The London Cycle Network

Transport Committee

November 2005

Rapporteur's Foreword

Cycling in London is growing in popularity yet a decade of delays have stopped us from having fast, safe and convenient cycle routes. The report reveals a series of barriers to creating the London Cycle Network plus (LCN+), which will create 900km of cycle friendly routes on London's roads. It highlights fears that the LCN+ will not be completed on time and the project may not meet cyclists' needs. To date less than 50 per cent of the planned routes have been completed and, when finished, it will only cover 9% of London's roads. LCN+ should have a positive impact on cycling and could drastically reduce accident hotspots.

The report recommends Transport for London take the following action:
- Increase next year's funding to help boroughs create more cycle lanes
- Appoint a champion for the LCN+ project
- Reduce the use of consultants and employ staff with expertise in cyclists' needs
- Ensure more cyclists are involved in rolling out the scheme
- Prioritise the completion of difficult routes for commuter cyclists in the City and West End

The London Cycle Network Plus could boost cycling even more in London, but we need a serious commitment from Transport for London and all the boroughs. Cyclists should be able to ride from the fringes of the capital to the centre with confidence and in safety. We need to convince Londoners that it is safe to get their bike out of the shed and onto the road.

My thanks to all our witnesses who gave us the benefit of their views.

Darren Johnson AM
Rapporteur on behalf of the London Assembly Transport Committee

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The London Cycling Network+ (LCN+) is intended to make London a city for cyclists. It should provide cycle routes through and in London where people can cycle safely. It is an ambitious project, involving 33 boroughs, TfL and 900km of London's roads. The network is a key part of the Mayor's strategy for cycling in London, and the Mayor has committed to delivering it by 2009.

But, as this report shows, there are cracks in the implementation of the LCN+ that suggest that without a change of gear, LCN+ will not be completed on time and will not deliver the Mayor's promised improvements in safety and convenience for London's cyclists – those who cycle now and those who LCN+ aims to entice onto their bikes.

LCN+ is, at the moment, a fragmented network. Most of the work that is carried out consists of completing links on a huge number of routes. Each project is now subjected to a new form of consultation called a Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan (CRISP). CRISPs are popular in principle, but in practice they seem to be of variable quality, expensive and time-consuming.

There are some major obstacles to the full implementation of the LCN+, and it is possible that the project may not be completed until 2016 – seven years late. There are questions about the quality of the network, and the extent to which the safety and convenience of cyclists are being given appropriate consideration alongside the needs of other road users. Until this happens cycle routes will remain less than ideal.

LCN+ will result in a series of valuable improvements for cyclists over time. But even once the whole network is in place it will still only account for around 9 per cent of London's roads. The needs of cyclists are far wider and should be considered in each and every road scheme across the capital.

The findings of this review point to the need for a re-think about the LCN+. The concentration on small projects across the capital puts pressure on resources and does not result in complete routes that will be attractive to new and prospective cyclists. LCN+ might be more effective if targeted at a series of flagship routes, with other roads and routes benefiting from a continuous programme of local improvements.

Recommendations

1. TfL should bring forward expenditure planned for future years in order to fund in total the £15 million of borough bids in 2005/06.

2. TfL should review the likely overall cost of the LCN+ scheme as part of the 2006/07 budget-setting process, in order to make clear the cost of guaranteeing quality and timely completion of the LCN+. This review should also look at how funds are distributed to boroughs.

3. TfL should commission an independent review of a sample of schemes that have been implemented following a Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan (CRISP), in order to assess whether the CRISPs have led to effective, well-

designed schemes that meet the needs of cyclists and to identify lessons learned.

4. TfL should designate a senior manager as 'champion' of the LCN+. This manager should check that all new traffic management schemes include clear plans for implementation of measures to provide safety and convenience for cyclists as well as other road users.

5. TfL and Camden as lead borough for LCN+ should develop plans for a core team of staff who can support boroughs in carrying out CRISPs and implementing projects. The funds for this team should come from the money currently spent on consultants. The aim should be to reduce the use of consultants by at least 50 per cent with resources redirected to a central team that will be able to share and spread expertise.

6. TfL and Camden should take a much more strategic approach to the implementation of LCN+, route-by-route rather than kilometre-by-kilometre. TfL and Camden should identify a small number of key routes across London and prioritise their early completion. These will probably be routes that attract commuter cyclists and they should encompass 'difficult' areas such as Parliament Square or Marylebone Road. The routes will also serve as showcase of good design and be of a standard for other schemes across London to emulate.

7. TfL and Camden should urgently review signage on the LCN+ to ensure that it is clear and meets the needs of cyclists. Cyclists and potential cyclists should be involved in this review.

8. TfL and the Metropolitan Police should instigate a joint campaign to encourage all road users to share the road. This campaign would include publicity aimed at both drivers and cyclists, asking them to respect other road users and the rules of the road. It would include action against cyclists who jump red lights or ride on the pavement, and involve TfL in setting targets for improving enforcement of parking restrictions in cycle lanes.

9. TfL should support Camden's suggestion for the asset management strategy to be extended to all boroughs. TfL should set a timetable for the implementation, monitoring and review of the asset management strategy in all boroughs.

10. TfL should monitor and review the London Cycle Design Standards to assess their effectiveness in schemes that have been implemented.

11. TfL should develop and implement a campaign to raise awareness of the LCN+. This should be launched in Spring 2006 and sit alongside existing campaigns to promote cycling in general.

1. Introduction

1.1 Increasing the number of cyclists in London is one of the Mayor's key objectives. The Mayor's longer-term target is for a 200 per cent increase in cycling in London by 2020, with and 80 per cent increase by 2010 (compared with 2000). One of the ways to bring this about is the London Cycling Network plus (LCN+), which aims to create 900km of cycle friendly routes on London's roads. The overall cost of the LCN+ is currently budgeted as £147m (London Cycling Plan), but the lead borough in charge of implementing the scheme believes that the actual cost could be much higher.

1.2 The LCN+ is being implemented by Transport for London, in partnership with the London Borough of Camden, through the implementation of the London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+). The LCN+ is based on plans put forward by London Boroughs. There is general agreement among cyclists that when completed, provided the quality is high, LCN+ will contribute to safer and more convenient cycling conditions in London.

1.3 However, despite some significant progress during the past year, LCN+ seems unlikely to be completed on time unless there is a significant increase in momentum. Despite the publication of the London Cycling Design Standards this year, there are still concerns by some cycling groups that the final product will not meet the needs of London's cyclists. Completion depends on the participation of all London boroughs, which is uncertain, and on the promotion of cycling up the transport hierarchy, which seems unlikely.

1.4 Progress in delivering the LCN+ is measured by the length of route completed (and even the length of route that has only so far been consulted on). But expressions of distance mask the nature of the LCN+, which in reality is a multitude of small schemes and individual improvements delivered by 33 London boroughs and TfL. Progress is not measured, for example, by how cyclists can now get from one place to another on completed cycle routes.

1.5 Yet, even without the improvements that are being delivered through the LCN+ and other measures, cycling is the quickest way to get around the capital. Recognising this, and the health benefits of cycling, more Londoners are taking to their bikes. After the July bombs there was a dramatic 30 per cent increase in the number of cyclists and many of these people are likely to continue to cycle.

1.6 This report considers some of the barriers to successful delivery of the LCN+, and makes recommendations for action by the Mayor and Transport for London to bring the LCN+ back on track. The report is based on evidence provided to London Assembly member Darren Johnson who sought to:
- review progress made to date in the implementation of London Cycle Network Plus and to examine the potential obstacles to its completion by 2009
- review and assess whether the LCN+ meets the needs of current and potential cyclists
- review and assess quality standards of the LCN+ implemented to date
- make recommendations for improving implementation, quality and standards of the LCN+.

> **What is the LCN+ ?**
>
> LCN+ is a network of 900km of radial and orbital routes for cyclists covering the whole of London. It is being developed and implemented by TfL and the London boroughs. LCN+ will be characterised by;
> - a socially inclusive cycling environment where high quality standards are maintained
> - routes that are continuous, fast, safe, comfortable and easy to use
> - clear guidance on surface treatment and road markings where there is a potential for conflict between cyclists and other road users.
>
> Around 20 per cent of the LCN+ is on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), 30 per cent on the Borough Principal Road Network (BPRN) and 50 per cent on other borough roads. TfL funds the work on BRRN and other borough roads through the Borough Spending Plans, and funds the work on the TLRN through its own area teams.
>
> TfL has overall responsibility for LCN+, but Camden is the lead borough for the project and manages the borough programme. Works on the TRLN are dealt with internally by TfL's Cycling Centre of Excellence and the TfL area teams. Camden reports on the overall progress of the LCN+.

2.   Will the network be completed on time?

2.1   Unless there is a rapid change of gear by Transport for London, it seems unlikely that LCN+ will be completed by the target date of 2009/10. Indeed, evidence from Camden, the lead borough for LCN+, is that based on TfL's current business plans it will not be ready until 2016/17. However, it could be completed by 2012/13 if all the money earmarked for spending on the scheme is spent as currently planned.

2.2   The evidence on how much of the network has been completed appears confusing, as the information came from a variety of sources. Camden gave a figure of 431km, although this figure included 62km 'off-carriageway' routes; 74km of 'park and canal' routes; and 89km of cycle lanes from the original LCN scheme *(which were not included in the post-LCN+ review). This might give the impression that TfL had nearly finished half the LCN+, but the confusing emphasis on kilometres completed fails to convey an impression of how much has actually been achieved that will make a significant difference to cyclists on London's roads. Also, some of the 431km of completed network still requires more work to bring it up to LCN+ standards.

2.3   The 2004 LCN+ annual report says that 72km of the network was completed in 2003/04, but then says that 58km was on LCN+ routes. The 2005 LCN+ annual report says that 81km was completed in 2004/05 but only 63km contributed to LCN+ delivery. The annual reports do list the number of junctions and crossings delivered, but this is not shown as a proportion of the total numbers of junctions and crossings.

2.4 The TfL submission estimates that completed kilometres in the later years of the project will rise from 80km in 2006/07 to 111km in the final year, 2009/10. Yet Camden suggests that progress may be slower in later years because the easier projects will have been tackled in the early years.

2.5 The concentration on completed kilometres, however, is unhelpful. It does not differentiate between small sections and completed routes that offer a real incentive for people to take up cycling or for existing cyclists to switch to LCN+ routes.

> *"There has been little progress in terms of on-the-ground implementation of LCN+…it is a matter of concern that there has been little progress on routes where CRISPs were completed more than a year ago."*
> *London Cycling Network*
>
> *"Most of the implementation has focused on simply providing the usual stop-start cycle lanes or cycle symbols to promote awareness as if cycling is some sort of brand on the way down: far from making attractive conditions for cycling this represents simply another assault on the urban environment by…the traffic engineer."*
> *City Cyclists*

3. Is enough money available for LCN+?

3.1 Progress has been made on the financial front – in 2004/05, for the second year running, all the money allocated was spent. This enabled 80km of cycle facilities to be completed against a target of 60km, with CRISP studies being completed on 375km of the network. While the project received no significant increases in funding in 2002/03 and 2003/04, in 2004/05 the Mayor allocated a significant increase and promised to maintain increases until the programme was completed. However, it is unclear whether the allocations will match the estimate of £147m in the London Cycling Plan. The most recent estimate from Camden is that LCN+ will need £154m to complete the elements of the network that are on borough roads.

3.2 Boroughs are granted funding to develop LCN+ schemes each year and further financial support for non-LCN+ schemes can be bid for through TfL's annual Borough Spending Plan.

3.3 The bidding process for LCN+ funds attempts to give boroughs some certainty over future work by anticipating future spending needs. Despite this, there are reports that some boroughs have left schemes to the end of the financial year and then had to "rush them through" (City Cyclists). We have also heard that borough bids for 2005/06 amounted to £15 million, but only £10 million was actually allocated in the budget by Transport for London. Transport for London has some flexibility within its five-year business plan to bring forward expenditure intended to take place in later years. More certainty is needed for boroughs over what funding will be available for LCN+ schemes. It would help to build the boroughs' confidence in the LCN+ if TfL were to bring forward funds from future years to fund the £15 million of proposed expenditure in 2005/06.

3.4 However, this would not address the question of whether there are sufficient funds overall within the five-year business plan to complete the LCN+ by 2009. TfL should review this question as part of the 2006/07 budget-making process.

> *Recommendation 1*
>
> **TfL should bring forward expenditure planned for future years in order to fund the £15 million of borough bids in 2005/06.**
>
> *Recommendation 2*
>
> **TfL should review the likely overall cost of the LCN+ scheme as part of the 2006/07 budget-setting process, in order to make clear the cost of guaranteeing quality and timely completion of the LCN+. This review should also look at how funds are distributed to boroughs.**

4. What are the barriers to progress?

4.1 Those who contributed to this report identified a number of issues that are affecting implementation of LCN+.

4.2 The LCN+ annual report for 2003/04 identified four 'challenges' the project had faced during 2003/04:
- boroughs had been slow to get to grips with the CRISP process and understanding the benefits of the future development of the programme
- there was a shortage of resources and high staff turnover in some boroughs
- there was still inconsistency in borough designs
- there was no established maintenance programme for completed themes.

4.3 Transport for London's own risk assessment also identified some significant potential barriers to be overcome to ensure successful delivery of the network by 2009/10.
1. The London Cycling Design Standard is not applied on a consistent basis
2. Certain boroughs do not support/implement LCN+
3. Costs of implementing LCN+ differ from forecasts contained within TfL business plan
4. Measures implemented on LCN+ network are not safeguarded, assured and maintained
5. Provision for cyclists in conflict with provision for other road users, particularly on the Transport for London Road Network and Strategic Road Network
6. Lack of skilled engineers and transport planners in delivery agencies to implement LCN+
7. Schemes do not offer returns anticipated (for example, casualty reduction, increased usage etc)
8. LCN+ not clearly understood as a network
9. Interface with major schemes delays implementation of parts of the network

10. The Mayor's Transport Strategy objective of modal shift not championed and undermines commitment to LCN+
11. Major barriers such as continuity across borough boundaries, major physical obstacles and long lead times
12. LCN+ not clearly understood or safeguarded as a network.

4.5   These and other issues were also highlighted by organisations and individuals who gave evidence. We welcome the openness of TfL and Camden in highlighting the barriers to completion and recognise that they are seeking to address them. However, we are particularly concerned with the first three of the barriers identified, as any one of these could stop delivery happening by 2009. We therefore believe that our recommendations provide a useful supplement to the solutions which TfL are pursuing.

The CRISP process

4.6   Introduced as a way of making sure that schemes that form part of LCN+ meet the needs of cyclists, Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plans (CRISPs) are now carried out for every proposed LCN+ route. CRISPS enable a comprehensive review of conditions for cycling on all LCN+ links. Recommendations from CRISP studies form the basis for the forward programme for completion of the network.

4.7   CRISPs help to make sure that when a scheme is implemented it has taken in account the views of those who use it. The LCN newsletter reports that in 2004/05, CRISP studies were carried out on 375km of the network. The LCN+ annual report for 2003/04 set a target of 78 CRISP schemes for 2004/05.

4.8   TfL reports that cycling user groups have consistently expressed satisfaction with the development of the CRISP process and its application was commended in a TRL review of facilities for cyclists in London (*TRL Review of procedures associated with the development and delivery of measures designed to improve safety and convenience of cyclists (2005)*). However, some problems were identified in the evidence to this report. The London Cycling Campaign points out that although the pilot CRISP was considered satisfactory by all participants, subsequent CRISPs have been met with a very mixed response depending on the borough, the consultant or CRISP organiser and the route. Stakeholders have also found it difficult to attend the large number of CRISPs, which are sometimes sub-divided into separate sections. Local LCC groups have complained that CRISP meetings are usually held during office hours when it is difficult for volunteers to attend.

> *"Consultation is important in relation to route option, but this should not be permitted to undermine clear and consistent principles in relation to quality which must be applied to LCN+ as a whole."*
> *London Cycling Campaign*

4.9   The question was also raised about whether CRISPS involve enough people. Sustrans points out that the CRISP process does not involve the non-cycling community and says that it tends to be dominated by the vocal few. It recommends that more data should be collected from current cyclists using the

network and that pre and post scheme completion monitoring should be carried out as a matter of course to inform which type of facilities are most likely to increase levels of cycling.

4.10   City Cyclists said that CRISP studies had failed to consider compliance of existing conditions and proposals within the London Cycling Design Standards, and suggested that this was not a good return for the large amount of money that was being spent on CRISPs.

4.11   While in theory CRISPs should lead to better schemes, there is a danger that they may delay the process, redirect resources that might be better spent on the schemes themselves – £7,000 is allocated for each CRISP study - and still not result in first class cycling facilities if they are not done well.

4.12   Despite some concerns about the variation of quality and implementation of some CRISPs, the London Cycling Campaign welcomed the introduction of CRISPs by TfL as the first systematic attempt to consider the views of cycle users and other stakeholders before introducing, or changing, cycle facilities.

> *Recommendation 3*
>
> **There should be an independent review of a sample of schemes that have been implemented following a Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan to assess whether the CRISPs have led to effective, well-designed schemes that meet the needs of cyclists and to identify lessons learned so far.**

Local politics

4.13   It is important to recognise that the LCN+ is a partnership project as well as being a strategic scheme. It has the active support of most local authorities and is being implemented by a lead borough, Camden. The original London Cycle Network was a locally-led scheme, with strategic routes put forward by the boroughs. The TfL review which developed the LCN+ also cut the scheme down to a smaller, even more strategically-focused project. The LCN+ is recognised within the Mayor's Transport Strategy as a key means of delivering a London-wide increase in cycling.

4.14   Some boroughs are not taking part in the scheme. Barnet and Kensington & Chelsea did not spend any of the funds available to them for LCN+ in 2003/04. Barnet has not bid for funds for future years and Kensington & Chelsea have made only small bids for future years. It was also suggested that local political issues were preventing implementation of local schemes – for example some authorities would not prioritise a cycle route over parking for local residents.

4.15   Camden's view was that a small number of boroughs claim that they support cycling but refuse to play a meaningful part in the LCN+ project. The lack of progress in three or four boroughs "appears to be politically motivated" and the problem "represents a critical obstacle to completion". As the project moves

forward this will inevitably result in gaps in the network and ultimately prevent its total completion. About 10 per cent of the network may not be completed due to this.

> *"There is support for cycle schemes in [my borough] as long as they do not impact on car parking spaces. Members pander to the car owning minority. It is useful to have councillors who are supportive of cycling."*
> *Cycling Projects Officer*

4.16 Another submission suggested that "politics at local authority level provides a significant obstacle to the completion of the project…individual political agendas and extensive consultation often results in watered down solutions to critical problems which often do not reflect cyclists' needs".(Individual contributor)

4.17 The solution in the short term could be to focus effort and resources on the majority of boroughs that are delivering their sections of the network and hope to gain the support of the others in the longer term. One way to do this could be through the Local Implementation Plans that individual boroughs have to produce showing how they will implement the Mayor's Transport Strategy in their area. Boroughs have been asked to express a firm commitment to the delivery of the LCN+ in their Local Implementation Plans, but it is unclear whether they will do so.

Is cycling really a priority?

4.18 There is a view among those who contributed to this report that despite the good intentions and the London Cycling Action Plan, cycling does not have a high enough priority. As a borough cycling officer put it: "There is a big gap between the policy of increasing cycling levels and the reality of implementation. The reality is that cycling still comes bottom of priorities when trying to implement a scheme. Capacity for private cars, bus journey times, car parking, 'expeditious movement of motor traffic', the Traffic Management Act, local car access for residents are all allowed to take prominence over the needs of cyclists on the LCN+. When this is combined with traffic engineers and management who have little interest in cycling, it becomes impossible to put in a decent cycle scheme. The result is a substandard…scheme which is unattractive or useless to cyclists and causes delay to their journeys".

4.19 Sustrans suggests that cyclists need to be clearly placed above motor vehicles in the road user hierarchy when new facilities are being designed for them, but thinks that there is still a refusal to do this in many local authorities and in some sections of TfL. It says that the department within TfL that has a remit to keep traffic flowing has been overturning some decisions to install toucan crossings or cycle lanes on busy roads.

4.20 The London Cycling Campaign also feels that support for cycling is lacking within TfL: "Unlike bus priority schemes and the congestion charge, LCN+ has not benefited from determined central direction by high ranking TfL officers with substantial powers to implement projects. Progress has therefore been patchy and standards are variable. Many LCC participants in the LCN+ programme are concerned that a preoccupation with motor traffic flows in some

TfL divisions can over-ride good design for vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians."

4.21   The 2004 TRL *Review of Procedures Associated with the Development and Delivery of Measures Designed to Improve Safety and Convenience for Cyclists* commended TfL for devoting significant staff and financial resources to delivering its cycling policy objectives. It said that the existence of a team dedicated to implementing cycling policy is unusual among UK highway authorities and represents a tangible commitment to supporting cycling. However, the review also found that internal communication between Surface Transport units has not been entirely effective, leading to difficulties in promoting higher standards of provision for cyclists.

Recommendation 4

TfL should designate a senior manager as 'champion' of the LCN+. This manager should check that new traffic management schemes include clear plans for implementation of measures to provide safety and convenience for cyclists as well as other road users.

Staffing problems

4.22   Once the schemes that make up the LCN+ have been identified, the schemes need to be designed and implemented by technical and professional staff. However, it is estimated that across the capital there is a 20 per cent shortage in these areas (LB Camden evidence).

4.23   Boroughs need support in delivering the LCN+ and wider cycling schemes. It may be that if the emphasis was shifted to developing whole routes at a time, a pool of central expertise could be established that would be available to all boroughs on the route.

4.24   The point was picked up in evidence from Ealing's Cycling Officer, who noted, "in order to progress the LCN+ network a large amount of officer time is required. LB Ealing has a total of one full time officer working on cycling projects, as well as additional work by colleagues in Highways and our team contractor. More resources are required to progress the full programme".

4.25   At the same time, a large part of the budget is being spent by boroughs on consultants. A representative from a borough commented that if a scheme had been granted £30,000, the fees for consultants would be £10,000 with £3,000 commissioning costs, only leaving £17,000 for the implementation. This suggests that lots of small schemes are not the most cost effective way to go about delivering the network.

"A lot of money is spent on consultants rather than implementing the schemes."
Cycling Projects Officer

4.26   City Cyclists complained that most of the design work and all the CRISPs are outsourced to consultants who frequently have scant experience or knowledge of cycling, let alone the local area, and are more accurately seen as sub-contractors.

4.27   The point was echoed by a borough cycling officer who said: "Cycling officers may not be engineers but they know what needs to be done to implement a project. A lot of knowledge is lost when a project is handed over to consultants who do not know cycling or the local roads. London is full of badly designed cycling schemes."

4.28   The LCN+ annual report said that there would be help for boroughs from TfL's resident consultants and TfL said it was developing a training programme on the London Cycling Design Standards for its own staff and borough officers and their consultants.

4.29   In June 2004, Transport for London commissioned an 'independent review of the procedures associated with the development and delivery of measures designed to improve safety and convenience for cyclists'. It was carried out by TRL Limited, and the report was completed in December 2004. TfL's response to the review included a commitment to, 'seek to improve the ability of the London Borough of Camden LCN+ Team to provide increased levels of cross-checking and specialist technical input by entering into discussions as to how further resources can be provided'.[1]

Recommendation 5

TfL and Camden as lead borough for LCN+ should develop plans for a core team of staff who can work with boroughs on CRISPs and on implementing projects. The funds for this team should come from the money currently spent on consultants. The aim should be to reduce the use of consultants by at least 50 per cent with resources redirected to a central team that will be able to share and spread expertise.

Reluctance to tackle difficult sections

4.30   The piecemeal approach that has evolved does not seem to be an effective way of encouraging cyclists. For example, a borough cycling officer commented: "We are currently at the half way stage of implementing the LCN+ and are now working on the most necessary, but most difficult schemes to implement. Many cyclists, new and experienced, complain that a route is fine until it suddenly hits one of these difficult areas, usually junctions".

4.31   The comment was made (Sustrans) that although there are many excellent sections of the LCN+, so far a great deal of the work has been based on 'easy wins' where there is sufficient road space or low volumes of traffic. The most

---

[1]TfL, January 2005, 'independent review of the procedures associated with the development and delivery of measures designed to improve safety and convenience for cyclists', page viii, para 4.7

significant challenges in terms of delivering cycling facilities have not yet been addressed – for example Marylebone Road, Old Kent Road, Holborn Circus, Shaftesbury Avenue, Piccadilly, Oxford Street, Regent Street and Parliament Square.

> *Recommendation 6*
>
> **TfL and Camden should take a much more strategic approach to the implementation of LCN+, route-by-route rather than kilometre by kilometre. TfL and Camden should identify a small number of flagship routes across London and prioritise their early completion. These will probably be routes that attract commuter cyclists and they should encompass 'difficult' areas such as Parliament Square and Marylebone Road. The routes will also serve as showcase of good design and be of a standard for other schemes across London to emulate.**

5. Does the LCN+ meet the needs of current and future cyclists?

> *"The routes on the LCN+ must be direct, long, coherent and continuous – uninterrupted by any problem points."*
> *London Cycling Campaign*

5.1 There were mixed views about the extent to which the LCN+ meets the needs of current and future cyclists. Overall, those who contributed to this investigation would seem to welcome any improvements in facilities for cyclists in London.

5.2 However, as City Cyclists point out, LCN+ only represents 9 per cent of the road network available and used by cyclists and therefore only amounts to a small minority of cycle trips.

5.3 TfL says that to ensure that the LCN+ meets current and future cyclist needs it has researched a range of cycle-friendly engineering treatments such as advanced stop lanes at traffic signals. But these are the kind of improvements that could be carried out regardless of the existence of a formal network in the shape of LCN+.

5.4 The real question for some of those who gave evidence was whether LCN+ is the right approach. One individual wrote: "LCN was based on a misconception; cyclists don't plan a route in the same way as you might plan a tube journey, yet they will make use of cycle lanes where they are convenient."

5.5 Evidence also suggested that existing and new cyclists had different needs. New cyclists needed measures that would make them feel safe, give them confidence and allow for a journey that was not full of 'stops and starts'. Existing cyclists needed facilities to allow them to use major routes as they would want the most direct route for their journey. While existing cyclists would be less likely to use longer routes away from traffic, these type of route are important in attracting new cyclists.

5.6   A borough cycling officer thought that LCN+ needed to think about what type of cyclists it is catering for. Quieter routes will only be used by new cyclists for a couple of months. In a way, the LCN+ would be the victim of its own success; new cyclists may be attracted by the existence of quiet routes, but once they gain confidence they will probably want to take the most direct route, which will frequently be on a main road.

5.7   City Cyclists also felt that most cyclists do and will continue to use main roads even where there are parallel LCN+ routes. It pointed to three examples of main roads that have very high cycle flows:
*   A10 Kingsland Road as opposed to the generally good LCN+ route 10
*   A1208 Hackney Road as opposed to the generally good LCN+ route 9
*   A5201 Clerkenwell Road/Old Street as opposed to Lever Street LCN+ 0.

5.8   Sustrans thought that there has been too little work undertaken to identify the needs of present or future cyclists and to match those to scheme prioritisation. It pointed to a 2003 TfL report, *The Impact of New Cycling Infrastructure Schemes – Customer Feedback*, which compared customer satisfaction for five new and different cycling facilities in London: Shoreditch Triangle, Kensington Gardens, Kingston Road, Royal Mint Street and Twickenham Station. The report concluded that the opening up of a shared use, traffic-free route through Kensington Gardens had (for zero implementation cost) been the most successful and popular scheme with 46 per cent of users saying they had switched to cycling as a result of the new route. This finding in favour of opening up attractive, traffic-free routes through London's parks is not being translated into action by the LCN+, which continues to prioritise cycle routes on main roads.

> *"I've never met a non-activist cyclist who's heard of LCN+, let alone who speaks of 'Route 37' or 'Route 4'. But they are quick to praise individual quality facilities, such as…the route across Hyde Park."*
> *Individual evidence*

5.9   Some measures that should benefit cyclists are not having the intended effect. For example, there was criticism that stop lights held cyclists for too long because TfL was concerned about traffic flows.

5.10   Several of those who contributed to this investigation made the point that cyclists need more than the LCN+ to meet their needs. Other measures are essential. For example measures designed to reduce motor traffic levels as a whole and to restrict motor traffic to major routes where appropriate. Other ways to meet the needs of current and future cyclists include the congestion charge, home zones, clear zones, safe routes to schools and other 20mph zones, as well as greatly increased road traffic law enforcement – there were complaints that advanced stop lines are poorly enforced. One submission to this inquiry said that it seemed that many authorities prioritise revenue-raising parking enforcement in controlled parking zones and that it was rare to see wardens undertaking duties in cycle lanes.

5.11   On a positive note, the London Cycling Campaign reports that its members are satisfied with the introduction of advanced stop lines and the widening of cycle

lanes to a minimum of 1.5m. They are also pleased to see a steady increase in parking stands.

5.12   However, some members of the campaign are concerned that the concentration on the LCN+ will mean that boroughs and TfL will fail to provide for cyclists on other roads, which are also part of the cycle network in a wider sense. Indeed, without access to all roads, cyclists may be unable to access LCN+.

5.13   Signing of routes has been the subject of criticism. Some of this is levelled at signs that do not say where the route is heading, some at a lack of clear signage. To meet the needs of all cyclists, routes need to be clearly signed, ideally with specific destinations rather than – or as well as – route numbers. This requirement must be balanced with concerns about cluttering streets and pavements with additional signposts. Where possible, signage should be appended to existing signposts.

> *"The signage is rubbish. What's the point of a sign that says 'M1' without saying where it leads?"*

Recommendation 7

TfL and Camden should urgently review signage on the LCN+ to ensure that it is clear and meets the needs of cyclists. Cyclists and potential cyclists should be involved in this review.

Recommendation 8

TfL and the Metropolitan Police should instigate a joint campaign to encourage all road users to share the road. This campaign would include publicity aimed at both drivers and cyclists, asking them to respect other road users and the rules of the road. It would include action against cyclists who jump red lights or ride on the pavement, and involve TfL in setting targets for improving enforcement of parking restrictions in cycle lanes.

6.   Quality and standards of the network

> *"London is full of badly designed cycle schemes"*
> *London borough cycling officer*

6.1   The development and publication of the London Cycle Design Standards has provided everyone involved in the LCN+ with a guide to the expected standards for the network. It is expected that the quality of the network will improve as the new standards are adopted.

6.2   However, Camden recognises that the design of adequate cycle facilities is complex and may vary from route to route. In any event, some sections of the

work have been carried out under older standards. It is proposing to bring all sections up to a consistent standard by subjecting all sections, including those currently identified as completed, to a CRISP.

6.3 Camden reports that cyclists continue to raise concerns about the maintenance of cycle facilities and the state of the roads in general. In 2004 a draft strategy for asset management or maintenance of the network was produced. This has been piloted with 13 boroughs and the initial results show that there are significant defects on the network that do present a hazard to cyclists and that targeted works can reduce these. Camden wants the initiative to be extended to the remaining 20 boroughs.

Recommendation 9

TfL should support Camden's suggestion for the asset management strategy to be extended to all boroughs. TfL should set a timetable for the implementation, monitoring and review of the asset management strategy in all boroughs.

6.4 A borough cycling officer commented that "maintenance is a disaster" and said that all boroughs have problems even with seemingly simple tasks such as getting a wrong facing sign turned the right way.

6.5 London Cycling Campaign members report a significant variation in the quality of completed schemes. Some completed schemes, for example Tooley Street in Southwark and York Way on the Camden/Islington border, fail to meet standards despite being implemented after TfL issued guidance on lane width. Cyclists in Wandsworth are very concerned with some of the work that has been carried out in the borough, suggesting it actually puts cyclists at risk.

6.6 Sustrans also believes that quality and standards of the LCN+ varies greatly across the network. It points out, for example, that many sections of the LCN+ have poor surfacing and that LCN+ has not yet come up with any innovative design solutions to the problems cyclists face at roundabouts.

6.7 Implementation of the London Cycle Design Standards should be monitored carefully. There have been criticisms (City Cyclists) that some aspects such as the measures to increase driver awareness of cyclists by marking cycle symbols and lanes may actually result in drivers being less cautious. The effectiveness of other features such as advanced stop lines need to be assessed – City Cyclists suggest that many of these are "useless" while some are dangerous as "sub-standard lead-in lanes encourage cyclists into the blind spots of HGVs.

Recommendation 10

TfL should monitor and review the London Cycle Design Standards to assess their effectiveness in schemes that have been implemented.

---

7. Promoting the network

7.1   TfL highlights a lack of understanding of LCN+ as a risk to delivery. It says that there is a need for TfL, the GLA and the boroughs to communicate the business case for the network and to agree on a strategy for signing and branding priorities.

7.2   David Breen, a design engineer who submitted evidence, suggested that the LCN+ will not succeed in attracting an 80 per cent increase in cycling in London by 2010 and a 200 per cent increase by 2020 without increased awareness of what the LCN+ is.

> *Recommendation 11*
>
> **TfL should develop and implement a campaign to raise awareness of the LCN+. This should be launched in Spring 2006 and sit alongside existing campaigns to promote cycling in general.**

8. Conclusion

8.1   The London Cycling Network+ is making a good contribution to improving conditions for cycling in London and in helping to achieve the Mayor's targets for getting more people cycling. However, the project is in danger of drifting well beyond its delivery date and of not making the dramatic changes that will really excite and encourage cyclists.

8.2   LCN+ needs to think bigger – to tackle difficult areas and complete routes that will enable cyclists to ride from the fringes of the capital to the centre with confidence and in safety. This will need the co-operation of all boroughs, something that is not evident at the moment.

8.3   A joined-up cycle route needs a joined-up strategy that shifts the emphasis from piecemeal projects to a route-by-route approach. To ensure that these routes are provided – without gaps – funding needs to be guaranteed for the length of the project and technical and staff support provided to boroughs.

8.4   And above all, the safety and convenience of cyclists needs to be given appropriate priority in relation to the needs of other road users. Without this, LCN+ will always be a part-project; a good idea that never quite worked out in practice.

Appendix 1 – Local Implementation Plans

The following excepts are taken from the Mayor's guidance on the drawing up of Local Implementation Plans (LIPs). It provides an explaination of what LIPs are, what powers the Mayor has in approving them and what the Mayor can do to enforce them.

LIPS guidance

The Mayor published his first Transport Strategy in July 2001. Under Section 145 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 ('the GLA Act'), London local authorities must prepare Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) containing their proposals for the implementation of the Transport Strategy in their area 'as soon as reasonably practicable' after the publication of the Transport Strategy.

Policy 5.4 of the Transport Strategy states:

'Partnership will be sought with the London boroughs in developing and implementing transport policies and plans. The London boroughs are required to set out their proposals for the implementation of the Transport Strategy in their areas. Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) will reflect the Transport Strategy's objectives, policies, proposals and priorities. The Mayor will issue guidance to the London boroughs setting out detailed requirements for their LIPs. Guidance will ensure the LIPs implement the Transport Strategy, are co-ordinated with each other and with the plans of other implementation agencies, and are effectively implemented and monitored. If necessary, the Mayor will issue directions to ensure the Transport Strategy is implemented.' Section 41(9) of the GLA Act gives the Mayor powers to set targets in relation to the delivery of the MTS. This guidance sets out these London targets in Chapter 4, for both boroughs and TfL, and explains how the boroughs are to consider and implement them in their LIPs.

LIP Guidance is provided to assist boroughs in the preparation of their LIPs and to fulfil the above requirements. A draft version of this guidance was issued to the boroughs and other stakeholders for consultation during March and April 2004. This final guidance has been developed taking into account the results of the consultation and incorporates many of the suggestions made in that period.

The following sections of the guidance describe in more detail the purpose of a LIP, the overall process, the MTS framework for LIPs, the new London targets and progress monitoring, including performance indicators. The final two chapters provide information on other Mayoral strategies, relevant policy areas and references for LIPs and information on the suggested format for LIPs.

It is expected that the first borough LIPs will be presented for evaluation and approval by the Mayor in July 2005, as set out in Table 3-1 (page 9). Preparing and consulting on LIPs in London is likely to coincide in part with neighbouring English local authorities preparing their second round of Local Transport Plans (LTPs). This gives a further opportunity to develop co-ordinated transport solutions in the region.

2.1 LIP function and scope

A Local Implementation Plan (LIP) is a statutory document that must set out a plan of how a borough proposes to implement the MTS in its area. It gives London local

authorities the opportunity to present their full range of transport initiatives and projects and to show how and when they will address local transport issues through delivery of the MTS in an integrated manner.

Each borough's LIP must therefore demonstrate clearly how the proposals it contains cover the necessary policy efforts, projects, programmes, implementation mechanisms, planning and co-ordination activities. Relevant timescales must be clearly set out.

Resource assumptions and performance measures must also be included. LIPs must be based on realistic planning assumptions and should not be used as aspirational bidding documents.

Proposals should be practical, sustainable, fundable (so far as can currently be predicted), represent good value for money and have the support of relevant partners.

2.2 Key deliverables for LIPs Boroughs must ensure that LIPs include:
- Clear links between LIP proposals and MTS policies and proposals
- A timetable for implementing the different proposals in the plan and the date by which these will be completed
- Clear proposals for delivery of Mayoral targets
- An assessment of the funding and resources needed to deliver the LIP
- Assumptions about sources of funding.

LIPs should also have regard to the London Plan and other Mayoral strategies, where appropriate.

2.3 Purpose of LIP guidance

The purpose of the guidance is to:
- Provide boroughs with information to assist the preparation of LIPs.
- The guidance seeks to draw boroughs' attention to the key areas of the MTS to be addressed in LIPs
- Clarify how the Mayor wishes to see certain aspects of the MTS taken forward by boroughs
- Provide an up-to-date policy context for LIPs. The guidance contains a summary of the current London transport policy context (Sections 4 & 6, respectively pages 19 & 37). It also contains a matrix (Appendix C), which sets out those policies and proposals in the MTS relevant to the boroughs and provides TfL and the GLA progress updates on these since publication of the MTS in July 2001
- Supply boroughs with information describing how LIPs will be evaluated and how delivery of LIPs will be monitored
- Describe certain new transport targets for TfL and boroughs in relation to the MTS, arising from Mayoral powers under section 41(9) of the GLA Act
- Give guidance as to whom boroughs should consult in preparation of LIPs, further to that provided in section 145(2) of the GLA Act.

LIP Guidance 2004

3.4 LIP evaluation

In accordance with section 146 of the GLA Act the Mayor can only approve a
LIP where he/she considers:
- The LIP is consistent with the MTS
- The proposals contained in the LIP are adequate for the purposes of the
- implementation of the MTS
- The timetable for implementing those proposals, and the date by which
  proposals are to be implemented, are adequate for those purposes. TfL will be
  involved in the evaluation process, with the Mayor retaining the decision-
  making powers. If the Mayor is not satisfied with the content of a LIP, he may
  require the borough to revise its LIP to meet his requirements within a set
  deadline. The Mayor will give the borough clear information on the issues in the
  LIP that need to be addressed.

In carrying out LIP evaluation, the Mayor and TfL will have regard to the contents of
this guidance. Approval of a LIP may be delayed for one or more of the following
reasons:
- Failure to set out appropriate plans for delivery of the MTS
- Unjustified inconsistency with the London Plan and other statutory Mayoral
  strategies
- Failure to address the priorities for borough actions set out within this guidance
  in Table 4-1
- Form or structure incompatible with this guidance
- Insufficient information on programmes or schemes and their background to
  permit proper evaluation
- An unrealistic/unachievable programme
- Unrealistic/unsuitable milestones/performance indicators/end date
- Inadequate information on funding and resource requirements.

3.4.1 LIP evaluation framework

The evaluation framework is based on the principle that LIP evaluation needs
to be straightforward for boroughs, TfL and the Mayor. It is therefore
designed to:
- Build on what exists, where possible
- Utilise formats with which boroughs are familiar
- Provide a common framework to appraise LIP submissions.

The LIP evaluation framework is intended to meet several objectives:
- Transparency
- Consistency
- Ease of use by both boroughs and TfL
- Maximise the chances of achieving a full set of approvable LIPs.

The framework is envisaged to be iterative with formal submission of LIPs at two stages:
when the Consultation Draft is submitted to TfL and on submission of the Final LIP to
the Mayor and TfL (the indicative timetable is described in Table 3-1). TfL will provide

feedback on the Consultation Draft, which the borough should then respond to in its Final LIP. The borough then submits the Final LIP for a further evaluation to both the Mayor and TfL. The Mayor will then decide upon approval of the LIP, supported by TfL's evaluation.

If, in the view of the Mayor, there are shortcomings identified in the Final LIP, it is likely that there will be further iterations involving reworking the Final LIP. Identified shortcomings (on which feedback will be given to the borough concerned) that are insufficiently addressed in subsequent submissions of the Final LIP may lead to the Mayor deciding to take further steps, as described in the GLA Act.

The evaluation framework will benefit greatly from the submission of robust LIPs. Two forms are included in Appendix F, described further in section 7.2.5, that provide the tools for this framework and which underpin LIP evaluation. These are:

1. LIP Proposal Delivery Form (Form 1):
Captures the essential details and summary of a borough proposal to deliver the MTS

2. LIP Proposal Summary Sheet
(Form 2): Enables proposals entered onto LIP Proposal Delivery Forms to be indexed against the MTS in a convenient, summary format.
The use of the forms, subject to any agreed variations, is strongly recommended to facilitate LIP preparation and evaluation. The forms and framework are designed to identify LIP strengths and weaknesses and enable focused feedback to boroughs for improvement, leading to approval. Please refer to Chapter 7 for further details on the structure and content framework for LIPs.

3.5 Legal framework and issues

Legal requirements for the preparation and approval of LIPs are set out in Appendix A. The following paragraphs identify some known pending significant legislative or regulatory changes and how they might affect LIPs. Appendix B also summarises the legislative framework for equalities issues relevant to LIPs that boroughs are encouraged to be aware of throughout this process.

5.1 Borough progress reports on LIPs

Once a LIP is approved, a LIP performance and progress report will be expected from each borough at the end of July18 each year. This report will support a high level review of borough LIP progress and performance, an outcome from which is anticipated to be the context and justification for further BSP funding.

The main elements of the Borough LIP Progress Report will be a review of performance against targets, updates to LIPs Proposal Delivery Forms and LIPs
- Proposal Summary Sheets (Forms 1 & 2, Section 3.4.1, Section 7.2.5 and
- Appendix F) and information on:
- Major milestones achieved since LIP submitted
- Changes to milestone dates in the LIP
- Where relevant, reasons for delays

- Progress on Performance Indicators (described in Section 5.2)
- Significant changes to information reported in the LIP, including updates on funding, resources and cross-cutting goals
- Assessment of BSP performance and need for future funding.

To be meaningful, the review will need to take account of TfL updates and progress (e.g. on the TLRN) so that any resulting decisions are coherent. The review will also aim to differentiate between factors within and outside a borough's control. For the first few years, boroughs should expect the review to include a senior level meeting between representatives of TfL and the borough. Such a meeting may be waived by agreement, thereafter, for boroughs making significant progress towards delivery of their LIP.

In circumstances where a borough's measured progress is unsatisfactory due to factors within its control, the Mayor intends to provide advice on any shortcomings to the relevant borough, and has the power to do this in the form of a direction under Section 153 of the GLA Act. A borough will usually be given a period to address identified shortcomings and the opportunity of a follow-up review to assess the need for further action, which might include the invocation of other Mayoral powers.

It is recognised that circumstances will change over the lifetime of a LIP, for example in relation to the availability of funding or delays to major projects. The annual LIP performance and progress report will provide an opportunity for a borough to set out changes in circumstances likely to affect the timing of delivery of the proposals set out in their LIP, and such circumstances would taken fully into account in appraising the annual report.

Legal framework

Introduction

The following is a brief summary of the legal framework in relation to Local Implementation Plans and the setting of Targets. All references are to the Greater London Authority Act 1999, unless stated.

Local Implementation Plans

The Mayor's Transport Strategy provides the policy framework for a number of bodies, including the London Borough Councils and the Common Council (called collectively the London Authorities).

The Greater London Authority Act 1999 provides that the London Authorities must implement the Strategy in two ways. First, in exercising any function the London Authority must 'have regard to the transport strategy' (section 144). The Mayor may also issue guidance about the implementation of the Strategy to London Authorities (section 144(2)) which they must have regard to in exercising any function (section 144(3)). It is pursuant to this power that the current Guidance has been prepared.

Secondly, 'as soon as reasonably practicable' after the Mayor has published the Transport Strategy, each London Authority is required to prepare a Local

Implementation Plan (LIP) (section 145). The LIP sets out its proposals for the implementation of the Transport Strategy in the London Authority's area. In particular, it must contain:

- a timetable for implementing the different proposals in the plan; and
- the date by which all the proposals in the plan are implemented (section 145(3)).

In preparing a LIP each London Authority must consult:

- the relevant Police Commissioner or Commissioners;
- Transport for London;
- such organisations representative of disabled persons as the council
- considers appropriate;
- each other London Borough council whose area is, in the opinion of the council preparing the local implementation plan, likely to be affected by the plan; and
- any other person required to be consulted by the direction of the Mayor.

Each London Borough Council must submit the LIP for the Mayor's approval (section 146(1)). The Mayor cannot approve a LIP unless he or she considers that:

- it is consistent with the Strategy;
- that the proposals contained in the LIP are adequate for the purposes of the implementation of the Strategy; and
- that the timetable for implementing the proposals and the end date by which the proposals are implemented are adequate (section 146(3)).

The Mayor may also issue directions to the London Authorities under section 153. The London Authorities 'shall comply with any direction'. A direction may cover any matter relating to how a London Authority exercises its LIP functions.

Directions can be general or specific and may cover such matters as:

- the timetable for completing or revising a LIP;
- the bodies or persons that must be consulted in preparation of a LIP;
- timetables and dates within the LIP;
- actions to be taken to implement the proposals in the LIP; and
- steps to be taken to remove the effects of an action which is
- incompatible with the proposals in the LIP (section 153(2)).

The Mayor has extensive powers to prepare the LIP if an Authority fails to prepare one that is in his or her opinion adequate (section 147). The Mayor can recover the cost of doing so from the London Authority as a civil debt (section 147). Also, where the Mayor considers that the London Authority has failed 'or is likely to fail' to implement any proposal within the LIP he can exercise on behalf of the London Authority its powers and recover the costs of doing so (section 152).

The Act states that a London Authority may revise its LIP at any time and must consider the need to do so when the Transport Strategy is revised.

Appendix 2 – Principles of London Assembly scrutiny

The powers of the London Assembly include power to investigate and report on decisions and actions of the Mayor, or on matters relating to the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, and on any other matters which the Assembly considers to be of importance to Londoners. In the conduct of scrutiny and investigation the Assembly abides by a number of principles:

- aim to recommend action to achieve improvements;

- are conducted with objectivity and independence;

- examine all aspects of the Mayor's strategies;

- consult widely, having regard to issues of timeliness and cost;

- are conducted in a constructive and positive manner; and

- are conducted with an awareness of the need to spend taxpayers money wisely and well.

More information about the work of the London Assembly, including published reports, details of committee meetings and contact information, can be found on the London Assembly web page at www.london.gov.uk/assembly.

Appendix 3 – Orders and translations

How to order

For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact Janet Hughes, Senior Scrutiny Manager, on 020 7983 4423 or email to janet.hughes@london.gov.uk

See it for free on our website - You can also view and download a copy of this report at: http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/environment.jsp

Large print, Braille or translations

If you or someone you know need a copy of this report in large print or Braille, a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call 020 7983 4100

আপনি বা আপনার পরিচিত কেউ এ রিপোর্টের সারমর্ম ও প্রস্তাবের কপি বিনামূল্যে বড়ছাপা বা ব্রেইল, অথবা তাদের নিজের ভাষায় চাইলে 020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারে ফোন করুন বা ই মেইল করুন এ ঠিকানায়: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

જો તમને કે તમે જાણતા હો તેવી કોઈ વ્યક્તિને, આ અહેવાલમાંથી કાર્યકારી સંક્ષેપ અને ભલામણોની નકલ મોટા અક્ષરોમાં છપાયેલી, બ્રેઈલમાં કે તેમની પોતાની ભાષામાં વિના મૂલ્યે જોઈતી હોય, તો કૃપા કરીને ફોન દ્વારા 020 7983 4100 ઉપર અમારો સંપર્ક કરો અથવા આ સરનામે ઈ-મેઈલ કરો assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Se você, ou alguém de seu conhecimento, gostaria de ter uma cópia do sumario executivo e recomendações desse relatório em imprensa grande ou Braille, ou na sua língua, sem custo, favor nos contatar por telefone no número 020 7983 4100 ou email em assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਜਾਂ ਕੋਈ ਤੁਹਾਡਾ ਜਾਣ-ਪਛਾਣ ਵਾਲਾ ਇਸ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਦਾ ਅਗਜ਼ੈਕਟਿਵ ਖੁਲਾਸਾ ਅਤੇ ਸੁਝਾਵਾਂ ਦੀ ਨਕਲ ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ, ਬ੍ਰੇਅਲ ਵਿਚ ਜਾਂ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਮੁਫ਼ਤ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰਨਾ ਚਾਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਡੇ ਨਾਲ 020 7983 4100 ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ assembly.translations@london.gov.uk ਤੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ ਈ-ਮੇਲ ਕਰੋ।

Si usted, o algún conocido, quiere recibir copia del resúmen ejecutivo y las recomendaciones relativos a este informe en forma de Braille, en su propia idioma, y gratis, no duden en ponerse en contacto con nosostros marcando 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

اگر آپ یا آپ کا کوئی جاننے والا اس ایگزیکٹوسمری اوراس رپورٹ میں سے سفارشات کی ایک کاپی بڑے پرنٹ میں یا بریل پڑی یا اپنی زبان میں بلا معاوضہ حاصل کرنا چاہیں تو ٗ براہ کرم ہم سے فون 4100 7983 020 پر رابطہ کریں یا assembly.translations@london.gov.uk پر ای میل کریں۔

Ta ba ri enikeni ti o ba ni ife lati ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kansiwa lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero assembly.translations@london.gov.uk. Ako ni gbowo lowo yin fun eto yi.

Haddii adiga, ama qof aad taqaanid, uu doonaayo inuu ku helo koobi ah warbixinta oo kooban iyo talooyinka far waaweyn ama farta qofka indhaha la' loogu talagalay, ama luuqadooda, oo bilaash u ah, fadlan nagala soo xiriir telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email-ka cinwaanku yahay assembly.translations@london.gov.uk