the retail sector.
4. The growth of on-line shopping has resulted in an increase in home deliveries and these are significant in increasing journey times to the level before the congestion charge was introduced. An increase in deregulated taxis may add further delays. While car sharing is a solution in lower density places, it consumes more road space than buses in London where an average occupancy of 15 is achieved. This figure masks the occupancy levels of 80-90 at peak times away from terminal points.
5. Failure to develop and extend the congestion zone – indeed an extension to the west was revoked with the loss of much needed income with which to sustain the transport system – has negated the significant benefits it bestowed in managing London's roadspace.
6. We believe **road pricing** is an essential tool in managing road space.
7. Improved provision for cycling is a controversial matter among our Society members. In part this arises from the aggressive behaviour of a minority of cyclists. This needs to be dealt with by appropriate enforcement action rather than penalising the law abiding majority. Cycling has grown as public transport costs and delays to vehicular traffic have risen, though it remains a small proportion of all movements within London. As the distances travelled to achieve the same ends increase, cycling becomes a less attractive option.

8. Cycle lanes have in places been introduced at the expense of bus lanes. Although we are pleased the pedestrian space is not being compromised, delays to buses are unacceptable. The bus remains the most significant mover of people in Outer London, and the only means in the short term of addressing congestion in most other parts of the country.
9. We are therefore strongly supportive of **bus priority measures**. Pedestrians in many places face congestion, particularly close to transport nodes. We strongly support the proposals of London Travelwatch for improved interchange. If buses are able to come within 20 yards of a station entrance and thus 50 yards of the station platform, rather than requiring a walk of 200 yards, pedestrian movements in the area are reduced by 75%.
10. Buses also need adequate road space to move freely between stops, and priority at junctions. In parts of London bus volumes are sufficiently high to justify constant priority. Elsewhere it is more efficient for the buses themselves to activate the priority using **innovative technology**.
11. Where these measures are insufficient, the solution has to be new infrastructure. Unfortunately, there is currently an obsession with mega schemes. As noted in point 7 above, they result in extended distances to travel to work. A long-distance regional scheme gains preference over a more modest Metro scheme, even though the latter may do more to ease existing congestion. This is because, although the latter costs less, it does not generate income from the private sector in the way that creating viable development sites far out of London might do. In practice, the ability of the private sector to contribute is often over-estimated. The Jubilee Line extension leapfrogged schemes with a higher cost:benefit ratio (Crossrail, Hackney-Chelsea line) on the grounds of a private sector contribution which never materialised.
12. Rather than predict and provide in this way, road space would be better managed if we planned for jobs and schools to be nearer to where people live. More use should be made of contra-flow public transport capacity. The trains have to get back out of London to bring the next trainload of passengers in.
13. Finally, you invite comment on the use of **street trams** and intermediate modes more generally. We believe that intermediate modes would be effective in diminishing the requirement for road space. The West London tram foundered because of overwhelming popular opposition. This came

about because Transport *for* London seemed unwilling to look beyond the articulated trams which have become fashionable. At one point they offered a choice between an articulated tram or trolleybus, when what would have been far more acceptable would have been a rigid double-deck tram or trolleybus. Dozens of single deck bus routes in London have been converted to double deck: the upper deck enhances the capacity without requiring additional road space. Opposition to the articulated tram (and the bendy bus for that matter) centred on the barrier they create for pedestrians wishing to cross the road. Why should the same logic not apply to trams and trolleybuses? Single deck trams in Manchester and elsewhere have been successful because they linked underused railway lines constrained by bridge heights, but any street running not so constrained should take the benefits of an upper saloon.