# Scrutiny Review of Sustainable Transport

## Summary of evidence heard by the panel

## February 2010

## 1. Introduction

1.1 The aim of this briefing is to bring together the main evidence that the panel has received during the review of sustainable transport in Haringey. The briefing also aims to highlight key issues for discussion which may guide and inform any conclusions or recommendations that the panel may wish to make.

## 2. Overview

2.1 The scrutiny review of sustainable transport was commissioned by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee as part of its work programme for 2009/10.

2.2 A panel of 4 members was convened to conduct the scrutiny review these were: Councillors Beacham, Mallett (Chair), Santry and Weber. The review panel met 6 times from September 2009 through to January 2010.

2.3 During the course of these meetings the panel has heard evidence from a wide range of informants, all of which are listed below:
   - Joan Hancox, Head of Sustainable Transport, Haringey Council
   - Alex Grear, Prog. Manager, Greenest Borough Strategy, Haringey Council
   - Malcolm Smith, Transport Policy, Haringey Council
   - Ismail Mohammed, Planning Group Manager, Haringey Council
   - David Rowe, Smarter Travel Unit, transport for London
   - Joanne McCartney, Member of Greater London Assembly
   - Matt Winfield, Greenways Manager, Sustrans
   - Sophie Tyler, Research Fellow, University of Westminster
   - Andy Cunningham, Head of Streetscene, Hackney Council
   - Oliver Schick, London Cycling Campaign
   - Pamela Moffatt, Haringey Disability Forum
   - Quentin Given, Friends of the Earth
   - Richard Bourn, Campaign for Better Transport
   - Tim Bellenger, London Travelwatch
   - Chris Barker, Sue Penny & Adam Coffman, Sustainable Haringey/ Haringey Living Streets, Haringey Cycling Campaign
   - Duncan Stroud, AD Communications, NHS Haringey
   - Tajinder Kaur Nijjar, School Travel Planning, Haringey Council

2.4 The panel also undertook two site visits to Sutton Council and to Peterborough City Council to assess sustainable travel programmes developed there.

2.5 The panel received both written and verbal reports on sustainable travel issues. The following provides a summary of evidence received by the panel. Those areas highlighted in bold relate to areas where the panel has agreed to form conclusions or recommendations.

## 3. Policy and strategy

<u>National policy framework for sustainable travel</u>

3.1    The panel noted there are a number of strands to the legislative and policy framework which supports the development of sustainable transport. These can be seen as a number of policy drivers which include: climate change, managing the transport network and delivering sustainable transport.

*Emissions*

3.2    The UK is a signatory to the 1997 Kyoto Agreement. Nationally the government has agreed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 60% (from 1990 levels) by 2050.

3.3    The Greater London Assembly Act (1999) required the Mayor to address both the causes and consequences of climate change. Thee Mayor's commitment to reduce greenhouses gas emissions exceeds the national target i.e. 60% by 2025.

3.4    Under the GLA Act (1999), the Mayor must publish a Statement on the Environment Report every four years (air quality, air emissions and particular emissions from road traffic, road traffic levels or energy consumption and the emission of substances which contribute to climate change. The Transport Act (2000) requires Local Authorities to provide a local transport plan which considers national climate change objectives

*Managing the Transport Network*

3.5    Under the Traffic Management Act (2004) Local Authorities have a *new network management duty* which requires them to proactively manage the national and local road network in their area. Similarly, the Transport Act (2008) provides Local Authorities with greater powers to tackle congestion and improve local transport provision.

*Sustainable transport*

3.6    A national framework for local and regional transport authorities to guide planning and delivery of sustainable transport programmes is provided through *Towards a Sustainable Transport Strategy (2007*). The 5 goals of this strategy are:
- Support national competitiveness and growth – reliability, connectivity and resilience of the network are key objectives
- Tackle climate change – reduce greenhouse gas emissions, carbon dioxide and other harmful pollutants
- Improve safety, security and health – reducing the risk of death or injury from transport and promoting modes of transport which are beneficial to health
- Promote greater equality of opportunity – ensure participation for a fairer society
- Improve quality of life and promote a healthy natural environment

<u>Mayors Transport Strategy (MTS)</u>

3.7     The new MTS was published in the summer of 2009.  The strategy outlines 5 high level outcomes which mirror those in the national strategy (in 1.6).  In terms of sustainable transport, the strategy aims to improve passenger information (i.e. countdown), increase the uptake of walking (i.e. walking routes) and cycling (i.e. superhighways).

3.8     The panel noted evidence from TfL that highlighted a number of key objectives within the MTS: increasing capacity, changed land use and demand management.  It was noted that Local Authorities and TfL should focus on the latter two objectives.

3.9     The panel noted that the MTS supported a polycentric model of 200 local town centres across London, to encourage sustainable communities.  The panel noted that this was supported by other informants to the review (Campaign for Better Transport, Sustrans).

3.10    In terms of sustainable transport, there were however a number of criticisms of the strategy:
- not enough measures to curb car usage
- measures included to increase car usage (abandonment of Western extension, traffic smoothing, relaxed parking and environmental standards)
- Public transport (esp. bus usage) had been made more expensive.

3.11    The MTS is highly influential as this guides and informs the development of Local Implementation Plans of London Boroughs.  These are highly significant documents they will detail how the MTS is to be put in to effect locally.  The LIP act as local transport strategies.

Local Implementation Plan

3.12    LIP is largely determined by guidance issued through TfL. Local Authorities will begin to develop Local Implementation Plans (LIP) in the spring of 2010.  As part of the preparation process, Haringey would be expected to consult widely with local stakeholders and other local interest groups.  Boroughs are also required to conduct a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Equalities Impact Assessment of proposals detailed within the LIP.

3.13    The panel heard about LIP reforms for 2010/2011 and the funding streams which underpin it which are designed to reduce bureaucracy and increase local flexibility as to how funds are spent. The panel noted that 21 funding streams have now been simplified to 5 broader programmes:
- maintenance (road renewal)
- corridors (e.g. bus priority, cycle network)
- neighbourhoods (e.g. 20mph zones, regeneration)
- smarter travel (e.g. travel plans, travel awareness) and
- major schemes (e.g. station access, town centres).

3.14    The panel noted that  approximately £160m is allocated through the LIP in 2010/2011 by TfL.  Funding provided to Haringey through the LIP in the period 2004/5-2009/2010 has ranged from £3.4m to £5.4m with the overall

share of funding varying from 2.5-3.9% of the total London allocation.   The funding allocation for Haringey for 2010/2011 is £2.807m.

3.15    The panel heard that reform of the LIP presented the need for structural reorganisation in the transport department in Haringey. The streamlining of the existing 23 funding streams would encourage more integrated and holistic patterns of work across the different transport modes and Haringey's transport structures should be seen to respond to this.

3.16    The panel heard noted that the timing of the scrutiny review is important as its conclusions and recommendations may guide and inform the development of the LIP in Haringey.

- **How will the conclusions and recommendations of the review relate to the development of the Local Implementation Plan?**

- **Who should be consulted in the development of the Local Implementation Plan?**

- **What local priorities and policies for sustainable travel should be reflected in the Local implementation Plan?**

- **How will the Local implementation Plan link to other Council strategies, policies and priorities?**

Greenest Borough Strategy (GBS)

3.17    The Greenest Borough Strategy was developed to coordinated responses to the climate change agenda.  The panel noted priority 6 within the GBS: the promotion of sustainable travel.  To help achieve this priority, the strategy identified four key objectives:
- Reduce car and lorry travel in the borough
- Improve public and community transport
- Encourage more people to walk and cycle
- Reduce the environmental impact of transport

3.18    A programme board oversees the Greenest Borough Strategy.  In addition, a quarterly progress report is submitted to the Better Places Partnership Board which maps activities and performance against agreed targets.  An annual report will also be produced from 2010.  The panel noted that there a number of tangible measures through which to assess the progress of the strategy i.e. $CO_2$ emissions, uptake of car club.

3.19    The panel noted that considerable amount of effort had been undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the work within the Greenest Borough Strategy.  A gap analysis had been undertaken to ensure that there were sufficient actions to deliver on key objectives and a prioritisation process had been undertaken to ensure that what actions were being undertaken were those which had most impact.  These were identified as: School Travel Plans, Community and Local Transport & Car Clubs.

| 4. | **Working in partnership** |
|----|------|

4.1     The panel heard that partnerships would be critical for local authorities to enable them successfully deliver the MTS, the Local Implementation plan and sustainable travel goals (i.e. modal shift).

4.2     The panel acknowledged that as an individual borough, it would be difficult to address a traffic volumes that passed through the borough on radial routes in and out of London.  This underlined the need to work in partnership with other neighbouring boroughs and of course TfL, to identify ways in which great use of sustainable travel methods beyond the borough boundaries.

4.3     The panel noted that review had highlighted a number of opportunities to work more with partners within the borough and through the Haringey Strategic Partnership.  The panel felt that there were a number of shared policy objectives for both the council and health partners that offered a number of development routes (promoting cycling and walking). Indeed, it was felt the health benefits of developing sustainable transport could be promoted further within local projects.

4.4     Of particular note to the panel  was that it was estimated that the lack of exercise in the local population has been estimated to cost local NHS services between £3-4million annually through the treatment of diseases which may could otherwise be prevented through physical activity.  It was noted that this could provide an avenue for dual investment by the council and its health partners.

4.5     Similarly it was noted that individual boroughs will find it difficult to influence public transport provision, especially train and bus services. The panel heard evidence that it would be important to develop strategic alliances with other north London boroughs, to influence service provision on rail, bus and tube networks.

- **How can the borough work with partners to help achieve sustainable travel priorities?**

- **How can partnership with neighbouring boroughs be developed to help achieve sustainable travel priorities?**

Partner audit provision of sustainable transport
4.6     In total, the survey heard back from 9 local partners including NHS Trusts, police service, fire service, housing authorities and colleges of further and higher education. Responses covered almost 4,000 employees, underlining the potential influence that work with these organisations may have in reducing car journeys and associated traffic congestion/ pollution.

4.7     The audit of partners provision of sustainable transport highlighted a number of developmental opportunities for the council and local partners:
- developing staff travel plans
- supporting staff in sustainable travel choices

- development of green fuel technology

**The panel agreed that there should be a number of developmental recommendations arising from this audit.**

## 5.    Smarter Travel (behaviour change)

5.1    The panel chose to make smarter travel initiatives the focus of this scrutiny review.  In essence, these are so called 'soft' transport measures, those that aim to reduce car use and enhance the attractiveness of alternative methods.

5.2    The main features of a smarter travel or behaviour change programme are known to include the following initiatives:
- Travel plans: for schools, workplaces, trip-generators and individuals.
- travel awareness and public transport information marketing
- Car club and car sharing schemes
- Tele-working, teleconferencing and home shopping

5.3    National studies undertaken by the DfT suggest that high intensity application of softer measures (to best practice) could achieve significant reductions in traffic volumes:
- Reduction in peak urban traffic of about 21% (off peak 13%)
- Nationwide reduction in all traffic of about 11%

5.4    There is also evidence to suggest that softer measures which aim to change travel behaviour also present a very cost effective option for achieving modal shift.  DfT study data would suggest that for every £1 spent on soft measures could bring about a £10 benefit in the form of reduced congestion.  This investment does not include other health and environmental benefits derived from reduced traffic.

5.5    The panel also heard evidence from an independent expert from the University of Westminster who confirmed that changing travel behaviour was effective in delivering improved uptake sustainable travel, was the most cost effective way to deliver modal shift (compared to hard measures) and helps target scarce resources appropriately.

5.6    The panel heard evidence that, to some degree, Haringey council was already undertaking a number of smarter travel measures including travel planning, travel awareness campaigns and car clubs.  These were at varying stages of implementation from firmly established (school based travel planning) to more recent developments (car clubs).


Developing a smarter travel programme

5.7    What was apparent from visits to other authorities (Sutton and Peterborough) which distinguished smarter travel initiatives in these areas was that there was programme of coordinated activities which targeted interventions with local residents.  The panel also identified a number of common themes in successful smarter travel programmes:

- Preliminary research to identify travel behaviours
- Clear programme objectives (i.e. modal shift)
- Was supported by a multi-agency stakeholder board and actively sought to involve partners
- Developed a balanced programme of initiatives
- Targeting of interventions  - those most likely to change use of new technology (i.e. MOSAIC)
- Initiatives need to be delivered in a branded programme which is recognisable to local residents

5.8    The panel felt that there was clearly good practice identified in other borough which could be successfully transplanted within Haringey, most particularly the programmatic approach to smarter travel initiatives.

- **The panel agreed that Council should make use of new technologies to ensure that appropriate targeting of smarter travel initiatives takes place (i.e. MOSAIC)**

- **Are there elements of the smarter travel programmes seen in other boroughs (i.e. in 1.6) which can be successfully implemented in Haringey?**

- **What resource implications will there be for developing a sustainable travel programme?**

- **How does the Council ensure that every smarter travel initiative has a legacy?**

Travel planning

5.9    The panel heard that the most efficient tool in a programme of smarter travel initiatives was the use of travel planning.  This entails providing targeted travel advice, information, resources and incentives to make people more aware of their travel choices and help them change their travel behaviour.  This can occur in a range of contexts including businesses, schools or the homes of individuals.

5.10   The panel heard from TfL that there was a need to prioritise travel plan provision, aiming at those organisations or events where there is the largest travel footprint such as large companies, colleges, schools and large entertainment venues. The panel heard that targeting these organisations would be the most cost effective way in delivering successful sustainable transport programmes and achieving modal shift.

5.11   In the context of the above, the panel also understood that there was a need to establish those organisations which created the largest local travel footprint and develop an appropriate hierarchy of travel plan provision (i.e. workplace, schools, entertainment venues, shopping centres, individuals).

Workplace travel plans

5.12 Work based travel planning is particularly important as 1/3 of all travel trips undertaken are work related. The panel noted that a reduction in operating costs would be a prime motivator for businesses and this should frame engagement and subsequent sustainable travel planning initiatives in this sector.

5.13 Larger businesses (over 250+ employees) in London can call upon the support of TfL own travel planning team to help develop staff travel plans in the workplace. It was noted that the Haringey shared a Workplace Travel Advisor with five boroughs to support sustainable travel. This work is done through an enterprise company and thus most work is performed 'at arms length'. From April 2010, it is anticipated that this role will be developed to focus more on outer London boroughs in the group (Haringey included).

5.14 In Haringey there are approximately 8,900 businesses, together employing some 61,700 people (based on 2008 figures). The majority of the businesses in Haringey are small: 94.2% of firms employ fewer than 24 people. These small businesses account for 39.3% of total employment in the borough.

5.15 It is apparent that workplace travel planning represents an effective approach to promoting sustainable travel. The panel may wish to consider:

- **Can the capacity of the workplace travel planner be increased to enable them to focus on Haringey workplaces?**

- **How else work place travel planning in Haringey can be supported?**

School Travel Plans
5.16 Schools and colleges are also significant trip generators and therefore an important target for dedicated travel planning (school travel plans). The panel noted that the aim of developing the school travel plan (STP) was to reduce the number of car trips to and from the school, remove barriers to sustainable transport, promote active travel and develop community responses to transport / traffic problems in the school location.

5.17 The panel noted that there is an established programme of travel planning with schools in Haringey. The panel heard that Haringey performs well with school travel planning: all schools have an approved travel plan and that 83/99 schools had an updated travel plan. The panel noted that there have been evident successes within this programme, for example Devonshire Hill Primary School achieved a 13% increase in walking. It was also noted by TfL, that Moselle School is cited at a model of STP best practice.

5.18 The panel hear that the STP was funded (£340k per annum) and monitored through Transport for London. The panel heard that STP in Haringey had a significant impact on modal shift: there was a 21% reduction in car usage amongst staff and 7% reduction amongst pupils. More pupils now cycled (+4%) and walked to school (+1%). More staff now walked to school (+11%) or got the bus (+6%).

5.19    Although STP coverage was good, the panel heard that the travel benefits would begin to tail off as individual circumstances / travel behaviour changed (children change school, school leads move on, parents change job).  In this context, the most pressing challenge was keeping schools motivated and engaged to the travel planning process.

5.20    The panel noted that small grants were available to promote further engagement and that TfL had developed better rewards for schools that continue with school travel planning (British Gas Green Leaves) where schools can receive funding for PC's.

5.21    The panel were very interested to her about the successful development of school travel planning in Haringey and were keen that momentum for this project did not falter.  The panel also noted that there was not as much funding in the smarter travel within the STP budget which would require the programme to refocus its work (i.e. provision of school cycle training).

5.22    In the context of the above, the panel:

- **Agreed that there School Travel Plans should be refreshed to ensure that travel (and other health and environmental) benefits are maintained and developed**

- **Wanted further clarification on the provision of school cycle training**

- **May wish to consider further ways in which STP can be supported in Haringey?**

Personal Travel Planning

5.23    The panel heard evidence from both Sutton Council and Peterborough Council that personal travel planning had been integral to smarter travel programmes developed in these authorities.

5.24    Individual travel planning was developed on an Individual Travel Marketing approach (developed by SUSTRANS), which targets particular segments of the population who may be most likely to change their travel behaviour.  This approach aims to save time and money for participants as well as improve their health and well being (via active travel methods).

5.24    The panel heard evidence that the individual travel planning approach had been successful in both authorities, for example, in Peterborough walking trips had increased by 9%, cycling trips by 36% and car usage reduced by 11%. Sustrans reported that similar results have been seen in Watford, Worcester and Doncaster.  Of particular interest to the panel was that Sustrans reported that they are working in areas of social housing in Tower Hamlets where the aim is to increase use of modes sustainable travel by 10%.

5.25    The panel heard that personal travel planning, although not as cost effective as other more collective forms of travel planning (schools and workplaces) it had been successful in delivering modal shift. Furthermore, the personal

contact developed with residents had been invaluable resource in identifying travel concerns and barriers,

5.26    The panel noted that Sutton had developed a more cost effective model in delivering individual travel planning advice and information. The key to this was employing teams of temporary staff who could be employed periodically in targeting campaigns.

5.27    In Haringey it was noted that the individual travel planning was to be included within the recently announced Muswell Hill low carbon zone project. In this project, travel marketing would occur alongside other broader sustainability issues (i.e. recycling, reducing energy consumption) to reduce carbon across the community.

5.28    The panel heard that London Travelwatch undertake outreach work through a mobile unit in London Boroughs. It was noted that at a recent excursion to Croydon, staff had conducted over 2000 individual travel surveys with local residents (to promote public transport options). It was suggested that the mobile unit be invited to Haringey (Wood Green).

- **What can be learnt from personal travel planning process within the Muswell Hill Low Carbon Project?**

- **Can personal travel planning accompany broader sustainability issues?**

- **Are there opportunities to develop personal travel planning with local partners/ other council departments with shared / similar objectives?**

- **How can individual travel planning be developed in Haringey?**

- **It was agreed that the sustainable transport service invite the London Travelwatch mobile unit to Haringey.**

Travel planning for events and trip generators

5.29    The panel also heard that there was a need to develop travel plans for those organisations or events which were significant trip generators for the borough. This could include festivals (at Finsbury Park), football matches (at Spurs) and local hospitals.

5.30    The panel noted in the evidence that TfL had supported travel planning at hospital sites in other boroughs which in some instances had given rise to a 9% uplift in bus usage. The panel noted that TfL had raised the redevelopment North Middlesex with NHS London for similar consideration.

5.31    The panel may wish to consider:

- **How trip generating events are are supported in the borough?**

Car clubs

5.32 Car clubs were seen as an important part of encouraging modal shift, as they offered considerable benefits to car owners which may encourage them to give up their car: easy access to car hire without the overheads associated with car ownership.

5.33 The panel heard that car clubs have grown rapidly across London where there are approximately 1,600 vehicles and 89,000 members across 23 boroughs. Car club audits have shown real benefits for sustainable transport as it is estimated that 20% of members will sell their car and an even higher proportion will decide not to buy a new vehicle as a result of joining a car club.

5.34 The panel heard that car clubs has been successfully developed in Haringey where there were currently 14 bays (for 27 cars). It was noted that additional investment was planned (10/11) which would see 66 vehicles available from 48 locations. It was reported that Membership uptake was good and that the average usage of cars was about 15 hours per day.

5.35 The panel noted that there was a target of developing 80 local bays across the borough with residents being no more than 5 minutes distant. It was also that the focus of future development was to increase local membership, develop access and consult on further new bays.

5.36 The panel noted the successful development of this scheme but considered ways in which access could be improved. The panel:

- **Agreed that the selection of car club sites should include areas of the borough where public transport links are underdeveloped.**

- **Agreed that the accessibility of car clubs to older people and those with a disability should be investigated further.**

- **Ensure that car club spaces are adequately provided within planned new developments.**

Car Share
5.37 A car share programme offer local residents the opportunity to register journeys and search for a match. The panel heard evidence from both visits to Peterborough and Sutton that both commuting and leisure journeys may be matched, as to can regular or one-off journeys. The aim of car share is to reduce car and passenger journeys.

5.38 In Peterborough, the matching travel plans was noted to have gone a stage further, in that cycle and walking journeys can also be matched as well as car journeys. This was used to support the uptake of sustainable ravel methods (i.e. for further confidence).

5.39 Haringey operates a car share scheme within the Council's own travel plan. To date, this has not been extended to residents.

## 6. Public Transport

6.1 The panel heard that Haringey is quite well-served by public transport, with a network of rail, bus and tube services spanning the borough. The panel noted that there were:
- 6 underground stations
- 3 overland rail lines (Barking-Gospel Oak/Moorgate-Hertford/Liverpool St-Enfield)
- 40 bus routes, almost all of which are high frequency.

6.2 The panel received evidence which indicated that bus and underground use among Haringey residents was higher than that recorded for people living in both central and outer London residents. Rail use by Haringey residents is slightly below inner and outer London averages.

6.3 The panel heard that targeted interventions to improve public transport uptake can achieve modal shift (i.e. promoting the development of a new bus service or the extension of an existing rail service). In Hertfordshire, a 9% uplift in bus usage had been achieved through targeted marketing (i.e. information and sample passes).

Bus Services

6.4 The panel heard that the bus service was particularly important to Haringey residents as the bus network supports far more passenger journeys than rail or tube combined. Further more, the panel heard evidence that the bus network is crucial in supporting the mobility of less physically able, lower incomes and other socially disadvantaged groups. As a result it was important, where possible, to develop and extend this network.

6.5 The panel heard evidence from both London Travelwatch and that there were a number of areas where possible developments could be made in Haringey: The panel indicated that it may wish to form recommendations in this area:

- **That there is further cooperation across boroughs to support the development of the b us network in Haringey.**

- **That for consistency, harmonisation the timing of bus priority schemes throughout the borough should be considered.**

- **That parking restrictions in bus lanes be extended to evenings and weekends should be considered.**

Rail Services

1.6 The Panel herd that there are two radial (Moorgate-Hertford/Liverpool St-Enfield) and one orbital (Barking-Gospel Oak) rail lines that operate through Haringey. The radial lines were considered to provide good links to the city and other inner London destinations.

6.7 A number of informants highlighted that the electrification of the Barking-Gospel Oak line was of paramount importance in developing orbital capacity,

not just for Haringey but for many other north London boroughs. It was also noted that electrification may also bring greater service reliability.

6.8 It was noted that individual boroughs would find it difficult to influence train service commissioners (DT/TfL/Network Rail) for improved rail services. It was suggested that the borough works more strategically with other boroughs to secure improvements which may include:

- **Electrification of the Barking- Gospel Oak line**

- **Improved passenger facilities on both the Barking Gospel Oak line and Moorgate Welwyn line to include more passenger shelters, station lighting and passenger information**

- **Increased frequency of trains on Liverpool St-Enfield line at peak periods.**

6.9 The panel also heard that the rail and tube line stations situated in the borough were subject to increased commuter traffic. It was suspected that a number of stations were used by commuter's access transport network to travel in to central London. London Travelwatch suggested the development of travel plans for all stations:

- **Travel plans should be developed for all main line and underground stations in Haringey to consider the development of CPZ around stations, and improved access by bicycle and foot should be prioritised.**

Tube services

6.10 The panel heard from Transport for London that the cost of developing capacity on tube lines was prohibitive, and that it was far more cost effective to support initiatives which reduced the passenger trips or supported other modes of travel.

6.11 The panel heard that there were planned improvements for both tube lines that run through the borough. It was noted that capacity on the Victoria line would be increased by up to 20% by 2012 and that capacity on the Piccadilly line would be increased by 25% by 2018.

## 7. Walking

7.1 A number of informants provided evidence to the panel of the importance of walking developing sustainable transport. It was noted that as all journeys start and finish on foot, greater attention needs to be paid to improving the walking environment to make walking more practicable and desirable option.

7.2 The Panel heard that footway maintenance was a significant area of investment for the borough. Footway repairs were planned 18 months in advance and were determined by a range of criteria including; condition of

footway, proximity to a school or other public amenity, whether it was a popular shopping route and the desire to spread investment across the borough.

7.3     It was also noted that there are two separate budgets (planned footway repair and reactive maintenance budget) to cover all short and medium term footway replacements.  The panel noted that the Council now has a robust system of inspection in place where roads and footpaths are inspected twice annually. This had reduced the Council's insurance premiums by one third.

7.4     Although walking accounts for 31% of all journeys in Haringey, it was felt that there through a number of identified actions there was scope to improve this modal share further.  A number of key suggestions were discussed among the panel:
   ▪ Improved maintenance
   ▪ Improved lighting
   ▪ Removing obstacles (and improving permeability)
   ▪ Improved signage

7.5     The panel heard that there had been some recent successes in developing walking and cycling Greenways, in particular Parkland Walk.  £175k has been granted from TfL to maintain access through this route which runs through the borough (Alexandra Park to Finsbury Park) and is used by both walkers and cyclists.  The proposed new Wood Green multiple crossing system would also be an example of greater walking permeability.

7.6     The maintenance of footways was an area of considerable discussion among the panel.  It suggested that it would like to consider recommendations in the following areas:

   ▪ **Improved public consultation/ notification processes to identify priorities for footway repair or renewal.**

   ▪ **Harmonisation of reporting processes to identify footways in need of repair/renewal across both Haringey Council and Homes for Haringey.**

   ▪ **Prioritisation of projects to improve the public realm.**

## 8.     Cycling

8.1     In the period 2000-2007, the number of cyclists in London has increased by 91%, however, cycling still accounts for a relatively small proportion of all trips (2%).

8.2     Cycle patterns also vary widely across London: in inner London cycling accounts for 3% of all trips but in outer London the comparative figure is just 1%.  Cycling's modal share varies widely by London borough: modal share in Hackney is ten times greater than lowest borough.

8.3 In Haringey cycling modal share is 1%, in line with outer London boroughs. Similarly, the proportion of people who have cycled for more than 30 minutes within a 4 week period was 10.2% in Haringey, lower than statistical neighbours (Southwark 13.4%, Hackney 14.8% and Lambeth 16.2%).

8.4 Perhaps because of the density of the travel network, trip indicators show that cycling declines the further journeys start from the centre of London. Furthermore, 50% of all car journeys in outer London are less than 2km which most people could cycle in 10 minutes. The panel heard that these factors underline the need to focus on delivering initiatives which encourage cycling in outer London areas.

Cycle strategy

8.5 The panel noted that coordination of effort and development of services had been central to cycling achievements in other boroughs. The panel also heard that the boroughs cycling strategy was the key to such coordination and ensured a consistency of approach and was recognised in all policy and development plans.

8.6 The panel may wish to consider the position of the Haringey Cycling Strategy or action plan (particularly in relation to Biking Borough status)

- **Refresh of existing strategy**

- **Clear targets for modal share**

- **Linked to other council policies**

Biking Borough

8.7 The panel supported Haringey Council's successful application for Biking Borough status. Within this scheme, 12 outer London boroughs have each been funded an initial £25k to conduct a study to identify and prioritise ways in which cycling can be developed in the borough. Additional logistical support will be provided from TfL in the form cycling/travel data and advice.

8.8 The panel noted that the Council intended to recruit external consultants to conduct the study and to produce a cycling plan for Haringey. It was also noted that the timeframe for the production of the cycling plan was tight (end of March 2010).

8.9 The panel may wish to consider the implications of cycle plan in respect of:

- **Assurances that local biking organisations consulted in development of cycle plan**

- **Clarification of cycle plan in relation to local cycling strategy (refresh)**

Cycle Superhighway

8.10 The panel noted that planned Cycle Superhighways (as specified in the Mayors Transport Strategy) would cross through Haringey: route 1 in the east (Tottenham to Liverpool Street) and route 12 in the west (East Finchley to Angel.

8.11 Although there was an expected delay to final implementation (2012) the panel indicated that the Council should plan and prepare for this addition to the cycle network:

- **local cycle network should develop access to and compliment theses main arterial routes**

Member Champion
8.12 The Panel noted the briefing from Cycling England concerning the appointment of a Member Champion for Cycling. The panel thought that this was initiative should be supported within the Council as this would provide leadership for the promotion of cycling in the borough.

- **That the panel consider the establishment of  Member Champion for cycling for Haringey**

Cycle Parking
8.13 Thee panel heard evidence through Joanne McCartney which suggested that availability of safe, secure and appropriately located cycle parking however, was significant barrier to potential cyclists. In particular the panel heard that:
- About 70,000 bikes are stolen each year in London
- Some bike stands are of poor quality
- There is a major under capacity of about 100,000 stands

8.14 The panel heard that the Council had fitted over 40 bike stands across the borough in the past year, for which Haringey Cycling Campaign had been consulted. The panel heard evidence that there should be a more systematic approach to improving cycle stand provision to ensure that stands were developed where they are most needed. In this context the panel may wish to consider the benefits of:

- **Conducting ward audits of cycle stand provision (perhaps in collaboration with local community groups)**

- **Developing a local database of the number, type and location of cycle stands Haringey**

- **Develop a cycle stand development plan from above (identify gaps in provision /inform priorities for stand development)**

Cycle Parking – social housing
8.15 The panel heard that there was a particular need to look at the fitting of bike stands in social housing as bikes left in communal hallways presented obvious health and safety issues (i.e. emergency access).

8.16 Evidence received by the panel concerning the installation of bikes sheds at 3 pilot sites in Haringey, suggested that success was limited, in fact two cycle sheds were hardly being used at all. The panel also understood that funding was also an issue, as these projects had been funded through TfL. The panel also noted that cycle stands were not being provided by Homes for Haringey under the Decent Homes process.

8.17 In respect of retrospective fitting of social housing, evidence from London Cycling Campaign and Haringey Council suggested a number of options to improve provision which the panel may wish to note:

- **Partnership between council, social housing providers and TfL to secure funding**

- **Developing local ownership through residents associations**

- **Improved management arrangements**

8.18 In respect of installing cycle stands within new development the panel may wish to assess:

- **whether there is a minimum standard for cycle stand provision which is systematically applied**

Improving cycling uptake.

8.19 The panel heard considerable evidence from a range of informants on how more people could be encouraged to cycle in Haringey. From this evidence and form discussion amongst the panel it was cleat that there were a number of perceived barriers in Haringey:
- Incomplete cycle network (disjointed)
- Funding for infrastructure improvement is limited
- Lack of individual area based approach to improving town centre access
- Parking facilities
- Safety concerns (traffic speed/volume/HGV)
- Training, information and education

8.20 A number of contributors provided evidence to the panel as to how uptake could be improved, of which there were a number of common themes and priorities. The London Cycling Campaign presented a hierarchy of developments:
- Reduce traffic volumes
- Reduce traffic speeds
- Hazard reduction at junctions (filtered permeability)
- Reallocation of carriageway
- Cycle tracks away from roads (connecting green spaces)
- Conversion of footpaths

8.21 A number of questions are presented below which the panel may like to consider in assessing how cycling uptake can be improved in Haringey>

- **Is there an appropriate and robust mechanism to consult local cycling groups in development of cycle network, transport infrastructure and other cycling developments?**

- **How are we addressing local barriers to cycle uptake?**

- **Do planning mechanisms and structures fully recognise and support the development of cycling in Haringey? Is this in the UDP?**

- **How can the authority overcome funding barriers to cycling developments (partners within the Haringey Strategic Partnership, neighbouring boroughs)?**

- **How should cycling be promoted? Is this reaching all groups?**
    - **Promotion of positive imagery**
    - **Health partners**
    - **Walking, jogging and cycling officer**

## 9. Parking policy

9.1 The Panel heard evidence which suggested that a central issue with car usage within the borough was local parking policy. The panel heard evidence from a number of sources (Friends of the Earth, Sustainable Haringey) which noted that the availability of parking was a key determinant within local traffic congestion and broader influence in the uptake of other sustainable modes of travel.

9.2 The panel heard that there were a number of local examples where improved parking policies could lead to reduced traffic congestion, improved traffic flow and uptake of sustainable travel alternatives:
- Introducing car parking restrictions around all rail and tube stations to prevent inward commuters.
- The availability of plentiful and free parking at Arena shopping centre was central to congestion in the Harringay areas of the borough.
- Availability of parking a local shopping centres generally which contributed to increased traffic, congestion and local pollution (i.e. Green Lanes)

9.3 The panel heard that parking policy is clearly an important demand management tool in controlling local traffic congestion and determining choice of transport.

Parking at local shopping centres

9.4 The panel discussed the provision of parking at local shopping centres, its impact on local congestion, its appeal as a shopping destination and the broader impact on the economic vitality of that area. The panel noted that a delicate balance needed to be achieved in meeting these objectives.

9.5 The panel heard evidence from the evaluation of the 'stop and shop' scheme in two local shopping centres (Crouch End and Muswell Hill). The main

findings from this evaluation were that the parking periods needed to be extended, that improved signage would be helpful and that there was scope for further pay and display bays in the main shopping areas.

9.6     The panel heard that whilst the car was clearly important mode of travel to access local shopping centres, convenient parking and with it large numbers of cars did not necessarily make these areas more attractive area to shop. The panel were agreed however, that encouraging people to shop local was an important process in encouraging sustainable transport use and that there should be further initiatives to incentivise local people to shop locally.

9.7     Furthermore, the panel heard evidence from other Sutton Council of schemes to encourage use of sustainable travel to local town centres.  In one example, incentives were provided to encourage people to access local shopping centres via sustainable travel methods.

9.8     The panel heard evidence of the need to change approach to local transport planning and to move away from assessing singular issues (i.e. parking, cycling provision) and move toward area based approaches to transport problem.   The panel heard evidence from Sutton that such an approach (which assessed an areas total transport needs) was being used for local town centres in this borough.

9.9     More broadly, the panel heard evidence which suggested that it may be useful to conduct further research on the transportation to local shopping centres.

9.10    The panel identified a number of areas where it may wish to consider drawling conclusions and recommendations:

- **The panel agreed that there should be further initiatives to incentivise local people to shop locally.**

- **Should there be further research on the modes of travel used to access local shopping centres?**

- **Should there be schemes to encourage greater usage of local shopping centres by sustainable transport?**

- **Will the development of travel plans or an area based approach to transport issues in local shopping centres help?**

Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ)

9.11    The panel also heard that the restriction of car parking in local residential areas could be effective in reducing car usage and promoting more sustainable methods of transport.  The panel heard evidence that CPZ's have been shown to reduce incoming traffic and encourage the use of other more sustainable forms of transport.

9.12    CPZs and parking policy in general were noted by the panel to be a particular sensitive issue which ultimately required community consent for successful

implementation. The panel heard conflicting evidence on approaches to the development of CPZ:

- should CPZ's be allowed to develop incrementally across the borough as local needs demand it and communities agree to their installation or,
- should CPZ's be developed in a planned and proactive response to broader transport objectives i.e. designating all areas around railway stations to be CPZ?

9.13 The panel heard evidence from the Campaign for Better Transport and Friends of the Earth which noted the importance of recognising the problem of parking in new residential and commercial developments. It was noted that local planning policies should reflect local sustainable travel priorities in considering parking provision in such developments.

9.14 In considering these issues, the panel agreed on a number of conclusions which it may like to form recommendations:

- **The panel agreed that further work should be carried out to establish whether the introduction of CPZ's have impacted on modal shift.**

- **How can community support be developed for the introduction of CPZ?**

- **Does a more proactive approach to the development of CPZ's need to be adopted?**

- **Should CPZ's be introduced around local transport hubs?**

- **Are the sustainable travel objectives of the Council acknowledged in local parking policies and planning guidance for approval of further car parking in new development?**

## 10. Reducing congestion/ traffic calming

10.1 The panel heard evidence which indicated that the Council was engaged in a wide range of activities to help reduce traffic congestion and reduce the volume and speed of traffic on local roads including 20mph zones, DIY Streets, psychological traffic calming and home zones.

10.2 The panel heard evidence from Living Streets which underlined how heavy blights local communities and that traffic calming was a useful tool in helping develop social and community networks. In this context, it was felt that traffic calming measures could help foster community spirit and cohesion.

10.3 The panel heard that processes which supported traffic calming or reduced congestion were an essential process in locking in the benefits of modal shift as well as encouraging further use of more sustainable modes of travel (especially walking and cycling).

Road Permit Scheme

10.4    The panel heard that the council had signed up to the road permit scheme from January 11th 2010.  Within this scheme, utility companies would be required to purchase a permit for undertaking roadworks in the borough.  It was noted that road replacement would be inspected for quality and there would be penalties for over runs.  It was hope that this would bring greater oversight to roadwork management in the borough and help to reduce congestion.

20mph zones/ 20 mph speed limit

10.5    The panel heard that the current policy of the council was that a number of 20 mph zones (n=18) have already been introduced where there has been a high accident rate, though there were no plans to introduce a borough wide 20mph speed limit until appropriate enforcement procedures could be agreed.

10.6    The panel heard that evidence that a number of areas had developed borough wide 20 mph zones, including Portsmouth City Council and two neighbouring boroughs, Hackney and Islington Council.  The panel heard that 24mph was the critical average speed for installation of physical road barriers to reduce speed: where the average speed is below 24mph no physical measures are needed by above this speed physical measures are required.

10.7    It has been noted that the interim evaluation of the Portsmouth scheme demonstrated a 0.9mph reduction in speeds city wide, a reduction of 7mph where prior average speeds were above 24mph, a reduction in road accidents and road casualties (13% / 15% respectively).  It was not possible to ascertain if any decrease in traffic volume had been achieved.

10.8    Another important consideration for local authorities was speed policy.  It was suggested to the panel that there should be a 20mph default limit across the borough to help create a cultural change of road usage, to make roads safer, more accessible and more attractive to other less polluting forms of transport and to pedestrians alike.

10.9    The panel may wish to draw further conclusions or recommendations from the evidence that was received:

- **Should 20 mph zones continue to be targeted at those areas of most need (i.e. where accidents occur)?**

- **Should there be an extension of 20mph limit within the borough?**

Home Zones

10.10   The panel heard that Home Zones were an attempt to strike a balance between vehicular traffic and other users. Home Zones work through the physical alteration of streets and roads in an area which force motorists to drive with greater care and at lower speeds. It was noted that these can be more costly compared to other measures (DIY Streets).

10.11   The panel noted that a number of Home Zones have been developed in the borough and whilst these had brought some improvement, there were ongoing

problems: namely continuing conflict between different street users. This highlighted the need for continuing engagement and education for new people coming on to the street and the need to involve people beyond just 'active residents'.

DIY Streets

10.12   This is an initiative developed by Sustrans which helps residents to re-design their streets affordably, putting people at their heart, and making them safer and more attractive places to live. The aim is to find simple interventions that have low capital costs, are effective and durable. These have an approximate £20k budget per annum.

10.13   The panel noted that the Council had signed up with Sustrans for a DIY Streets project in Haringey. It was noted that the Langham Road area (off West green Road) had been selected as there had been a number of speeding concerns in this area. The project would commence in April 2010.

Psychological Traffic Calming

10.14   The panel heard evidence to support the development of psychological traffic calming, a process through which strategic planting of trees can contribute to reducing traffic speeds. Through planting tall evergreen trees, the road ahead is obscured for drivers which has the psychological effect of reducing vehicle speed and calming traffic flow.

10.15   The panel noted that there were additional benefits for this approach in that tree planting was on the road (tubs) which left footways free of obstruction whilst still maintaining pleasant environment. It was also noted that this was a relatively cheap and effective form of traffic calming.

10.16   The panel noted that a pilot of psychological traffic calming had already been commissioned locally (Crescent Road, N17). It was noted that the psychological traffic calming may be an ideal project to be included within local Making the Difference schemes.

10.17   During the course of discussion about traffic calming, no recommendations or conclusions were made by the panel. The panel may wish to considered the following questions:

- **As the above traffic calming programmes are in their early stages of development, is a coordinated evaluation needed to assess there impact?**

- **Could psychological traffic calming be put forward as possible suggestions for Making the Difference scheme?**

- **How can areas within the borough be put forward for traffic calming schemes?**

## 11.   Land Use and Planning

11.1    The panel noted that planning and land use in developing sustainable transport options was recognised through national planning guidance: Planning Policy Guidance 13.  This recognises that planning can shape the nature, level, density and pattern of development which may influence travel and patterns and behaviour.  The guidance stipulates that there needs to be
- More sustainable choices for moving people and freight
- Promoting accessibility of jobs and leisure via public transport, walking and cycling
- Developing measures that reduce the need to travel (especially by car).

11.2    The panel heard evidence from a range of informants which suggested that local land use and planning guidance was a critical factor in influencing use of sustainable modes of transport.  Through the Local Development Framework and other planning guidance, the Council could actively shape transport development and subsequent travel behaviour.

11.3    The recently developed core strategy provides a number of planning policy guidelines which should support economic regeneration, reduce car dependency, combat climate change and improve environmental quality.  Proposals will commit the Council to:
- Promote public transport, cycling and walking
- Integrate transport planning and land use planning to reduce the need to travel
- Promote improvements to public transport interchanges
- Locate trip generating developments (i.e. supermarkets) in locations with good public transport
- Support measure to influence behavioral change.

11.4    The panel heard evidence to suggest that local planning guidance should be assessed to ascertain how this may help to:
- Reduce the need to travel – promotion of sustainable town centre's
- Encourage place led design – where traffic schemes designed on what a place needs rather than how much motor traffic needs to pass through.
- Deter car use – through minimizing parking provision in new development and extension of car free developments
- Promote sustainable travel – minimum standards cycle stand provision in new development.

Sustainable Town Centres
11.5    The panel heard evidence from a range of sources (Campaign for Better Transport, Friends of the Earth) which indicated that the creation thriving local town centre's which catered for the needs of local residents were of paramount importance in minimizing the need to travel and encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of travel.

11.6    The heard that an audit was undertaken (prior to the recession) of all local metropolitan (Wood Green) and district shopping centers (Muswell Hill, Crouch End & Seven Sisters and Tottenham).  This identified that district centers were doing quite well, though Wood Green was facing pressures from

the number of vacant shops and the need to diversify appeal to a broader range of leisure and entertainment opportunities.

11.7  The panel heard that local town centers were under pressure from the rising cost of rentals which was a deterrent to smaller businesses. It was also noted that the diversity of local shops was under pressure, because although class usage (retail A1) could not change, leases may be more affordable to chain outlets.

11.8  The panel was in agreement that the creation of sustainable shopping facilities should be a key priority for the council, which should prioritise access by sustainable transport. This would be beneficial to all stakeholders; more attractive to local shoppers, more people shopping locally is better for business and less pollution/ emissions.

11.9  The panel may wish to consider if there are any further measures identified in the review which may support the development and maintenance of thriving local town centres.

- Is the link clearly between land use and sustainable transport within the Core Strategy and other planning guidance?

- Are walking and cycling represented within the UDP/ Core strategy?

New development
11.10  The panel heard that the construction of new development, be it residential or commercial, presented significant opportunities to determine transport infrastructure and influence subsequent travel behaviour.

11.11  The panel heard from the Campaign for Better Transport on the need to influence the location of residential development in outer London, to ensure that local accommodation was adjacent to local town centres (to minimise the need to travel).

11.12  The panel noted that the council was supportive of car free development in Haringey. Whilst these have evidently reduced car usage (they do not totally exclude cars) it was noted that they were not without problems, particularly if those residents require a car for their own business.

11.13  The panel sought clarification of the council's position on car free developments. It was noted that the Council is supportive of car free developments and also specify maximum car parking spaces for other new developments.

11.14  The panel also heard evidence of the need to make sufficient provision for sustainable travel in new development which would be a significant trip generator for the borough (i.e. the Spurs redevelopment). The panel noted that it would want the mistakes at the redevelopment of the Arsenal football ground, where only 60 cycle spaces were provided for a stadium seating over 60,000 people.

11.15 The panel may wish to consider the following questions in determining any conclusions or recommendations for the review?

- **Are there minimum standards for cycling provision within new development and broader cycle stand installation?**

- **Do all new developments have a travel plan?**

- **How are sustainable travel options systematically included in development plans?**

- **What restrictions are placed on the provision of parking at new developments? (Maximum provision ratio)**

## 12. Accessibility of sustainable transport

12.1 During the course of evidence presented, a number of issues were noted by the panel which affect the accessibility of sustainable modes of travel, which should be acknowledged within the review.

12.2 In evidence to the panel, the importance of the local **bus network** was highlighted. Buses were noted to have greater benefit for low income groups, or those limited or no access to a car, such as young people, disabled people and older people. It was also noted that some low-paid jobs require shifts which make it difficult to access other forms of public transport (i.e. rail and tube).

12.3 The panel heard evidence from older people and disabled group representatives which highlighted the need to address a number of accessibility issues for the local bus network:
- Lighting at bus stops
- Step free access
- Bus journeys (braking too quickly)

12.4 The panel heard that **cyclists** in London are predominantly white, male, under 55 years of age and social class ABC1 (middle class and upward). The panel heard from hackney council, that a promoting cycling to women and black and Minority Ethnic communities represented a significant challenge.

12.5 The panel also heard evidence about the limited disabled access to the **rail and tube network** in Haringey. It was noted that there is just one rail station (Harringay) and one tube station (Tottenham Hale) which have disabled access.

12.6 Not all older people or those with a disability can use the main transport networks and are reliant upon **door to door transport** (Dial-a-ride, Taxicard, Community Transport and Hospital Transport). The panel heard evidence which suggested that these services were not reliable and were integrated. It

was noted that the GLA are investigating door-to-door transport and this has been identified as an area for possible scrutiny review.

12.7    The panel heard that there were **parking problems for carers** of elderly and disabled people in the borough.  There were numerous instances of where carers were receiving parking tickets for just popping in to look after vulnerable Haringey residents.  The panel heard that LB Barnet have a dedicated badge for carers which allows them to park without worry when caring for local residents.

12.8    It was noted that Haringey Council operates the Companion Badge, which is a type of parking permit for disabled people.  It is designed to provide eligible residents with protection against people who steal Blue Badges displayed in vehicles. It was not clear if this can be used generically for carer's or needs to be used for specific vehicles.

- **The panel agreed that that Companion badge and Taxicard should be promoted further among elderly and disabled residents and their carers.**

- **The panel agreed that parking permit provision for carers should be looked in to further.**

- **How door to door transport is integrated in Haringey?**

- **How can cycling be promoted to groups - women, BME groups and**

- **Car clubs to older and disabled people**

- **Do we need to think more about sustainable transport from equalities perspective – age group, BME groups.  – maybe this could be the focus of the walk, cycle and jog officer**

- **Disabled access to main line rail and tube network?**

- **Car clubs should be developed which are accessible for older and disabled people.**