

TOP LINE THOUGHTS ON LEAKED TfL "Travel & Places" RESEARCH AND EMAIL EXCHANGES

- There is an extremely disproportionate obsession with cycling in both the email exchange and the report itself. The lengthy email exchanges over long periods repeatedly discuss cycling throughout but never once mention public transport or walking. This is despite the official stated aim of the research being *"to assess the impact of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) and other built environment interventions on the travel behaviours of London's population"*. Note the research should be about all "travel behaviours".
- Furthermore, the researchers are very proud to state that they *"have created a novel 'cyclability score' to measure, based on several different indicators, how cycling-friendly the local environment is near to respondents' homes."* But there is no equivalent score mentioned in the research for walking or buses or tubes or trains – or indeed driving.
- The report also finds that the biggest correlation with cycling is household income: *"As in previous waves, higher household income is associated with a higher likelihood of having cycled during the previous week in Wave 2; 12% of respondents within the lowest household income reported cycling the week before the survey compared to 31% amongst those respondents within the highest household income."* So - arguably - the focus should be on more affordable transport options where household income is not a barrier.
- The report's six "Key Takeaways" in the Executive Summary are ALL about cycling. How can a piece of research ostensibly about the impact of LTNs on all travel behaviours have not a single takeaway about any travel mode other than cycling?
- This obsession with cycling is further borne out in the proposed structure for a third research wave, in which four of the five proposed sections are devoted to cycling.

Does this all betray the highly partial influence of ex-LCC "researcher" Rachel Aldred? (answer: almost certainly yes)

- Despite the obsession with cycling, it is not clear from the research if LTNs are having any positive or negative overall effect on cycling levels. The report's Executive Summary states that:

"Like the two previous waves, the majority (83%) of Wave 2 respondents report no cycling minutes at all during the previous week, and there is almost no change in the amount of cycling reported by those who did make journeys by bicycle."

However, the report also later states that: *"Across all models, there is a statistically significant association between a higher proportion of LTN roads and a higher likelihood of any past-week cycling. There is also a statistically significant association between a higher proportion of LTN roads and a higher number of minutes of past-week cycling."*

So – if cycling has not increased overall in London (as stated in the executive summary), but the report finds that cycling increases in LTN roads, does that mean that LTNs contribute to a decrease in cycling outside of LTNs to mean no change overall? Surely if they were even remotely objective the researchers would have looked into this?

- Finally, the report also looks into how attitudes have changed to TfL's funding for all travel modes. the key finding is that: *"The net values continue to be negative for all modes, indicating that a higher proportion of participants feel that there is insufficient support for each mode."* In other words, people think that TfL are doing a poor job across the board!