

Meeting Title:	Streetspace for London Advisory Group		
Date of Meeting:	05 March 2021	Time of Meeting:	10:00–12:00
Location of Meeting:	MS Teams		
Attendees	<p>Chair: Alexandra Batey, Director, Investment Delivery Planning, TfL</p> <p>[REDACTED], Active Travel Academy</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], Transport for All</p> <p>[REDACTED], LEDNet</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>TfL:</p> <p>Sam Monck (presenter)</p> <p>Steph Pathak (presenter)</p> <p>Alex Longdon (presenter)</p> <p>Steph Bortoli</p> <p>Catharine McEwan</p> <p>Amy Edgar</p> <p>Georgia Heathman</p>		
Apologies	<p>[REDACTED], London BIDs</p> <p>[REDACTED], RAC Foundation</p>		
Next meeting	This was the final meeting, as per the Group's Terms of Reference		

#	Actions/Minutes	Resp.	Due Date
1	<p>Opening remarks: Alexandra Batey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlined that this was the final meeting of the Streetspace Advisory Group, as per the Terms of Reference and that the focus of the meeting would be on how we move from the Streetspace programme to the Healthy Streets portfolio. • Mentioned that we would be asking for views on whether there was an appetite to continue this group in some form with this focus on Healthy Streets. 		
2	<p>Delivery update and update on borough guidance: Sam Monck (see slide deck):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given out the £20m from the second tranche of the DfT money to the boroughs. • A list of all the projects which are being funded by that will be sent out following the meeting (Action completed) – pointed out that this was only for internal use within their organisations. • Experimental TROs are being used now, which allows for better consultation and engagement. • Gave a brief update on the status of new draft interim borough guidance in light of the High Court judgement. 	TfL (SM)	Done
3.	<p>Discussion on delivery & borough guidance</p> <p>Key:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAG stakeholder comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TfL response <p><u>Consultation and engagement with disabled groups:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation was asked for on whether proper consultation and engagement would be at the heart of what is being reviewed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SM responded that guidance on what was expected on consultation and engagement would be much stronger – this was necessary under the ETRO consultation process. ○ Also outlined that we are doing an additional layer of equalities impact assessment at the programme level and recommend this in the guidance, alongside a recommendation that each scheme has its own EQIA. This has also been discussed with TfL's Independent Disability Advisory Group to ensure that appropriate views are fed back as the guidance develops. • Who was "marking TfL's homework" – the Judge in the A10 Bishopsgate judicial review suggested that the consultation process on the guidance wasn't good enough last time, who is checking that it is better this time? • There was a feeling following the judgment that the recommendations and guidance TfL had given in the past wasn't good enough. • The comment was made that there didn't seem to be any major step change in internal processes that would give confidence that we won't end up in the same place. • Evidence was needed to prove that these changes were having an effect. Need tangible outcomes. 		

TfL Restricted

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SM responded that the set-up is different – the guidance for the boroughs is what we're doing already and we're reaching out better. ○ SM said that there had more input from TfL's D&I people and from IDAG, as well as from Transport for All and this group. This time there is more time and a stronger requirement for consultation and engagement built into the Experimental TRO process (as opposed to the Temporary TRO process recommended previously by DfT). ○ AB outlined the step changes in focus: more active forums to discuss EQIAs; discussing the issues raised in TfA's Pave The Way report – especially on leaflets e.g. focus has shifted but accepted that we may not yet have it all right – which is why we value this group and reports like Pave The Way. ○ AB mentioned that the feedback collated in that report is already being reflected in EQIAs. ○ AB also said that it is important not to just have an internal view of processes – referenced IDAG, but more could be done on independent reviewing. ○ In summary – processes have changed, culture has improved, the emphasis & importance on engagement has increased and high quality EQIAs all through the lifecycle – this has all been improved with room for improvement. ○ As we restart Healthy Streets, we want good engagement and processes from the start. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● On the timing of production of revised guidance: please continue to share updates and best practice with the boroughs rather than waiting for a final version. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SM agreed that helpful guidance is needed now. 		
4	<p>Monitoring update: Steph Pathak (see slide deck)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ran through slides, summarising results of monitoring & surveys on school streets, LTNs, Customer Pulse, Autumn intercept and next steps. See slides attached. 		
5	<p>Discussion on monitoring</p> <p>Key:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SAG stakeholder comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TfL response <p><u>LTNs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The overrepresentation of cyclists and motorists in the monitoring respondents was mentioned – need to consult with all kinds of groups. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SP said that future LTN surveys will have face-to-face interviews with residents on boundary roads and in LTNs. ● Were any measures being considered to prioritise the bus on roads where traffic might be moved to as a result of LTNs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SM mentioned the 78km 24/7 bus lanes on the TLRN and that there are discussions taking place with boroughs about extending to some of their bus lanes – can be difficult because of kerb space demands. ● TfL's view was sought on the emerging narrative about LTNs and traffic displacement into disadvantaged areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SP said that some traffic analysis was planned which would look at 		



	<p>TfL Restricted</p> <p>what people are saying and what is actually being seen on boundary roads/TLRN. Would take the point away about looking into the narrative about displacement into disadvantaged communities. Within the meeting's chat, a member mentioned research which their organisation had done on this.</p>		
5	<p>The role of Healthy Streets in London's recovery: Alexander Longdon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See attached slide deck which outlines Healthy Streets strategy and how we move on from Streetspace. • Pandemic has brought into focus equality issues and how the decisions that city planners make can affect those issues. • Climate change continues to drive the agenda. • Can't just dust off old Healthy Streets programme – need to evolve how we plan, design and deliver Healthy Streets so the programme faces up to the challenges and incorporates lessons learnt from the Streetspace programme. • Summarised challenges and lessons: need to avoid car-led recovery, supporting walking & cycling and by winning back people onto rail and buses; got to be more inclusive and accessible; decarbonisation of transport; address road danger. • These were all in MTS but pandemic has shone a light on these and in some cases exacerbated them. • Healthy Streets will be on the frontline of London's recovery. • Outlined how would be making Healthy Streets as relevant and as effective as it needs to be for this – outlined shift in approach pre-pandemic to new approach now (slide 19). • Welcomed input from SAG both on the challenges that need to address and how to achieve them. 		
6	<p>Discussion on the role of Healthy Streets</p> <p>Key:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAG stakeholder comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TfL response <p><u>Decarbonisation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of the decarbonisation agenda was raised. Decarbonisation of London's transport will be a "big ask". • Healthy Streets would have to sit in this broader policy framework and there was a feeling that it's not yet there. Unless there is an overarching framework, the Healthy Streets programme won't be fit for purpose. TfL will need all the help, input, advice and support it can get to recalibrate London's streets. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AB agreed that it is a significant challenge and will need help and support. TfL can't do it alone. • Emphasis on carbon reduction needs to be elevated – most organisations have carbon reduction targets and the arguments also have real traction with communities. Would urge the Healthy Streets programme to have more emphasis on that – and links with public health agenda – in order to bring the public along. <p><u>Active Travel & public transport:</u></p>		

- Good news that active travel and public transport will be brought together more, with buses firmly at the heart of that, along with inclusive design.
- There was an interest in what actions would be taken to alleviate road danger (dangerous junctions, lack of pedestrian crossings in some areas etc); uneven pavement surfaces that reduce accessibility.

Infrastructure:

- Lessons had been learnt from the temporary schemes – particularly the use of low-cost measures but need to show what great infrastructure looks like – identify a vanguard to show where we can get to. Temporary infrastructure has virtue but need to show what's possible to pull us towards better standards.

Active Travel & accessibility:

- It was pointed out that active travel was not always an option – streets can be very inaccessible, but sometimes walking and taking the bus are the only options for partially sighted people. What are you doing to embed accessibility into designs from the start?
- The point was also the organisations can suffer from "consultation fatigue". It would be better if it could be trusted that inclusive features were going to be embedded to begin with.
 - AB agreed – and why we want your feedback on continuing this group.
 - If we refocus this group to Healthy Streets then members would be in at the start – want to embed lessons upfront into policies, designs etc. It's not an easy challenge but we are looking at policies and will make sure we have good, appropriate engagement.
 - SM said that the possible next iteration of this group could look at that – what's its remit, what can be covered at this strategic level and what needs to be covered at scheme level. Pointed out that we can't control things that happen on roads and streets that aren't TfL's.

Businesses:

- It was argued that more needs to be unpacked on the economic case – there will be huge pressure to support businesses, need powerful arguments on the transport interventions needed to support the return to offices and business recovery.

Local communities:

- Communities need to be brought along and robust case studies will be needed – a lot of people haven't been travelling or been out and about and haven't seen the Streetspace schemes or felt the benefits they bring. It might be hard for them to picture that different street/different approach to the way we live our lives.
- COVID would limit how we pursue some of the objectives of Healthy Streets. Need fresh arguments and rationale for Healthy Streets beyond COVID – climate change agenda should be key to this.
 - AB mentioned the importance of being able to show evidence of good investment.

TfL Restricted

- Need to be much better on how we build business cases for carbon reduction and carbon accounting.
- Impact of school streets has shown a culture shift with more people walking. With the return of schools will these trends continue – will look at that as we return to “normal”.

15 minute cities:

- The 15 minute city and the polycentric approach were mentioned and how they were connected to active travel and LTNs.
- Trials in areas to demonstrate a polycentric approach and what the attendant access issues might be in those areas would be welcomed – to see if the 15 minute city idea is feasible.
- Some low carbon options are inaccessible for disabled people and the alternatives (hand cycles, good wheelchairs) can be costly.
- The point was made about the “common good” – being used a lot in the discourse around the public realm. But who is that common good for? Need to reset it.

Cashless:

- A concern was raised around cashless for disabled people – inaccessible shops being used for tickets (using cash) rather than accessible Tube stations.

Summary:

- AL said that there were two key messages he was taking away: 1) importance of the decarbonisation agenda and 2) inclusivity and accessibility which will feed back into the planning, investment, design & delivery of Healthy Streets.
- Several members expressed a wish to continue meeting as a Group in some format, and that they had found the Group’s meetings useful.

7	Next Steps: A survey will be sent to members to see what appetite there is for continuing the group in some form, focusing on the Healthy Streets programme.	TfL/All	
	Next meeting: This was the final meeting of the Streetspace Advisory Group		