TransportPlanning Society

One Great George Street, LONDON SW1P 3AA
T : 020 7665 2238   F : 020 7799 1325   E : policy@tps.org.uk

Response to Draft Mayor's Transport Strategy consultation
2 October 2017

The Transport Planning Society is an independent institutional body in the UK, established to facilitate, develop and promote best practice in transport planning and to provide a focus for dialogue between practitioners and others interested in the field. It is supported by four long established professional institutions – ICE, CIHT, CILT and RTPI - all of whom have an interest in transport planning as well as their own core activities.

The Transport Planning Society administers its own Professional Development Scheme for transport planners, leading to award of the Transport Planning Professional (TPP) qualification which is the only professional qualification uniquely aimed at transport planners. The Society has over 1200 individual members and 30 corporate member providers of transport planning services in the UK and elsewhere. Many of our members are working actively within the Transport industry to ensure that all modes of transport are catered for in a safe and considered way.

Our response has been drafted by the Policy Group within the Transport Planning Society Board, all of whom were elected by the membership as a whole. The Policy Group is in constant dialogue with other members of the Society and the views expressed here may be taken as representative of those held generally by our membership.

Consultation Response

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 1 – THE CHALLENGE

1) London faces a number of growing challenges to the sustainability of its transport system. To re-examine the way people move about the city in the context of these challenges, it is important that they have been correctly identified.

Please provide your views on the challenges outlined in the strategy, and describe any others you think should be considered.

TPS Response:

- We generally agree that health, population growth, air quality, affordable housing and quality of public transport are key challenges. We would also add economic and social inequality.
- The link between high population growth and the areas immediately outside London is unclear. Will high growth within London reduce the pressures for growth in, say Green Belt areas, or will those pressures be there as well? Is the right balance being struck between population growth within and without London? The balance eventually achieved will have its own impacts on London's transport systems.
- Could also add the maintenance of existing and new transport infrastructure. Maintaining what is already there is also a challenge when funds and resources are stretched.
- Finding alternative funding sources for transport is also a challenge. Many key beneficiaries of transport improvement do not make a contribution comparable with their gains.
- Sustaining implementation of the strategy through successive administrations at City Hall may be a challenge. Some aspects of the strategy also rely on government regulation and ensuring that may be a challenge, especially as government policy tends to be very responsive to a wide range of other events.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 2 – THE VISION

2) The Mayor's vision is to create a future London that is not only home to more people, but is a better place for all of those people to live and work in. The aim is that, by 2041, 80 per cent of Londoners' trips will be made on foot, by cycle or using public transport.

To what extent do you support or oppose this proposed vision and its central aim?

TPS Response:

- We generally support this vision but suggest that not only should London be a better place for all, but that social and economic inequality should be reduced (insofar as transport can contribute).

- We also suggest that more urgent action is needed on air quality, road safety and congestion, and that targets should be set for different parts of London. We consider that a higher target than 80% should be set for central London; that there should generally be intermediate targets, for different parts of London (e.g. central, inner, outer) between now and 2041; and that targets should be set for reductions in all vehicles, not just those carrying people.

3) To support this vision, the strategy proposes to pursue the following further aims:

- by 2041, for all Londoners to do at least the 20 minutes of active travel they need to stay healthy each day
- for no one to be killed in, or by a London bus by 2030, and for deaths and serious injuries from all road collisions to be eliminated from our streets by 2041
- for all buses to be zero emission by 2037, for all new road vehicles driven in London to be zero emission by 2040, and for London's entire transport system to be zero emission by 2050
- by 2041, to reduce traffic volumes by about 6 million vehicle kilometres per day, including reductions in freight traffic at peak times, to help keep streets operating efficiently for essential business and the public
- to open Crossrail 2 by 2033
- to create a London suburban metro by the late 2020s, with suburban rail services being devolved to the Mayor
- to improve the overall accessibility of the transport system including, by 2041, halving the average additional time taken to make a public transport journey on the step-free network compared with the full network
- to apply the principles of good growth

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the aims set out in this chapter?

TPS Response:

These are generally laudable aims, we have the following comments:

- There will be Londoners who are not capable of doing 20 min of active travel due to disability, illness or old age. They should not feel excluded from the Mayor's vision.
- It is ambitious to set "zero" fatality and injury targets, no matter how desirable. This should be done without imposing unacceptable costs or constraints on society.
- We agree with zero emission targets generally, although heed needs to be paid to the supporting technology and electrical infrastructure needed to support them.
- We consider that the target for all buses to be zero emission by 2037 is insufficiently ambitious, bearing in mind the Mayor's responsibilities and powers, and would welcome more challenging targets for zero emission buses, building on existing proposals for Low Emissions Bus Zones.
- We suggest that there should also be comparable targets for zero emission taxis, private hire vehicles and coaches, along with clearer rules and better enforcement on idling.
- We would regard some freight movements, at least, at peak times as "essential business". Suggest this target needs to be carefully considered.

- London Overground has been very successful to date but it has been in introduced on lightly used lines or lines which are shared by other trains only to a limited extent. There seems a risk that extending the concept more widely could require new railway capacity to be built to accommodate both London Overground and longer-distance services. This is supported provided that it can be funded.
- The Plan must recognise that transport and housing are integral to spatial planning, and policies for each must support the other. There should be a coherent vision that considers infrastructure and services needed to support sustainable urban forms and settlement patterns within London and the wider region. There needs to be explicit policies to avoid encouraging longer distance commuting into London that would generate significant additional (rail) transport demand that is very expensive and difficult to accommodate.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 3 – HEALTHY STREETS AND HEALTHY PEOPLE

4) Policy 1 and proposals 1-8 set out the Mayor's draft plans for improving walking and cycling environments (see pages 46 to 58).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve an improved environment for walking and cycling? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- We agree they would produce an improved environment for walking and cycling.
- However, more needs to be done to address some of the other deterrents to walking and cycling such as :
    - Making better provision for changing (clothes) and showering at destinations served by walking and cycling (especially)
    - Much better security for bicycles in public parking
    - Finding means of encouraging both whatever the weather (e.g. better drainage, protection from vehicle spray and splashing)
    - And the behavioural points noted below.
- Safe cycle routes also require safe use by cyclists, respectful of other road users including pedestrians. Suggest that instilling discipline into cyclists is needed if safe cycle routes are to be attractive to all.
- Improved discipline and understanding are needed by all non-motorised road users. Weaker cyclists are currently deterred by the aggression of the stronger. Misuse of footways by skateboarders and cyclists currently deters pedestrians or makes walking more stressful than it should be. Pedestrians walk out in front of cyclists without looking, relying on sound only. Bus queues can obstruct free movement along the footway. A behavioural programme is needed to instil better habits and consideration by all if walking and cycling are to become the norm. Motorists have the Highway Code; something similar is needed for non-motorised road users.

- Care needs to be taken to ensure that bus services are not disadvantaged by creating environments conducive to walking and cycling. Bus travel times through Parliament Square have already been extended due to the recent provision made for cycling facilities. That needs to be redressed in any further works there.
- Infrastructure to support longer intermodal journeys which include walking and cycling element also needs to be encouraged
- It is important in all transport planning that the unique multi-purpose nature of walking as the mode which enables personal interaction, dwell time and the undertaking of activities such as window shopping or simply enjoying a walk, is fully recognised. We suggest the following addition to Policy 1 in the Healthy Streets Section:
  - *….will seek to make London a city where people choose to walk and cycle more often by improving street environments, making it easier for everyone to get around on foot and by bike, **prioritising the improvement of footways and other pedestrian space**, and promoting the benefits of active travel. The Mayor's aim is that, by 2041, all Londoners do at least the 20 minutes of active travel they need to stay healthy each day.*
  - Proposal 1 e should be clarified: *Ensuring any scheme being undertaken on London's streets for any reason improves conditions for walking and cycling, **and not one at the expense of the other***.

5) Policy 2 and proposals 9-11 set out the Mayor's draft plans to reduce road danger and improve personal safety and security (see pages 62 to 67).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would reduce road danger and improve personal safety and security? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- We are generally supportive of the plans.
- We are concerned about the possible blanket application of 20mph speed limits on some streets carrying bus routes. The scale of any negative effects of applying 20mph limits on bus journey times should always be considered.

6) Policy 3 and proposals 12-14 set out the Mayor's draft plans
to ensure that crime and the fear of crime remain low on London's streets and transport system (see pages 68 to 69).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would ensure that crime and the fear of crime remain low on London's streets and transport system? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- More needs to be done to reduce street and public transport crime. Actual crime or fear of it is another deterrent to walking and cycling, especially among the weaker and more vulnerable, and those travelling at quieter times. More straightforward reporting procedures, more rapid assistance and higher rates of conviction would help.
- There is also the linked issue of perceived danger which in turn affects social exclusion in vulnerable sections of society.

7) Policy 4 and proposals 15-17 set out the Mayor's draft plans to prioritise space-efficient modes of transport to tackle congestion and improve the efficiency of streets for essential traffic, including freight (see pages 70 to 78).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would tackle congestion and improve the efficiency of streets? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- These are sensible proposals although we are not sure how much scope there is to transfer freight to rail, either in terms of the journeys it is making or in terms of spare capacity on the rail network. The rail network round London focuses on radial passenger services and freight often has to use circuitous and slow routes to pass through the area. There may be some scope to divert freight trains to routes further afield but considerable investment may be needed and operating costs may be increased.
- More off-street parking for delivery vehicles would help. Too often on-street parking by delivery vehicles obstructs passing traffic and reduces the efficiency of the street.
- TfL should also consider innovative means of facilitating deliveries, for example developing its 'virtual loading bay' concept to make kerbspace available for deliveries and servicing at critical times but releasing it for other uses when not required for freight.

8) Proposals 18 and 19 set out the Mayor's proposed approach to road user charging (see pages 81 to 83).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposed approach to road user charges? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- We are very supportive – given the lack of a coherent national road user charging strategy, London should take the lead in rolling out such a scheme and demonstrate the benefits.
- Charging focused on reducing congestion (i.e. road use at congested times and places) and emissions (i.e. related to emissions of vehicle) target exactly the Mayor's objectives.

- The role of PHV's needs to be carefully assessed – are they a help or a hindrance?

9) Proposals 20 and 21 set out the Mayor's proposed approach to localised traffic reduction strategies (see page 83).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this approach? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- Yes, the boroughs have a key role to play implementing the Mayor's Transport Strategy and it is right and imperative that they are encouraged to think about these matters and buy into the Strategy.

10) Policies 5 and 6 and proposals 22-40 set out the Mayor's draft plans to reduce emissions from road and rail transport, and other sources, to help London become a zero carbon city (see pages 86 to 103).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would help London become a zero carbon city? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- We like the proposal to issue air quality alerts. This would make the public more aware of the issue.
- All the measures would help although there are no proposals in the Strategy for dealing with non-transport emissions (although the issue is mentioned in the Strategy document). The objective of a zero carbon city is unlikely to be met within the timescale of the strategy but air quality should be significantly improved by the proposals. However, we probably do not need to get down to a zero carbon city. There is probably a low level of carbon emissions which is sustainable, and may not be worth the cost of eliminating.
- The issue of vehicles based outside London (and not necessarily subject to the Mayor's restrictions on new vehicle purchase) entering the capital is not mentioned although they would be deterred by penalties for entering the proposed expanded UL or Zero Emission Zones.
- While the Mayor's objective is to improve air quality in London, is there is a risk that the power generation elsewhere needed to support this will increase emissions in other locations, without any benefit to global climate change?

11) Policies 7 and 8 and proposals 41- 47 set out the Mayor's draft plans
to protect the natural and built environment, to ensure transport resilience to climate change, and to minimise transport-related noise and vibration (see pages 104 to 111).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve this? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included

TPS Response:

- These are all sensible suggestions although as many involve research, development, encouragement etc. it is unclear how effective they will be – but they should be beneficial.
- We support more trees but there will need to be increased maintenance funding to deal with leaf fall and removing trees at risk of falling.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 4 – A GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT EXPERIENCE

12) Policy 9 and proposal 48 set out the Mayor's draft plans to provide an attractive whole-journey experience that will encourage greater use of public transport, walking and cycling (see pages 118 to 119).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would provide an attractive whole- journey experience? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- We believe that these plans will contribute positively to the whole journey experience.
- More could be done to make ordinary bus stops more welcoming. Larger shelters to allow for wet weather. Reintroduction and extension of countdown displays (mistake to have removed so many as they are so much quicker to read than getting the same info. on a mobile device, and there are risks associated with displaying a mobile device at certain times and locations). Improved immediate surroundings (e.g. litter-free, quality paving). Strict enforcement of local parking restrictions so that buses can pull into kerb.

13) Policies 10 and 11 and proposals 49 and 50 set out the Mayor's draft plans to ensure public transport is affordable and to improve customer service (see pages 121 to 125).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would improve customer service and affordability of public transport? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- Careful balance needs to be struck between farebox income and investment. Support for those who find public transport unaffordable may produce a better outcome in terms of service quality and attractiveness than freezing/reducing fares for all.
- Not sure why bus drivers are singled out for improved training. This should apply to all customer-facing staff.

- While mobile phone use underground will be of use to many, it will also increase noise levels and be an irritant to others when phones are used in audible mode. That aspect may need to be reviewed.

14) Policy 12 and proposals 51 and 52 set out the Mayor's draft plans to improve the accessibility of the transport system, including an Accessibility Implementation Plan (see pages 127 to 129).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would improve accessibility of the transport system? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- All these plans will be very helpful.
- Agree with adding more space on buses for wheelchairs and other disability aids but with tip-up seats included so that other passengers can use the areas when not required for accessibility purposes.
- There is no mention of improving accessibility for those with mental disabilities or for educating other passengers on how to deal with their behaviour which can sometimes seem intrusive and threatening (and a deterrent to public transport use by others).

15) Policy 13 and proposals 53 and 54 set out the Mayor's draft plans to transform the bus network; to ensure it offers faster, more reliable, comfortable and convenient travel where it is needed (see pages 133 to 137).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve this? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- We are supportive of these plans, while stressing the need to :
  - Consider the effect of any proposed 20 mph speed limits on bus journey times
  - Strictly enforce on-street stopping and parking on bus routes
  - Make traffic signals more responsive to bus needs, especially off-peak when the resulting increased delays to other traffic will be more manageable
  - Reduce bus-on-bus congestion by careful consideration of bus operation and bus stop locations on roads where multiple routes operate
  - Improve the quality of bus ride by enhanced maintenance of carriageways used by buses and removing surface discontinuities (e.g. kerbside gutters lying below the level of the surrounding carriageway, better reinstatement of carriageways after excavations)
  - Improve the working environment for bus drivers by providing bus stands off main roads at the ends of all routes, so that they can distress and briefly enjoy a quieter and healthier environment.

16) Policy 14 and proposals 55 to 67 set out the Mayor's draft plans to improve rail services by improving journey times and tackling crowding (see pages 140 to 166).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve this? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- These plans will all help but a few comments:
  - Apart from the Sutton – South Wimbledon line, there are no proposed tram extensions. Given the success of Croydon Tramlink, there must be a wider role for trams in London but no further consideration seems to have been given to them.
  - Wishful thinking to increase service frequencies on the core part of Crossrail above 24 trains/h given the at-grade junction at Whitechapel, which will be a throttle on throughput
  - Applying London Overground operations to lines in South London must pay heed to the needs of longer distance trains
  - There are many places in London where one railway line crosses another without there being any interchange. These locations should be studied to investigate the potential for providing interchange, even without external access to the station. Provision of such interchange would shorten many journeys.
  - Simplify touching in/touching out arrangements when transferring between National Rail and TfL services. Make this seamless in ticketing terms.
  - Consider extending DLR to Waterloo using the Waterloo and City tunnels from Bank. That would significantly improve journey times and connectivity between South-West London and East London.

17) Policies 15 to 18 and proposals 68 to 74 set out the Mayor's draft plans to ensure river services, regional and national rail connections, coaches, and taxi and private hire contribute to the delivery of a fully- inclusive and well-connected public transport system. The Mayor's policy to support the growing night-time economy is also set out in this section (see pages 176 to 187).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would deliver a well- connected public transport system? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included

TPS Response:

- We consider that there should also be reference to measures concerning :
  - Improved accessibility to airports
  - Improved accessibility to rail stations except on HS2
  - Integrated ticketing between river services and other transport modes. There may currently be a commercial requirement to pay separate/supplementary

fares on river services but this tends to set them apart from an otherwise integrated transport system, and is a deterrent to their use as part of a more complex trip.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 5 – NEW HOMES AND JOBS

18) Policy 19 and proposals 75 to 77 set out the Mayor's draft plans to ensure that new homes and jobs are delivered in line with the transport principles of 'good growth' (see pages 193 to 200).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve this? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- We agree in principle, however consideration needs to be given to ensuring that services are provided in the first place.
- Also link to unlocking empty and unused housing within London.
- The Plan must recognise that transport and housing are integral to spatial planning, and policies for each must support the other. There should be a coherent vision that considers infrastructure and services needed to support sustainable urban forms and settlement patterns within London and the wider region. There needs to be explicit policies to avoid encouraging longer distance commuting into London that would generate significant additional (rail) transport demand that is very expensive and difficult to accommodate.

19) Proposals 78 to 95 set out the Mayor's draft plans to use transport to support and direct good growth, including delivering new rail links, extensions and new stations, improving existing public transport services, providing new river crossings, decking over roads and transport infrastructure and building homes on TfL land (see pages 202 to 246).

To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would ensure that transport is used to support and direct good growth? Please also describe any other measures you think should be included.

TPS Response:

- If growth is to be encouraged in the areas identified, these seem a sensible set of proposals.
- Not sure why the A13 at Barking has been singled out for decking. There must be other opportunities for this, there were other examples from the previous Mayor's Roads Task Force initiative including the A4 Hammersmith complex and the A3 at Tolworth.
- Proposal 87 refers to demand-responsive bus services. Londoners generally find it easy to work with a comprehensive fixed network with easy interchange between routes and that is likely to give faster journey times than waiting for a demand-responsive bus to

arrive. Services like Uber are likely to be far more responsive than any bus service and could be encouraged as a means of accessing the nearest fixed route transport hub in preference to demand-responsive bus services.

- Key is the relationship with the boroughs - the MTS should actively encourage/ incentivise the Boroughs to initiate mixed use development around station zones.
- Bakerloo Line Extension to Lewisham particularly welcomed.
- Details of job provision – currently the aims are over a long period and the detail will need to be provided.

20) Policy 20 and proposal 96 set out the Mayor's proposed position on the expansion of Heathrow Airport (see pages 248 to 249).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this position? Is there anything else that the Mayor should consider when finalising his position?

TPS Response:

- We agree in principle
- The Mayor is right to insist that environmental targets are met and that access infrastructure funding commitments are put in place.
- There is a high risk that the expansion of Heathrow will not proceed due to environmental and access issues, so the Mayor should be considering other strategies., firstly identifying how much air travel Londoners need (or should have). Should Londoners be priced out of flying from London airports, thereby reducing demand at those airports? Given HS2, could Birmingham International have an increasingly important role in serving London. What about Stansted – there is spare capacity there or additional capacity could be provided more easily than at Heathrow, and the Mayor is already proposing improvements to transport in the London – Stansted – Cambridge corridor? And Gatwick could also be reconsidered if access to the airport could be improved.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 6 – DELIVERING THE VISION

21) Policy 21 and proposals 97 to 101 set out the Mayor's proposed approach to responding to changing technology, including new transport services, such connected and autonomous vehicles (see pages 258 to 262).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposed approach? Is there anything else that the Mayor should consider when finalising his approach?

TPS Response:

- See previous comments about demand-responsive bus services (Q 19, Proposal 87).

- All very sensible proposals but the outcomes remain entirely unclear at this stage. However, TfL must keep abreast of new technologies and consider their potential role in London.
- Safety is paramount in permitting new vehicle technology to be used but consideration also needs to be given to the way in which other road users work with autonomous vehicles in particular. Given the highly responsive nature of automated vehicles to surrounding events, other road users will effectively control what autonomous vehicles do if they operate in a mixed environment. This is a dynamic that needs further research.
- In addition to physical safety, cyber safety is also very important.
- Key to this will be data and its collection and monitoring and more details on this is needed.

22) Policy 22 and proposal 102 set out the Mayor's proposed approach to ensuring that London's transport system is adequately and fairly funded to deliver the aims of the strategy (see pages 265 to 269).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposed approach? Is there anything else that the Mayor should consider when finalising his approach?

TPS Response:

- All these ideas are worth pursuing but we make a couple of additional comments to provoke discussion:
- VED is not hypothecated for transport but is used by the Government for the general wellbeing of the country. It does not seem fair to allocate part of it specifically for use in developing London's transport systems.
- The main aim must be to find a means of making the beneficiaries of transport investment pay for those benefits. This may be politically unacceptable, but if the key aim of the Mayor's strategy is to make London a better place for all, then the logic would be that all should contribute to this, possibly through a supplement on Council Tax. You pay more, you get a better city to live in. Separate arrangements would be needed for businesses and tourists – maybe a supplement on Business Rates or a tourist tax on hotel rooms or other services used mostly by visitors to the capital.
- Agree and support a fair costing system for all.

23) Policies 23 and 24 and proposal 103 set out the proposed approach the boroughs will take to deliver the strategy locally, and the Mayor's approach to monitoring and reporting the outcomes of the strategy (see pages 275 to 283).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposed approach? Is there anything else that the Mayor should consider when finalising his approach?

TPS Response:

- The Boroughs have a key role to play and their actions need to be integrated with the Strategy and, in turn, supported by the Mayor.
- Monitoring is vitally important. The outcomes of many of the proposals are unknown at this stage and some of the proposed interventions are relatively untried. The whole science of changing transport behaviour and managing demand is still in its infancy in terms of understanding exactly how it works and reliably forecasting outcomes. Monitoring the interventions made as part of the Plan will serve several purposes :
  - o It will indicate whether the Mayor's Strategy is on track and on target to achieve its goals, or whether some adjustment is needed
  - o It will identify the impacts of individual interventions and enable us to better understand their impacts
  - o That, in turn, will enable us to better refine future interventions of a similar nature and better predict their impacts
- This is imperative to ensuring the success of this challenging Strategy.

24) Are there any other comments you would like to make on the draft Mayor's Transport Strategy?

TPS Response:

- This is a bold and visionary strategy and if successful will introduce a step change in the quality of life in London. It is forward thinking and imaginative.
- It contains many sensible and good ideas and provides a plan to get from where we are today to where we want to be.
- It is wide ranging in its consideration of London's transport system (trams excepted – see Q 16) and comprehensive in the range of issues examined and proposals put forward.
- The timescales are sensible although the long-term nature of the Strategy means that it will have to survive possible changes in administration at City Hall.
- That said, it is inevitable that the Strategy will be reviewed and refreshed at regular intervals, and external circumstances are bound to affect it.
- The Strategy has one key overriding quantitative objective (80% of trips by foot, cycle or public transport by 2041) and a selection of other quantified targets (e.g. open Crossrail 2 by 2033, zero deaths and serious injuries from road collisions by 2041, 45% increase in London Overground capacity by 2030 etc..). However, many of the proposals require encouragement, research, examining feasibility, unspecified scales of improvement etc. and have unknown outcomes at this stage. It is therefore unclear whether the Strategy as a whole will deliver the targets set, or perhaps over-deliver. Quantifying the scale of individual interventions and their effects on the outcomes as a whole is a further piece of work to be done, and will have a key bearing on the level of investment needed.