



## **Response of the Road Haulage Association to London Assembly Transport Committee.**

### **“Call for evidence: cycling infrastructure”.**

**22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018**

#### **Background about the RHA**

1. The RHA is the leading trade association representing road haulage and distribution companies, which operate HGVs as profit centres. Our 7,000 members, operating near to 100,000 HGVs, range from single-truck firms to those with thousands of vehicles. These companies provide essential services on which the people and businesses of the UK depend.
2. We proactively encourage a spirit of entrepreneurship, compliance, profitability, safety and social responsibility. We do so through a range of advice, representation and services, including training.
3. We would like to thank London Assembly for the consultation and the opportunity to comment on the issues raised.

#### **General Comments**

4. The RHA believes that the movement of freight is fundamental to the wellbeing of Londoners and their businesses, every journey matters for all road users, so the roads must accommodate the needs all road users whether personal or business.

#### **Responses to the Questions**

**Question 1.** What progress on new cycling infrastructure has been made under Sadiq Khan, and what are his long-term plans?

5. No comment

**Question 2.** Has TfL resolved the problems that delayed some cycling schemes under the previous Mayor?

6. No comment

**Question 3.** Has segregation delivered the anticipated benefits on the Cycle Superhighways? How many cyclists are using these routes?

7. Cycle Superhighways have only delivered benefits for cyclists, not other road users. Almost everything that we make and consume in London is delivered by road freight. It is essential that the road network meets the need of freight and all road users. We do not believe all segregation projects have worked for all road users. Some have dramatically increased local congestion, not just on the segregated route itself.

**Question 4.** To what extent has segregation had negative consequences for other road users and, if necessary, how can this be mitigated?

8. Segregation has reduced available road space for other road users and increased their journey times. It has reduced the amount of road side parking for freight and other deliveries.

**Question 5.** Have Quietways delivered their anticipated benefits? How many cyclists are using them?

9. No comment

**Question 6.** What are the differences in infrastructure between inner and outer London? How can TfL ensure infrastructure in different areas is sufficient and appropriate to the location?

10. The infrastructure in inner and outer London needs to accommodate all traffic that needs to use the network this includes freight which is necessary for the viability of the City. TfL needs to ensure that road space for Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) and van deliveries is not further reduced, thus increasing congestion, journey times and unreliability. Consequently available road space must be retained for motorised traffic, if this is reduced there will be a negative impact for road freight deliveries, congestion and air quality. This will result in higher charges for consumer products, which consumers will pay.

**Question 7.** How will TfL's new 'Strategic Cycling Analysis' help determine where and how to invest in infrastructure?

11. At 4.3 the analysis acknowledges that more detailed analysis is required. This document should have provided that data, clearly this work is incomplete. It states, "The data presented here focuses mainly on the potential for change and on the capacity of existing and future form to accommodate that change. More detailed analysis is needed of the possibilities this offers – ideally informed by specific local knowledge."

**Question 8.** How appropriate is the 400-metre target set in the draft Transport Strategy? Can we equate proximity with access?



## The Road Haulage Association

12. No comment

**Question 9.** Is TfL's approach to public engagement working effectively to improve scheme designs and meet stakeholder needs?

13. No Comment

**Question 10.** Are Londoners sufficiently aware of the cycling infrastructure available to them, and how can awareness be increased?

14. No Comment

**Question 11.** How is TfL using infrastructure to attract a more diverse range of people to cycle in London?

15. No Comment

**Question 12.** Is there sufficient cycle parking in London, and is it in the right locations?

16. No Comment

**Question 13.** How are the lessons of the Mini-Hollands and other previous cycling schemes being applied elsewhere?

17. No Comment

**Question 14.** Should cycling infrastructure be oriented toward longer-distance commuting journeys, or more localised trips?

18. Localised cycling trips will tend to replace walking trips and some short road trips. Longer distance commuting into central London will almost exclusively replace trips on public transport we believe infrastructure must be short journey orientated.

22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018

Tom Cotton.

Head of Roads and Infrastructure Policy

Road Haulage Association

[t.cotton@rha.uk.net](mailto:t.cotton@rha.uk.net)