

TfL Restricted

Meeting Title:	Streetspace for London Advisory Group		
Date of Meeting:	15 January 2021	Time of Meeting:	9.30–11.00
Location of Meeting:	MS Teams		
Attendees	<p>Chair: Alexandra Batey, Director, Investment Delivery Planning, TfL</p> <p>[REDACTED], Sustrans</p> <p>[REDACTED], LCCI</p> <p>[REDACTED], Logistics UK</p> <p>[REDACTED], Living Streets</p> <p>[REDACTED], London TravelWatch</p> <p>[REDACTED], RAC Foundation</p> <p>[REDACTED], London Councils</p> <p>[REDACTED], CPT</p> <p>Will Norman</p> <p>[REDACTED], RNIB</p> <p>[REDACTED], LCC</p> <p>[REDACTED], London First</p> <p>[REDACTED], Active Travel Academy</p> <p>TfL:</p> <p>Sam Monck (presenter)</p> <p>Steph Pathak (presenter)</p> <p>Fraser MacDonald (presenter)</p> <p>Sam Gould</p> <p>Catharine McEwan</p> <p>Heather Preen</p> <p>Amy Edgar</p>		
Apologies	<p>[REDACTED], London BIDs</p> <p>[REDACTED], Transport for All</p> <p>[REDACTED], LEDNet</p>		
Next meeting	5 March 2021 – via MS Teams		



TfL Restricted

#	Actions/Minutes	Resp.	Due Date
1	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alexandra Batey: AB opened the session. Reminded Group that the meeting would be conducted under Chatham House rules. Outlined that the meeting would look at consultation & engagement as we move into next phase of the programme. Mentioned that the DfT guidance had been updated in November 2020. Our approach had been agreed with DfT, for existing and new schemes. 		
2	<p>Delivery update: Sam Monck</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second tranche of DfT funding: £20m on borough-led projects & £10m from wider settlement for 2nd half of the year for TfL led-projects. Came with revised guidance from DfT on consultation & monitoring, still want rapid delivery in context of public health emergency, but recognition that consultation & monitoring are key. TfL work with boroughs to apply learning – fed back on design guidance following feedback from emergency services and others. TfL knows what it will do with the TfL-led projects, still agreeing final list of what's desirable and deliverable with boroughs. 39-40 LTNs likely and changes to 18 existing LTNs – responding to feedback, esp from emergency services and others. Programme is trying to be responsive as we go along. Also hoping to fund some more School Streets. Ongoing programme of borough-led cycling schemes will exceed what we can fund to completion – some will use Active Travel fund, some will be part of longer-term programme. Borough-led delivery will extend beyond end of this financial year. Will need to decide which will need to be removed or retained following necessary consultation. Map of what's coming for pop-up cycling facilities – trying to provide some connectivity between temporary and existing schemes. List of TfL projects – hope to have final list of borough projects soon. We are learning & changing as we go along. More time to consult, engage and monitor has been welcomed by all. 		
3	<p>Discussion on delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity sought on DfT funding & scheme delivery being allowed to be carried over to next financial year and whether this applied to TfL funding too. Is there flexibility for TfL funding? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SM responded that can't confirm yet – in discussion with finance. Have to abide by agreement with DfT on wider settlement. It is hoped that there will be some flexibility with that deadline and that delivery of 		



	<p>TfL Restricted schemes could be completed across the year rather than ending early.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging at a programme level, not just at a scheme level: can stakeholders engage at a programme level, not just at an individual scheme level. Responding to each consultation as it comes is resource intensive. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Responsibility for schemes is spread across the boroughs as well as TfL which means that each project moves at different speeds so there will still be a need to keep scheme-by-scheme engagement, but interested in thoughts on how we might be able to work better with you on the programme as a whole, as well as individual schemes. Keen to share info on what is happening at a wider level so that stakeholders know what's coming. 		
4	<p>Update on Monitoring: Steph Pathak</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will have more to share at the next meeting, as some survey results due shortly. • Brief update of highlights in TfL B -see presentation attached. • Pointed out that the Vision Zero dashboard went live. • Monitoring – LTN survey results expected shortly; School Street survey results also expected shortly; Cycle intercept surveys being analysed. Third lockdown has impacted monitoring programme, some things have had to be paused. • We'll be able to provide more detail of the outputs of our monitoring at the next SAG meeting. 		
5	<p>Consultation & engagement approach: Fraser MacDonald</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlined how consultation in 2021 will be taken forward. • Interested in views, what can we do more of, how you can support us and how can we more effectively engage and consult with stakeholders. • Approach in 2020 was at pace, due to the need to react quickly at short notice. Very little opportunity for dialogue before schemes went in. • In recognition of that, over past 8 months we have had a very focused active listening phase for each scheme. • Outlined what we're committing to as we hope to move temporary legacy schemes to permanent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Moving from active listening to greater engagement ○ Once we have clarity on what proposals for future schemes we want to do as much early engagement as possible, then public consultation ○ Provide transparency on what has been heard and then feed through to decision-making body, publish consultation report ○ If decision to be made permanent is made, then statutory process (traffic orders) – another opportunity for stakeholders to engage • Outlined approach for next LSP phase – new schemes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How it aligns with DfT guidance and with boroughs 		

	<p>TfL Restricted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognised that there was an engagement and consultation deficit last year Now opportunity to engage at earlier stage This is an overarching approach but there is opportunity for TfL and for boroughs to do more than bare requirements as per DfT's guidance. Want timely, good quality engagement Using Experimental Traffic Orders, rather than Temporary Currently in pre-statutory consultation engagement stage. Reaching communities and stakeholders. Work with elected reps, local communities, businesses, disability groups. Ran through phases (see slide). During construction phase, we will redouble our engagement efforts to flush out issues. So there is more focused engagement at the front end and goes right through. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eg of CS8 phase 2 and outlined groups that we're engaging with now <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early engagement stage been running since Dec 2020 and prior to that there was engagement between sponsors and key stakeholders (e.g emergency services and boroughs) Broadened out in Jan 2021 Started reaching out to residents and businesses this week: 20k letters to people along route, reached out to 180 people from over 100 organisations along route. Statutory phase started in Feb Noted that there had been feedback before the meeting to share the list of statutory consultees - will speak to the traffic order team to get that share with Group. Toolkit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has had to change due to restrictions Outlined tools used Keen to hear what other tools you might be using that we could learn from <p>ACTION: FM to share list of statutory consultees</p>	TfL (FM)	
6	<p>Discussion on consultation & engagement approach</p> <p>Guidance document: Discrepancy between what's in the guidance document (p3) and presentation regarding the need to show "broad support" for schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FM responded by saying that the page in question came from DfT requirements, it became apparent in discussions with them that there was (on their side) some confusion between what engagement or consultation is and how that fitted in with using experimental traffic orders and approach for 2021. On the need to show "broad support", FM said that there was a slightly contradictory footnote on that page – he said he would pick out that reference and send across but acknowledged confusion. There might be schemes that need to be taken forward for public health or safety reasons regardless – there is a balance to be struck. 		

TfL Restricted

- Before construction starts, there will be an audit trail of how a scheme has been approached and the engagement feedback. Schemes can be adapted during the trial phase, which is a strength.

ACTION: FM to clarify reference to broad support in guidance document.

How do **online surveys** fit in?

Didn't want to prescribe that in guidance document, each borough and TfL have slightly different approaches. Didn't want to stifle their consultation and engagement, but there is a wide range of online surveys being used.

EQIAs:

Where do EQIAs fit in and at what stage?

- Sponsors deliver EQIAs for us. We could get better at being transparent about them. When we launch a public consultation, EQIAs are part of that. We would expect them to be already underway under new approach underway.
- EQIAs feed into decision making – no decision to implement a scheme is made without an EQIA. They remain live throughout the process and are assessed as we go along. Adding to it necessary. Different boroughs will have slightly different approaches, but that's TfL's approach

Where can information on EQIA be found – are the issues raised and feedback published?

- FM: Feedback on changes – during a trial we will provide a feedback loop to everyone we engage and consult with – both for what changes could be made and what couldn't, with an explanation.
- SM – EQIAs set out what issues we identify and what mitigation actions we're taking and if no action taken, why not. Live feedback loops are v important.

Disabled groups:

Will you move disabled groups up from optional into necessary group of consultees?

- FM – we need to be better and do more on this. Keen to work with stakeholders on it. They already are essential groups - the guidance document outlines the bare minimum groups as per DfT but at TfL we go beyond the bare minimum.

Inclusive features:

Inclusive features should be built in from the beginning – this is more important than just engagement. Rather than saying "yes" or "no" to a scheme, want to see those features built in.

- FM – We need to be reaching out as early as possible and will go back to the team to find out where we stand on the level of engagement and will see if it needs to be focused on or accelerated. Used e.g. of road safety schemes in the past where there was useful dialogue (tactile mapping e.g). Can do similar in context of Streetspace.
- SM – Flagged inclusive design standards and would expect designers to work with them from the beginning. Mentioned a piece of work on understanding our diverse communities, which sets out how people from different communities can/or choose to move around London which informs our EQIAs and

TfL (FM)

TfL Restricted

designs. We don't always get it right, so continuous feedback is important. E.g of barriers used for Streetspace at the beginning of the pandemic were physical and bulky – we knew they were not ideal for all pedestrians. So now we are taking them out while keeping the space – building out with tarmac instead.

Safety priorities:

Asked about safety priorities – more cyclists are injured on the roads than disabled pedestrians, so are they taken more seriously?

- SM – Safety is critical, mentioned Vision Zero. There is a balance but will put safety first – safe and inclusive.
- AB – Safety is a priority, and it is a balance – sessions like this are important to help us get this balance right.

Transparency:

Issue of transparency throughout process is important. Try to provide as much information right up front as possible – don't fall back on "classified/confidential" – even if it's imprecise. This creates confidence.

- Agree we can do more, in the past may have been hesitant to share detail until a final design agreed but for this phase of Streetspace our approach has been much more focused on talking to stakeholders at earliest opportunity – and to be clear about direction of travel, even if a final design isn't yet decided, and get feedback. Continuous engagement important to get a good level of transparency.

Responsiveness to evidence:

Important to explain reasons for why a particular decision is made, with evidence to back it up.

- TfL quite effective on this already – when we produce consultation reports we identify the key themes and issues raised (either in report, or alongside) through consultation process and make sure we can provide rationale for why we've responded in a particular way to a particular issue.

Engagement on consultees terms:

This programme is process-driven and conducted on TfL's/borough's/DfT's terms – consultation and engagement therefore happening on your terms not the consultees terms. Consultees prefer to express in their own way and using own process. Ask them how they want to be engaged rather than telling them how they're going to be engaged with.

- Agree – pre-covid we had been looking into better approaches around early community engagement and how they want to work with us, so that it isn't solely on TfL's terms. For the next phase, we will look to improve on this.

Organisations are time and resource constrained, so should accept that will get responses that are neither objecting nor supporting.

- Will take this away and think a bit more about it. Key thing for us is that we are never trying to run referendums on these consultations, rather asking what is it that is causing concern and how can we make it a better proposal.

Engagement with politicians:

Engage with politicians sooner rather than later in an election year. Councillors won't be brave in an election year. They are very

TfL Restricted

	<p>susceptible to voters with loud voices on particular issues – e.g of LTNs and some MPs wavering in their support in the face of local opposition to them, who would ordinarily be supportive of such measures.</p> <p>Gaps in consultee list: Absence of faith groups raised as an obvious gap - there are Friday/Saturday/Sunday traffic events around large Muslim/Jewish/Christian places of worship and faith leaders are key community leaders. Another gap – socially excluded & poor people are not being talked about. A strong equalities argument around young people, old people and poor people whose voices don't get heard. Schools are a way into these groups – as are food banks, local covid support groups/other informal networks – they aren't traditional consultees but very useful.</p> <p>Social value: Don't forget the social value piece when consulting – in terms of who you consult and need for the use of money to prove social value (as stated by Government). Talk to your “anchor organisations” – the Council, local hospitals, local football clubs to promote active travel among other things, other trusted local people to talk about benefits of reducing air pollution, local colleges – use young people as advocates for change (context of youth unemployment and disruption of their lives and education due to pandemic). Use social media more effectively.</p> <p>AB summarised the questions that had been sent out ahead of the meeting. No-one responded in the meeting, but there were some responses in the chat and by email.</p> <p>FM said that he would be happy to provide further briefing to organisations if that would be helpful.</p>		
7	<p>Next Steps: AB asked for suggestions on topics to focus on at the next meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: Members to send suggestions via email, or in the meeting's chat facility.</p>	All	
	Next meeting: 5 March 2021 on MS Teams	TfL	