

Schedule of Modifications

The schedule below contains a list of the changes that Transport for London (TfL) recommends be made to the text and proposals in the revisions to the Mayor's Transport and Air Quality Strategies as published for consultation with stakeholders and the public in January 2006. The schedule also contains TfL's reasons for recommending these changes. The proposed text would be inserted into both the Transport and Air Quality Strategies.

Both the original and proposed revised text is shown for ease of comparison. The numbering shown in column 2 refers to the draft Transport and Air Quality Strategy Revisions.

Main Text

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
1.	Introduction	Preamble – Whole section	Whole section.	Updated to reflect later stage in process. Updated section on details of public and stakeholder consultation. New section on status of document entitled 'What happens now?'
2.	4G.126 4C.1	London is a very large city with a growing population, which is putting increased pressure on both the environment and the transport infrastructure. This pressure will get worse without determined action. Vehicle emissions contribute to poor air quality, and poor air quality is damaging to human health and people's quality of life; it particularly affects the most vulnerable in society – the sick, the very young and the very old.		No changes.
3.	4G.127 4C.2	London's air quality is much better now than it was in the first half of the twentieth century. However, it still has the worst air pollution in		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>the UK, and some of the worst air pollution in Europe. There are also still too many areas of London where nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulate matter (PM₁₀) exceed recommended limits for protecting human health. It was predicted that around one thousand early deaths and the same number of hospital admissions would occur in the London area in 2005 due to air pollution.</p>		
4.	4G.128 4C.3	<p>Road transport related emissions are a significant contributor to air pollution in London. Road transport was predicted to be responsible for 47% of emissions of PM₁₀ in London in 2005. These are the emissions most harmful to human health. PM₁₀ affects the respiratory and cardiovascular system, and is known to contribute to premature deaths. It can also carry carcinogenic compounds into the lungs that can cause cancer. It may worsen existing lung disease and increase the sensitivity to allergens of people with hay fever</p>	<p>Road transport related emissions are a significant contributor to air pollution in London. Road transport was predicted to be responsible for 47 percent of emissions of PM₁₀ in London in 2005. These are the emissions most harmful to human health. PM₁₀ affects the respiratory and cardiovascular system, and is known to contribute to premature deaths. It can also carry carcinogenic compounds into the lungs that can cause cancer. It may worsen existing lung disease and increase the sensitivity to</p>	Clarification.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>and asthma. Road transport was also predicted to be responsible for 47% of the emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) in London in 2005; NO_x includes nitric oxide (NO), which in the presence of ozone (O₃) reacts in the atmosphere to produce nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). NO₂ has been associated with impaired lung function, as well as increases in allergies and a general deleterious effect on quality of life.</p>	<p>allergens of people with hay fever and asthma. Road transport was also predicted to be responsible for 47 percent of the emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) in London in 2005; NO_x includes nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). NO₂ has been associated with impaired lung function, as well as increases in allergies and a general deleterious effect on quality of life.</p>	
5.	4G.129 4C.4	<p>UK policy on air quality is determined to a considerable extent by European legislation. The primary legislation governing air quality in the EU is the Directive 96/62/EC known as the "Air Quality Framework Directive". This EU Directive establishes a framework under which the EU will set "limit values" or "target values" for specified pollutants. The legally binding "limit values" are set out in the Daughter Directives for a range of pollutants that impact on human health, vegetation and</p>		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		ecosystems. They also require countries to achieve these "limit values" by a certain date, and once attained not to exceed them.		
6.	4G.130 4C.5	The Air Quality Framework Directive and the Air Quality Daughter Directives are transposed into English law by the Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000, Air Quality Limit Values Regulations 2001 and amendments. They are implemented in large part through Part IV of the Environment Act 1995. Regulations made under Part IV, the Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000, contain domestic air quality objectives for England. Many of these are set at the limit values contained in the Air Quality Daughter Directives. The Secretary of State, local authorities and the Mayor are required to take steps to achieve these domestic air quality objectives. The Secretary of State is required to prepare a national air quality strategy, which is the Air Quality Strategy (AQS)	The Air Quality Framework Directive and the Air Quality Daughter Directives are transposed into English law by the Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000, Air Quality Limit Values Regulations 2001 and amendments. They are implemented in large part through Part IV of the Environment Act 1995. Regulations made under Part IV, the Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000, contain domestic air quality objectives for England. Many of these are set at the limit values contained in the Air Quality Daughter Directives. The Secretary of State, local authorities and the Mayor are required to take steps to achieve these domestic air quality objectives. The Secretary of State is required to prepare a national air quality strategy, which is the Air	To reflect the current stage the proposal is at.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (2000).	Quality Strategy (AQS) for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (2000). In April 2006, the Government commenced consultation on a review of the Strategy – <i>The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland: A consultation document on options for further improvement in air quality.</i>	
7.	4G.131 4C.6	In its AQS, the Government has set objectives for nine main air pollutants. Two of these pollutants are being tackled at the national and European level, but responsibility for addressing the remaining seven is devolved to local authorities. Within London, the Mayor has a statutory duty to take steps towards achieving the objectives for the seven locally managed pollutants.		No Changes
8.	4G.132 4C.7	London is expected to meet the objectives for five out of the seven pollutants. However, provisional data suggests it has not met the annual mean objective for NO ₂	London is expected to meet the objectives for five out of the seven pollutants. However, data suggests that in many places London has not met the annual	Clarification.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		(date for achievement, end 2005) and the annual mean and daily mean objective for PM ₁₀ (which applied from the end of 2004). In particular, these objectives are expected to have been exceeded at locations in the vicinity of the main road network.	mean objective for NO ₂ (date for achievement, end 2005) and the annual mean and daily mean objectives for PM ₁₀ (which applied from the end of 2004). In particular, these objectives are expected to have been exceeded at locations in the vicinity of the main road network.	
9.	4G.133 4C.8	Beyond 2005, the next target date for achieving the prescribed air quality objectives is the end of 2010. On current trends and without further action, it is predicted that London will exceed its annual mean objectives for NO ₂ , as well as its annual and daily mean objectives for PM ₁₀ . Each year that the UK exceeds an EU limit value there is the risk of infraction proceedings and the UK potentially paying daily fines based on a percentage of GDP.		No changes.
10.	4G.134 4C.9	The European Commission recently published a Thematic Strategy and proposed a new directive on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe. The new	In September 2005, the European Commission published a Thematic Strategy on air pollution and proposed a new directive on ambient air quality and cleaner air	Updated to reflect proposal regarding PM _{2.5} .

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>directive, should it be adopted, would provide scope for the achievement of the PM₁₀ and NO₂ limit values in 2010 to be deferred, but only where a Member State has demonstrated that it has taken significant action to try and meet those limit values. The proposed LEZ would be a means to demonstrate that London is making every effort to achieve the relevant limit values, or concentration caps, as the new directive may define them. The new directive also proposes a new concentration cap for fine particles, PM_{2.5}, which may replace that for PM₁₀ in 2010. PM_{2.5} are fine particles that in many cases are more damaging to human health than PM₁₀. A high proportion of PM_{2.5} emissions are from road transport, and the proposed LEZ would contribute significantly to reducing emissions of these particulates.</p>	<p>for Europe. The new directive, should it be adopted, would provide scope for the achievement of the PM₁₀ and NO₂ limit values in 2010 to be deferred, but only where a Member State has demonstrated that it has taken significant action to try and meet those limit values. The proposed LEZ would be a means to demonstrate that London is making every effort to achieve the relevant limit values, or concentration caps, as the new directive may define them. The new directive also proposes a new concentration cap for fine particles, PM_{2.5} from 2010, which would be in addition to that for PM₁₀. PM_{2.5} are ultra-fine particles that are considered to be more damaging to human health than PM₁₀. A high proportion of PM_{2.5} emissions are from road transport, and the proposed LEZ would contribute to reducing emissions of these ultra-fine particles.</p>	
11.	4G.135	The proposed LEZ represents the	The proposed LEZ represents the	To reflect initial findings from

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
	4C.10	<p>most effective option for helping London work towards meeting its daily mean objective for PM₁₀. It should also help London make progress towards achieving its 2010 annual mean objective for PM₁₀, and its 2010 annual mean objective for NO₂. While the introduction of the proposed LEZ would not meet the 2010 objectives in all locations, it should reduce the areas of London that exceed these objectives, and most importantly the exposure of people who live, work and visit London to these pollutants.</p>	<p>most effective option for helping London work towards meeting its daily mean objective for PM₁₀. It would also help London make progress towards achieving its 2010 annual mean objective for PM₁₀. While the introduction of the proposed LEZ would not enable London to meet the 2010 objectives in all locations, it should reduce the areas of London that exceed these objectives, and most importantly the exposure of people who live, work and visit London to this pollutant.</p>	<p>recent research into the causes of observed increases in direct NO₂ at roadsides that may imply that the LEZ, while reducing emissions of PM₁₀ and NO_x, may not have an impact on NO₂ concentrations in the short term.</p>
12.	4G.136 4C.11	<p>Within the Mayor's Transport Strategy, a number of initiatives are concerned with mitigating the environmental impacts of transport in London. The Central London Congestion Charging Zone primarily aims to reduce traffic congestion, though it does have some small secondary benefits in reducing vehicle emissions. Initiatives to improve and encourage the use of public</p>	<p>Within the Mayor's Transport Strategy, a number of initiatives are concerned with mitigating the environmental impacts of transport in London. The Central London Congestion Charging Zone, and the Western Extension of the Zone, primarily aim to reduce traffic congestion, although the existing zone has had secondary benefits in reducing vehicle emissions and one would</p>	<p>To reflect the progress on the Western Extension of the Central London Congestion Charging Zone and make link with other complimentary measures set out in the Mayor's Transport and Air Quality Strategies.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		transport and other alternatives to private cars have also had a positive impact. However, no initiatives within the Transport Strategy directly target vehicle emissions.	anticipate comparable benefits with the Western extension. Initiatives to improve and encourage the use of public transport and other alternatives to private cars have also had a positive impact. The LEZ would be complemented by a range of other measures set out in the Mayor's Transport and Air Quality Strategies addressing air quality both directly and indirectly.	
13.	4G.137 4C.12	Within the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy there are a number of initiatives that are being pursued to deliver reductions in emissions. These have aimed to accelerate the introduction of cleaner vehicles, and take advantage of the technological advances that reduce emissions of vehicles already on the road. Where possible, the GLA group has led by example. All London buses under contract to TfL met a minimum of Euro II emission standards for all pollutants by the end of 2005. Through the fitting of particulate traps on all Euro II and Euro III	Within the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy there are a number of initiatives that are being pursued to deliver reductions in emissions. These have aimed to accelerate the introduction of cleaner vehicles, and take advantage of the technological advances that reduce emissions of vehicles already on the road. Where possible, the GLA group has led by example. All London buses under contract to TfL met a minimum of Euro II emission standards for all pollutants by the end of 2005. Through the fitting of particulate traps on all Euro II and Euro III	Factual update.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>buses, the fleet also met a minimum of Euro IV emission standards for particulates by the end of 2005. Similarly, the Taxi Emissions Strategy will require all London licensed taxis to meet Euro III emission standards for PM₁₀ and NO_x by mid 2008. The London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) also replaced half of their original fire engines by the end of 2005, and all their vehicles should meet Euro III emission standards for PM₁₀ by mid 2008.</p>	<p>buses, the fleet also met a minimum of Euro IV emission standards for particulates by the end of 2005. Similarly, the Taxi Emissions Strategy will require all London licensed taxis to meet Euro III emission standards for PM₁₀ and NO_x by mid 2008. The London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) also replaced half of their original fire engines by the end of 2005, and all their vehicles should meet Euro III emission standards for PM₁₀ by mid 2008. TfL has also introduced a 100% discount on the Congestion Charge for the cleanest alternative fuel vehicles.</p>	
14.	4G.138 4C.13	<p>The Mayor requires boroughs to improve air quality at a local level, including pollution hotspots, through the Local Air Quality Management system. The Mayor is also working with the boroughs to address emissions arising from local traffic, new developments, and construction activities. The Mayor is encouraging local</p>		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		boroughs to assess and improve their own vehicles, including refuse collection and waste vehicles.		
15.	4G.139 4C.14	While the emissions of vehicles operated by the GLA group and the boroughs are being targeted and reduced by these measures, further action is required to address emissions from diesel-engined Heavy Goods Vehicles, Light Goods Vehicles, coaches and non-TfL contracted buses.		No changes.
16.	4G.140 4C.15	The Mayor's Air Quality Strategy identified one or more Low Emission Zones within London as a means of addressing these polluting vehicles. Given the above, it is now considered that this proposal should be taken forward, building on the work of the Joint Feasibility Study from 2001 to 2003, and subsequent work by TfL.	In the absence of national initiatives, a Low Emission Zone covering Greater London has been identified as the most effective means of reducing emissions from heavier, diesel-engined vehicles. Given the above, it is now considered that this proposal should be taken forward, building on the work of the Joint Feasibility Study from 2001 to 2003, and subsequent work by TfL.	To reflect the current stage the proposal is at.
17.	4G.141 4C.16	A Low Emission Zone is a geographically defined area which seeks to restrict or deter access by	A Low Emission Zone is a geographically defined area which seeks to restrict or deter access	To reflect the current stage the proposal is at.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>certain polluting vehicles. A LEZ would reduce road transport emissions by accelerating the introduction of cleaner vehicles and reducing the numbers of polluting vehicles within the LEZ. There are currently no cities in the UK that operate a LEZ, though cities such as Edinburgh, Nottingham and Bath have established zones with broader remits, for example, focusing on restricting levels of traffic overall.</p>	<p>by certain polluting vehicles. A LEZ would reduce road transport emissions by accelerating the introduction of cleaner vehicles and reducing the numbers of polluting vehicles within the LEZ. There are currently no cities in the UK that operate a LEZ, though a number of UK cities have expressed an interest in introducing LEZ's.</p>	
18.	4G.142 4C.17	<p>Low Emission Zones have been operating in the Swedish cities of Gothenburg, Lund, Malmo and Stockholm for a number of years. Initially these LEZ schemes only applied to Swedish-registered vehicles, but in 2001/02 were extended to non-Swedish registered vehicles. The cities banned diesel-engined HGVs from entering their boundaries if they were over 8 years old and had not been fitted with appropriate abatement equipment. Emissions of PM₁₀ and NO_x were shown to</p>	<p>“Environmental Zones” have been operating in the Swedish cities of Gothenburg, Lund, Malmo and Stockholm for a number of years. Initially these LEZ schemes only applied to Swedish-registered vehicles, but in 2001/02 were extended to non-Swedish registered vehicles. The cities banned diesel-engined heavy vehicles from entering their boundaries if they were over eight years old and had not been fitted with appropriate abatement equipment. Emissions of PM₁₀</p>	Defining acronym.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>have been reduced as a result of these schemes. The entry criteria for the Swedish LEZs are now being modified. New emission standards will be based on age of vehicle (a six-year limit) and Euro standards. These new emission standards are a move towards the kind of standards envisaged for London.</p>	<p>and NO_x were shown to have been reduced as a result of these schemes. The entry criteria for the Swedish Environmental Zones are now being modified. New emission standards will be based on age of vehicle (a six-year limit) and Euro standards. These new standards represent a move towards the kind of emissions-based standards envisaged for London and favoured by the European Commission.</p>	
19.	4G.143 4C.18	<p>Tokyo also implemented a LEZ in October 2003, which has been successful in reducing the emissions of heavy diesel-engined vehicles. More recently, Berlin has moved to implement a LEZ in the central city area.</p>	<p>Tokyo also implemented a LEZ in October 2003, which has been successful in reducing the emissions of heavy diesel-engined vehicles. More recently, Berlin has developed plans to implement a LEZ in the central city area.</p>	Factual update.
20.	4G.144 4C.19	<p>The success of the Swedish LEZs inspired work in the UK which led to the investigation of a LEZ being included in the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy, and referenced in the Transport Strategy. A Feasibility Study to examine methods of reducing traffic emissions in</p>	<p>The success of the Swedish LEZs inspired work in the UK which led to the investigation of a LEZ being included in the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy, and referenced in the Transport Strategy. A Feasibility Study to examine methods of reducing traffic emissions in</p>	To reflect the current stage the proposal is at.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>London via one or more Low Emission Zones was commissioned in July 2001. This study was undertaken on behalf of the GLA, the Association of London Government, TfL, the Department for Transport (DfT) and the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). Phase I of that study concluded that a LEZ was the best approach to help achieve air quality objectives in London. Phase II, which reported in July 2003, looked at options for introducing a LEZ in more detail and concluded that a London wide LEZ was the most effective option.</p>	<p>London via one or more Low Emission Zones was commissioned in July 2001. This study was undertaken on behalf of the GLA, the Association of London Government, TfL, the Department for Transport (DfT) and the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). Phase I of that study concluded that a LEZ was the best approach to help move London closer to achieving its air quality objectives. Phase II, which reported in July 2003, looked at options for introducing a LEZ in more detail and concluded that a London wide LEZ was the most effective option.</p>	
21.	4G.145 4C.20	<p>In 2004, the Mayor asked TfL to review the Feasibility Study to determine whether its recommendations still formed a viable basis for the implementation of a LEZ. The TfL Strategic Review re-examined the legal framework for implementation of the LEZ under three main options:</p>		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		a Scheme Order; a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) jointly undertaken on behalf of the London Boroughs and TfL; and a Parliamentary Bill introduced by TfL.		
22.	4G.146 4C.21	A LEZ enacted under the TRO approach would ban specific classes of vehicle that did not meet the proposed emission standards from entering the zone. A LEZ introduced via a TRO would require either individual TROs made by TfL and the London local authorities as the local traffic authorities for their roads, or a single TRO made by one party, such as the Association of London Government Transport and Environment Committee (ALG TEC) or TfL. These organisations would be acting on behalf of all the London traffic authorities.		No changes.
23.	4G.147 4C.22	In order to implement a LEZ by making a single TRO, the individual traffic authorities would have to enter into a 'joint arrangement' agreement under		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972, to delegate their TRO making functions to the joint committee or a chosen traffic authority. This would involve co-ordinating the actions of up to 34 traffic authorities, and would therefore be extremely complex and time consuming to implement. The Parliamentary Bill option would also be likely to result in a long implementation timetable, given the time needed to take a Bill through Parliament. There could be significant risk of delay to the implementation of the LEZ, which would lead to a delay in the health and air quality benefits from the LEZ.</p>		
24.	4G.148 4C.23	<p>The Strategic Review, therefore, recommended a LEZ covering the whole of the GLA area and introduced through a Scheme Order under the GLA Act 1999. This was considered to achieve the best balance between the costs of the scheme and health and air quality benefits. In addition, it</p>	<p>The Strategic Review, therefore, recommended a LEZ covering the whole of the GLA area and introduced through a Scheme Order under the GLA Act 1999. This was considered to achieve the best balance between the costs of the scheme and health and air quality benefits. In</p>	Factual update.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>would be simpler to implement than the other options. Consequently this consultation focuses primarily on the preferred implementation mechanism, and hereafter references to specific elements of the proposed LEZ relate to a LEZ implemented through a Scheme Order. However, this does not preclude the possibility that other implementation mechanisms could be utilised for a LEZ.</p>	<p>addition, it would be simpler to implement than the other options. Consequently this document focuses primarily on the preferred implementation mechanism, and hereafter references to specific elements of the proposed LEZ relate to a LEZ implemented through a Scheme Order. However, this does not preclude the possibility that other implementation mechanisms could be utilised for a LEZ.</p>	
25.	4G.149 4C.24	<p>The 2001 to 2003 Feasibility Study considered that a LEZ was the most effective policy available to the Mayor that could realistically move London significantly closer towards meeting its air quality objectives.</p>		No changes.
26.	4G.150 4C.25	<p>TfL has reviewed alternative ways at both the national and local levels for addressing road transport related emissions. Alternative methods to a LEZ for achieving road transport related emission reductions that have been considered are summarised below.</p>	<p>TfL has reviewed alternative ways at both the national and local levels for addressing road transport related emissions. Alternative methods to a LEZ for achieving reductions in road transport related emissions that have been considered are summarised below.</p>	<p>Updated to reflect the expected impact of the revised LEZ proposals and to reflect the current stage the proposal is at. Deferring the introduction of the Euro IV for PM₁₀ standard for HGVs from 2010 to 2012 results in the loss of some benefits. This is</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relying on the natural vehicle replacement cycle and tighter Euro standards to produce the same air quality improvements as the proposed LEZ. Work undertaken by TfL estimates that the introduction of a London LEZ would bring forward by some 4 – 5 years reductions in PM₁₀ emissions in 2010 than would otherwise be achieved under the natural vehicle replacement cycle. ▪ Higher levels of Vehicle Excise Duty (VED) for more polluting vehicles. Government has indicated it has no plans to support the introduction of differential VED rates depending on PM₁₀ and NO_x emission levels. ▪ The introduction of national road user charging with higher charges for more polluting vehicles. Planning for a national road user 	<p>These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relying on the natural vehicle replacement cycle and tighter Euro standards to produce the same air quality improvements as the proposed LEZ. Work undertaken by TfL estimates that the introduction of a London LEZ, as proposed below, following consultation would bring forward by some 3 – 4 years reductions in PM₁₀ emissions in 2012 than would otherwise be achieved under the natural vehicle replacement cycle. ▪ Higher levels of Vehicle Excise Duty (VED) for more polluting vehicles. Government has indicated it has no plans to support the introduction of differential VED rates depending on PM₁₀ and NO_x emission levels. ▪ The introduction of national road user charging with higher charges for more 	<p>largely offset in later years by the additional benefits arising from including LGVs and minibuses from 2010.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>charging scheme is in its infancy. There is no firm target date for its introduction and much debate on its form and development is still to be had.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="488 491 987 970">▪ Grants for retro-fitting emissions reducing equipment to vehicles. European Union rules limit any environment-related grant to 30 per cent of the capital cost of the equipment. Funding grants for operators to this level is unlikely to be cost-effective, and unlikely to provide adequate incentives to operators to clean up their vehicles. <li data-bbox="488 970 987 1339">▪ Scrapping of older vehicles. The issues relating to the provision of incentives for scrapping older vehicles are similar to those relating to grants. There would also be a number of problems in targeting financial assistance to the large number of UK vehicles that operate in 	<p>polluting vehicles. Planning for a national road user charging scheme is in its infancy. There is no firm target date for its introduction and much debate on its form and development is still to be had.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1019 563 1518 1297">▪ Grants for retro-fitting emissions reducing equipment to vehicles. European Union rules limit any environment-related grant to 30 percent of the capital cost of the equipment. Funding grants for operators to this level is unlikely to be cost-effective, and unlikely to provide adequate incentives to operators to clean up their vehicles. Furthermore, the Government has announced that it is stopping its Air Quality Retrofit programme which until relatively recently provided grants to operators to fit pollution abatement equipment to vehicles <li data-bbox="1019 1297 1518 1339">▪ Scrapping of older vehicles. 	

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>London but are registered outside.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Roadside emission testing of vehicles. Roadside emissions tests would only be able to identify the most polluting vehicles as the tests are insensitive. Roadside testing also requires the involvement of Vehicle and Operator Services Agency or the police to stop vehicles, and it would not be practical to stop HGVs in many parts of London. As an approach for dealing with the emissions of Heavy Goods Vehicles, buses and coaches, roadside emissions testing would achieve very small reductions in emissions compared to those from the proposed LEZ. 	<p>The issues relating to the provision of incentives for scrapping older vehicles are similar to those relating to grants. There would also be a number of problems in targeting financial assistance to the large number of UK vehicles that operate in London but are registered outside.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Roadside emission testing of vehicles. Roadside emissions tests would only be able to identify the most polluting vehicles as the tests are insensitive. Roadside testing also requires the involvement of the Vehicle and Operator Services Agency (VOSA) or the police to stop vehicles, and it would not be practical to stop HGVs in many parts of London. As an approach for dealing with the emissions of Heavy Goods Vehicles, buses and coaches, roadside emissions testing 	

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
			would achieve very small reductions in emissions compared to those from the proposed LEZ.	
27.	4G.151 4C.26	In the absence of national initiatives, therefore, the proposed LEZ represents the most effective option for achieving reductions of the most harmful road transport generated emissions in London between 2008 and 2015.		No changes.
28.	4G.152 4C.27	<p>The primary benefits of the proposed LEZ would be the health improvements achieved both inside and outside Greater London through reductions in PM₁₀ and NO_x emissions from road traffic. The benefits fall into three categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Primary health benefits derived from reductions in PM₁₀ emissions. These benefits include reductions in premature deaths, reductions in years of life lost and reduced hospital admissions for people with respiratory illness; ▪ Secondary health benefits. 	<p>The most significant benefits of the proposed LEZ would be the health improvements achieved both inside and outside Greater London through reductions in PM₁₀ and NO_x emissions from road traffic. The benefits fall into three categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Primary health benefits derived from reductions in PM₁₀ emissions. These benefits include reductions in premature deaths, reductions in years of life lost and reduced hospital admissions for people with respiratory illness; ▪ Secondary health benefits. 	Correction.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>These would benefit people with pre-existing respiratory conditions, through reductions in NO₂ emissions; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Non-health benefits achieved through a reduction in damage to materials, primarily building soiling associated with PM₁₀. 	<p>These would benefit people with pre-existing respiratory conditions, through reductions in NO_x emissions; and,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Non-health benefits achieved through a reduction in damage to materials, primarily building soiling associated with PM₁₀. 	
29.	4G.153 4C.28	<p>The proposed LEZ would operate according to the 'polluter pays' principle. It would provide a powerful means to help secure key priorities of the Mayor's Air Quality and Transport Strategies by tackling road transport emissions in London. The following is a summary of the key benefits of the proposed LEZ:</p>		No changes.
30.	4G.154 4C.29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would reduce transport related emissions within London, and nationally – this would contribute to better air quality within London and would also have impacts nationally, as vehicle operators based in and outside Greater London would be encouraged to replace or upgrade their 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would reduce transport related emissions within London, and nationally – this would contribute to better air quality within London and would also have impacts nationally, as vehicle operators based in and outside Greater London would be encouraged to replace or upgrade their 	Correction.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>vehicles to operate within the LEZ.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would be more effective than other measures in assisting to reduce the level of air pollution – in the absence of national initiatives, the LEZ is the most viable initiative to achieve this goal. Other local initiatives such as incentives to help scrap older vehicles would be difficult to implement and are unlikely to be cost-effective. ▪ It would bring a number of health benefits to people who live in, work in and visit London – this would include fewer premature deaths, less years of life lost to illness and reduced hospital admissions due to respiratory illness. ▪ It would make London a more pleasant location – as a result of improved air quality, people's enjoyment of London's open spaces would be enhanced. 	<p>vehicles to operate within the LEZ.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would be more effective than other measures in assisting to reduce the level of air pollution – in the absence of national initiatives, the LEZ is the most viable initiative to achieve this goal. Other local initiatives such as incentives to help scrap older vehicles would be difficult to implement and are unlikely to be cost-effective. ▪ It would bring a number of health benefits to people who live in, work in and visit London – this would include fewer premature deaths, less years of life lost to illness and reduced hospital admissions due to respiratory illness. ▪ It would make London a more pleasant location – as a result of improved air quality, people's enjoyment of London's open spaces would be enhanced. 	

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would benefit London as an international location – improved air quality would enhance the image of London as an open, green and sustainable city. ▪ It would integrate well with other initiatives – it would complement the Taxi emissions strategy and the requirement for all TfL contracted buses to meet stringent emission standards, as well as other initiatives to reduce transport emissions and improve air quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would benefit London as an international location – improved air quality would enhance the image of London as an open, green and sustainable city. ▪ It would integrate well with other initiatives – it would complement the Mayor's Taxi emissions strategy and the requirement for all TfL contracted buses to meet stringent emission standards, as well as other initiatives to reduce transport emissions and improve air quality. 	
31.	4G.155 4C.30	<p>The proposed LEZ would make a direct contribution to achieving two of the six objectives of the London Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To make London a better city for people to live in – the LEZ would contribute positively to improving health and easing the pressure on the health services. ▪ To make London a more attractive, well-designed and 		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>green city – the LEZ would contribute to London's sustainable development through minimising air pollution, and so improving the quality of life of people who live and work in London.</p>		
32.	4G.156 4C.31	<p>The LEZ would also help achieve some of the objectives in the Mayor's other strategies by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Creating a sustainable world city with strong long-term economic growth, social inclusion and environmental improvement (Economic Development Strategy) – Improvements in air quality would support London's sustainable development, its reputation as a clean and green city, and could have beneficial impacts on tourism. ▪ Encouraging the greening of the built environment and the use of open spaces in ecologically sensitive ways (the London Biodiversity 		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>Action Plan) – Improvements in air quality would assist the Mayor in promoting the health benefits of open space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimising the adverse impacts of road transport noise (Ambient Noise Strategy) – In addition to having lower emissions, modern vehicles can be quieter, and the LEZ may lead to some small reductions in roadside noise through accelerating the vehicle renewal cycle. ▪ Enhancing the cultural value and potential of London's public realm (The Culture Strategy) – Supports the creation and enhancement of public spaces such as London's parks, through helping Londoners to appreciate fresh air and to enjoy these open spaces. 		
33.	4G.157 4C.32	The likely implementation route for the proposed LEZ is via a Scheme Order, although alternative		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		implementation mechanisms are also available.		
34.	4G.158 4C.33	<p>The emission standards for the LEZ should reasonably encourage the upgrade or replacement of diesel-engined heavy vehicles to Euro III for PM₁₀ by 2008 and to Euro IV for PM₁₀ by 2010 (or to the relevant particulate standard in force at that time, for example, should the European Commission move towards a standard for ultra-fine particles or PM_{2.5}). The standard of Euro IV for NO_x from 2010 is being considered subject to a suitable certification and testing mechanism being established.</p>	<p>The LEZ is designed to discourage the use of the most polluting vehicles in Greater London by encouraging the upgrade or replacement of diesel-engined HGVs, buses and coaches to meet or exceed Euro III for PM₁₀ by 2008 and Euro IV for PM₁₀ by 2012, and upgrade or replacement of heavier more polluting light goods vehicles (LGVs) and minibuses by 2010. Should the European Commission set a new standard covering ultra-fine particles or PM_{2.5} TfL will consider including such a standard within the LEZ. Any proposal to include a PM_{2.5} standard in the LEZ would be accompanied by a full consultation process. The standard of Euro IV for NO_x is still being considered subject to commercial availability of suitable abatement equipment certification and a testing mechanism being established.</p>	<p>To reflect changes to the proposal following consultation. TfL had originally proposed that from 2008 the LEZ standard for HGVs, buses and coaches would be Euro III for PM₁₀ and that in 2010 the standard would become Euro IV for PM₁₀. From the consultation it has become clear that it would be unduly expensive and impractical for operators to meet a standard for Euro IV for PM₁₀ and therefore TfL proposes that the introduction of the standard of Euro IV for PM₁₀ commence in 2012.</p> <p>TfL has considered the implications of including LGVs within the scope of the LEZ and the representations received during the consultation regarding the potential economic impacts of the inclusion of LGVs. On the basis of this analysis, TfL recommends including LGVs in the LEZ from 2010.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
				<p>To reflect that a workable NO_x target by 2010 now looks technically impractical and unworkable. TfL will continue to refine how a NO_x option might feasibly be implemented with the pollution abatement equipment industry with the Department for Transport.</p>
35.	4G.159 4C.34	<p>Operators wishing to bring vehicles into the Zone that did not meet the specified emissions standards for the LEZ would be required to pay a substantial charge. Operators that do not pay the daily charge and whose vehicles are identified as not meeting the proposed emission standards would have to pay a penalty charge. Vehicles which meet the proposed emission standards would be able to operate in the LEZ without paying the charge. The charge would be set at such a level as to encourage operators to modify or replace their vehicles to comply with the</p>		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		proposed LEZ standards. To encourage compliance, the level of the charge and associated penalties would need to be set at a far higher level than that for the Central London Congestion Charging Scheme.		
36.	4G.160 4C.35	Whilst the details of the proposed London LEZ would be confirmed by an Order, the key features are likely to be broadly as follows.		No changes.
37.	4G.161 4C.36	In order to maximise the air quality and health benefits, it is proposed that the LEZ should cover all of Greater London. It should include those areas with the highest exceedances of air pollution within the Greater London boundary. These are central London, Heathrow and around the main road networks. Defining the LEZ according to the GLA administrative boundary achieves this objective.		No changes.
38.	4G.162 4C.37	Other possible geographical configurations have been considered by TfL, including a boundary at the M25, a LEZ	Other possible geographical configurations have been considered by TfL, including a boundary at the M25, a LEZ	To reflect that TfL is working with Highways Agency and the Department for Transport and seeking to include trunk roads

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>applying to the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) only and a LEZ covering the existing central London congestion charging zone and western extension. Alternatives were considered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A LEZ with a boundary at the M25 – This option would increase the health and air quality benefits of the LEZ, but would be more difficult to implement and enforce, requiring the agreement of non-London local authorities to include parts of their areas in the LEZ. TfL also has no powers over roads maintained by the Highways Agency without the consent of the Secretary of State – the relevant roads being those sections of the M1, M4, M11 and M25 that come within Greater London. ▪ A LEZ applying to the TLRN only – TfL could introduce the LEZ under a TRO on its own 	<p>applying to the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) only and a LEZ covering the existing central London congestion charging zone and western extension. Alternatives were considered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A LEZ with a boundary at the M25 – This option would increase the health and air quality benefits of the LEZ, but would be more difficult to implement and enforce, requiring the agreement of non-London local authorities to include parts of their areas in the LEZ. • A LEZ applying to the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) only – TfL could introduce the LEZ under a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) on its own roads, and by so doing some Boroughs might be encouraged to join TfL in implementing the LEZ. However, there could be dis- 	<p>within the GLA Boundary in the LEZ.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>roads, and by so doing some Boroughs might be encouraged to join TfL in implementing the LEZ. However, there could be dis-benefits on non-TRLN roads in terms of increased emissions and congestion from vehicles diverting off the TLRN to avoid the LEZ. The signage required could also contribute to visual clutter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A LEZ covering the area of the central London congestion charging zone and the area of the western extension – it is estimated that the air quality and health benefits gained from a scheme covering this relatively small area of London would be minor and would not address a substantial number of the areas in London which are projected to exceed the air quality objectives. 	<p>benefits on non-TRLN roads in terms of increased emissions and congestion from vehicles diverting off the TLRN to avoid the LEZ. The amount of signage required could also lead to a significant increase in visual clutter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A LEZ covering the area of the central London congestion charging zone and the area of the western extension – it is estimated that the air quality and health benefits gained from a scheme covering this relatively small area of London would be minor and would not address a substantial number of the areas in London which are projected to exceed the air quality objectives. 	
39.	4G.163 4C.38	The proposal is therefore that the boundary of the LEZ be the GLA	The proposal is therefore that the boundary of the LEZ be as close	To update further work on designing a workable boundary for

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		administrative boundary. This would maximise the health and air quality benefits of the LEZ, and is the most feasible option to implement. The broad parameters of the proposed LEZ covering the GLA area are now discussed.	as practicable to the GLA administrative boundary. This would maximise the health and air quality benefits of the LEZ, and is the most feasible option to implement. In practice, to allow for suitable diversion routes and identification of appropriate locations for signage, the actual boundary would not coincide exactly with the GLA boundary.	the proposed LEZ.
40.	4G.164 4C.39	The hours of operation are proposed to be 24 hours a day, Monday to Sunday, 365 days a year. Suspending the LEZ on weekends or public holidays would erode the air quality and health benefits of the proposed scheme.		No changes.
41.	New section on use of European vehicle definitions		Where possible and practicable, it is proposed that European vehicle definitions be used to describe the vehicles to be included in the LEZ. This would ensure that vehicle definitions have a legal basis that applies equally to UK and European based vehicles. The vehicle definitions would be defined in the Order establishing	New section explaining the basis for defining the vehicles to be included in the LEZ. The aim of this approach is to ensure consistency and transparency between UK and non-UK vehicles for enforcement purposes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
42.	4G.165 4C.40	<p>The LEZ is designed to discourage the use of the most polluting vehicles. These are diesel-engined HGVs, buses and coaches. The LEZ would apply to HGVs with a gross vehicle weight that is over 3.5 tonnes. It would also cover buses and coaches, which are defined as having 17 seats or more (excluding the driver). This definition does not include smaller minibuses, of nine seats or more (excluding the driver). Heavy diesel-engined vehicles, particularly articulated HGVs, emit the most PM₁₀ and NO_x per km driven as shown in Figure 2.</p>	<p>the LEZ.</p> <p>The LEZ is designed to discourage the use of the most polluting vehicles. These are diesel-engined HGVs, buses, coaches and heavier LGVs and minibuses. The LEZ would apply to HGVs with a gross vehicle weight that is over 3.5 tonnes. It would also cover buses and coaches, which are those vehicles having more than 8 seats in addition to the driver's seat and a mass exceeding 5 tonnes, and subsequently heavier LGVs and minibuses. LGVs, or vans as they are often referred to, are designed for the carriage of goods and do not exceed 3.5 tonnes. Minibuses are those vehicles designed and constructed for the carriage of passengers comprising of more than eight seats in addition to the driver's seat, and having a maximum mass not exceeding five tonnes. Minibuses are the passenger carrying equivalent of the heavier LGVs, they use very similar</p>	<p>Updated to reflect revised vehicle definitions based on, as far as practicable EU definitions, and the range of vehicles included.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
			chassis and engines to larger LGVs, and have similar emissions levels, and there are no technical reasons to exclude them from a scheme that includes heavier LGVs. Car Derived Vans would not be included in the scope of the LEZ at this stage. Heavy diesel-engined vehicles, particularly articulated HGVs, emit the most PM ₁₀ and NO _x per km driven as shown in Figure 2.	
43.	4G.166 4C.41	Emissions per kilometre driven are only part of the picture however. Total kilometres driven also contribute to levels of road transport emissions in London. HGVs contribute 16 percent of road transport emissions of PM ₁₀ by 2010, and 37 percent of NO _x .	Emissions per kilometre driven are only part of the picture however. Total kilometres driven also contribute to levels of road transport emissions in London. It is estimated that HGVs will contribute 16 percent of road transport emissions of PM ₁₀ by 2010, and 37 percent of NO _x .	Clarification.
44.	4G.167 4C.42	Whilst diesel-engined cars have lower emissions per km driven, the combined kilometres driven by diesel-engined cars are estimated to contribute a round 39 percent of road transport-related PM ₁₀ emissions in London in 2005, and	Whilst diesel-engined cars have lower emissions per km driven, the combined kilometres driven by diesel-engined cars are estimated to contribute around 39 percent of road transport-related PM ₁₀ emissions in London in 2005, and	Addresses issues raised during consultation on strategy revisions on inclusion of cars and other vehicles within the proposed LEZ.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>nearly 32 percent of road transport-related NO_x emissions. For this reason the inclusion of diesel-engined cars has been carefully considered. However, work undertaken indicates that the cost of administering and enforcing a scheme that included cars would be prohibitive. Retrofitting several hundred thousand diesel-engined cars would also be costly and impractical, as the market for retrofit abatement equipment has not developed for these vehicles.</p>	<p>nearly 32 percent of road transport-related NO_x emissions. For this reason the inclusion of diesel-engined cars has been carefully considered. Cars would not be included from the onset of the scheme, which would initially focus on the most individually polluting vehicles. The range of vehicles included in the LEZ would be kept under review by TfL.</p>	
45.	4G.168 4C.43	<p>On the balance of considering the Mayor's social and economic development objectives for London with the AQS objectives, the most cost effective approach is to focus on the most polluting vehicles, i.e. HGVs, buses and coaches. The Mayor is already delivering on initiatives to discourage car use as well as other vehicles through the Central London Congestion Charging Scheme by improving the accessibility and reliability of London's public transport, and</p>	<p>It is necessary to balance the Mayor's social and economic development objectives for London with his AQS objectives. To this end, the most cost effective approach is for the LEZ to focus on the most individually polluting vehicles (i.e. HGVs, buses, coaches, heavier LGVs and minibuses). The Mayor is already delivering on initiatives to reduce the volume of traffic on London's roads through the Central London Congestion Charging Scheme,</p>	<p>Updated to reflect current proposal of including LGVs and minibuses.</p> <p>To allow flexibility for the scheme to be modified in the future to address future air quality challenges.</p> <p>Section to be moved to below current 4G.171.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		promoting walking and cycling.	improvements to the accessibility and reliability of London's public transport, and the promotion of walking and cycling. The LEZ and Congestion Charging policies will be kept under review by the Mayor and TfL as London's congestion and air quality challenges evolve.	
46.	4G.169 4C.44	There has also been careful consideration of whether the LEZ should be extended to Lights Goods Vehicles (LGVs) from 2010. LGVs, or vans as they are often referred to, are designed for the carriage of goods and do not exceed 3,500 kg. They generally are more polluting per kilometre driven than cars, though less so than HGVs, buses and coaches. By 2010 it is forecast that they will be responsible for 24 percent of road transport emissions of PM ₁₀ within London.	There has also been careful consideration of whether the LEZ should be extended to include the heavier, most polluting LGVs and minibuses from 2010. LGVs generally are more polluting per kilometre driven than cars, though less so than HGVs, buses and coaches. By 2010 it is forecast that they will be responsible for 24 percent of road transport emissions of PM ₁₀ within London.	Updated to reflect proposal of including LGVs and minibuses from 2010.
47.	4G.170 4C.45	Whilst LGVs have a faster replacement cycle than other vehicles, approximately 20 percent of commercial vans are more than	Whilst LGVs have a faster replacement cycle than other vehicles, approximately 20 percent of commercial vans are more than	Updated to reflect proposal of including LGVs and minibuses from 2010.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>ten years old. Any proposal to include these vehicles in the LEZ should target the most highly polluting part of the vehicle fleet to achieve the greatest air quality benefits for the least cost. To target these vehicles, it is proposed that the LEZ would charge vehicles that were over ten years old. The LEZ would encourage operators to replace their vehicles, rather than cleaning them up. This is because the market for retro-fit abatement technology is less developed for these vehicles than for the heavier vehicles.</p>	<p>10 years old. Any proposal to include these vehicles in the LEZ should target the most highly polluting part of the vehicle fleet to achieve the greatest air quality benefits for the least cost. TfL has considered the costs to operators and projected improvements in air quality of including LGVs in the LEZ. On the basis of this analysis, TfL concludes that the heavier, most polluting LGVs and minibuses should be included in the LEZ from 2010. It is anticipated that operators of heavier LGVs would tend to comply with the LEZ by replacing their vehicles, rather than cleaning them up. This is because the market for pollution abatement technology is less developed for these vehicles than for the heavier vehicles and because the cost of pollution abatement equipment would typically be a large fraction of the low residual value of older LGVs.</p>	<p>TfL is now considering the relative merits of different types of standards for LGVs. TfL's decision on the type of standard employed will be based on further consideration of the costs, benefits and workability of the standard. The details of the standards for the proposed LEZ would be set out in the Order to implement the proposed LEZ.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
48.	4G.171 4C.46	Extending the LEZ to these vehicles could have an adverse impact on some small businesses. Therefore, before extending the scheme to cover LGVs in 2010, it is proposed that further analysis be undertaken into the implications of doing this. TfL will advise the Mayor on the results of its further investigation into the option of including LGVs in 2010 following this public consultation.		Proposal 4G.171, 4C.46 deleted. See proposals 4G. 165, 4C.40 and 4G.169, 4C.45.
49.	4G.172 4C.47	The proposed emission standards determine the number of HGVs, coaches and, potentially, LGVs which would need to take some action to operate within the LEZ without paying a charge. Such action includes replacing vehicles or fitting emissions abatement equipment for HGVs, buses and coaches, and replacement for LGVs. The emission standards need to be practical and easily recognisable, and balance affordability with achieving maximum air quality benefits. The standards need to discourage the	The proposed emission standards determine the number of HGVs, buses, coaches, heavier LGVs and minibuses which would need to take some action to operate within the LEZ without paying a charge. Such action includes replacing vehicles or fitting pollution abatement equipment for HGVs, buses, coaches, heavier LGVs and minibuses. The emission standards need to be practical and easily recognisable, and balance affordability with achieving maximum air quality benefits. The standards need to discourage the	Updated to reflect current proposal of including LGVs and minibuses.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>most polluting vehicles from driving within the LEZ. The standards should also encourage the clean up of existing vehicles, or the replacement of polluting vehicles with cleaner models more quickly than would occur through natural vehicle replacement.</p>	<p>most polluting vehicles from driving within the LEZ. The standards should also encourage the clean up of existing vehicles, or the replacement of polluting vehicles with cleaner models more quickly than would occur through natural vehicle replacement.</p>	
50.	4G.173 4C.48	<p>There are a number of options for specifying a vehicle emission standard, ranging from a simple standard based on age, a vehicle's Euro standard, and/or a standard based around the fitting of emission abatement equipment.</p>		No changes.
51.	4G.174 4C.49	<p>TfL, on behalf of the Mayor, has examined the potential of a rolling age-based system for all vehicles that would be covered by the LEZ. TfL considered a six-year age limit, but decided that this would be too restrictive, particularly for coach operators whose vehicles have much longer life-cycles. A longer age limit of ten years was also considered, but such a limit would not deliver the same level of air</p>	<p>TfL has examined the health and air quality benefits and compliance costs of six, eight and 10-year rolling age-based systems for HGVs, buses and coaches. This analysis has shown that a 10-year standard generates smaller health and air quality benefits than the proposed Euro standard approach. More specifically, the benefits of an age based scheme (either six or eight years rolling)</p>	To reflect additional work undertaken to assess the impacts of adopting an age-based standard.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>quality and health benefits that a LEZ based on Euro standards would achieve.</p>	<p>are also less than those delivered by the proposed Euro standards based scheme and the costs for operators associated with an age-based standard are also slightly higher. An age-based scheme can also be unfair as vehicles of the same Euro class and emissions but of a different age could be treated differently. Such a scheme could also penalise early adopters of exhaust after-treatment systems, and those who had converted their vehicles to alternative fuels or re-engined their vehicles to a higher Euro standard.</p>	
52.	4G.175 4C.50	<p>It is considered that the standard that best balances affordability with maximum air quality and health benefits is one based on Euro standards. This would allow operators to meet the emission standards not only through vehicle replacement but also through the fitting of abatement equipment to bring them up to the required standard.</p>		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
53.	4G.176 4C.51	<p>Manufacturers have already begun producing and delivering new vehicles capable of meeting Euro IV standards, which become mandatory for manufacturers from October 2006. This makes it reasonable to introduce a Euro III standard for PM₁₀ in 2008, and to tighten this to Euro IV for PM₁₀ in 2010. TfL therefore proposes the following emission standards for the proposed LEZ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For 2008, a standard of Euro III for PM₁₀ for HGVs, coaches and buses; ▪ For 2010, a standard of Euro IV for PM₁₀ or the relevant particulate standard in force at that time (TfL will monitor the progress of the recently published European Commission's Thematic Strategy, and take account of the impact of the proposed new Directive on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe). In the event that NO_x certification capability is 	<p>Since October 2001 it has been mandatory for manufacturers to produce HGVs, buses and coaches that meet Euro III emission standards. Since January 2002 it has been mandatory for manufacturers to produce heavier LGVs and minibuses that meet Euro III emission standards. Manufacturers are already producing and delivering new vehicles that comply with Euro IV standards, which become mandatory for manufacturers of HGVs, buses and coaches from October 2006 and for manufacturers of heavier LGVs and minibuses from January 2007. This makes it reasonable to introduce a Euro III standard for PM₁₀ for the heaviest vehicles in 2008, and to tighten this to Euro IV for PM₁₀ in 2012. TfL therefore proposes the following emission standards for the proposed LEZ on the following indicative timetable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ from Quarter 1 2008, a 	<p>Updated to reflect revised LEZ proposals.</p> <p>From the consultation, it has become clear that it would be unduly expensive and impractical for operators to meet a standard of Euro IV for PM₁₀ from 2010. The Euro IV standard only becomes mandatory for newly manufactured HGVs, buses and coaches from October 2006, so many vehicle operators are currently purchasing Euro III vehicles. This would mean that under the 2010 proposal, some vehicles less than four years old would not be compliant with the LEZ without modification. In addition, many operators will have upgraded their fleets in 2008 to meet the Euro III PM₁₀ standard. A requirement for a further upgrade only two years later would impose a large financial burden on industry. This would however reduce the air quality and health benefits associated with moving to Euro IV, this would however largely</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>available, a standard of Euro IV for PM₁₀ and NO_x. This would apply to HGVs, coaches and buses, with an option of extending the scheme to LGVs.</p>	<p>standard of Euro III for PM₁₀ for HGVs over 12t;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ from Quarter 3 2008 a standard of Euro III for PM₁₀ for HGVs 3.5t – 12t, buses and coaches; ▪ from 2012, a standard of Euro IV for PM₁₀ for HGVs, buses and coaches. Should the European Commission set a new standard covering ultra-fine particles or PM_{2.5} TfL will consider including such a standard within the LEZ. Any proposal to include a PM_{2.5} standard in the LEZ would be accompanied by a full consultation process including any required amendment to the Scheme Order and Mayoral strategies; and, ▪ appropriate standards to address emissions from heavier LGVs and minibuses from 2010. 	<p>offset by the inclusion on LGVs and minibuses.</p>
54.	4G.177 4C.52	<p>Implementation of the proposed standards for PM₁₀, and potentially NO_x, requires a process for ensuring that abatement</p>		<p>No changes.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		equipment is appropriately fitted, tested and maintained. The Department for Transport's Reduced Pollution Certification scheme is already in place and can be adapted to support the proposed LEZ's particulate standard. However, the issues around developing a certification process to support a NO _x emission standard are more complex.		
55.	4G.178 4C.53	Targeting NO _x as well as PM ₁₀ would help London to make more substantial progress towards meeting its air quality objectives for NO ₂ . However, a NO _x emission standard is dependent on developing certification and standards for the fitting and testing of retro-fit NO _x abatement equipment. NO _x abatement technology is still evolving. No appropriate registers exist of vehicles retrofitted with NO _x abatement equipment. Testing is also a complex process, requiring sophisticated on-board diagnostic equipment to be built into the	Targeting NO _x as well as PM ₁₀ would help London to make more substantial progress towards meeting its air quality objectives for NO ₂ . However, a NO _x emission standard is dependent on developing certification and standards for the fitting and testing of retro-fit NO _x abatement equipment. NO _x abatement technology is still evolving. No appropriate registers exist of vehicles retrofitted with NO _x abatement equipment. Testing is also a complex process, requiring sophisticated on-board diagnostic equipment to be built into the	To reflect that a workable NO _x target by 2010 now looks technically impractical and unworkable.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>vehicles. TfL is continuing to refine how a NO_x option might feasibly be implemented with the retrofit abatement industry and with the DfT.</p>	<p>vehicles. TfL is continuing to refine how a NO_x option might feasibly be implemented with the retrofit abatement industry and with the DfT and will consider moving to implement a NO_x standard when feasible. Any proposal to implement a NO_x standard would be subject to consultation, including any required amendment to the Scheme Order and Mayoral strategies, and would allow sufficient lead time for vehicle operators to comply with the standard.</p>	
56.	New section		<p>There is evidence that the increased concentrations of NO₂ recently detected at roadside monitoring stations is due in part to the increasing number of newer diesel vehicles in the London fleet, and a side-effect of fitting catalysed diesel particulate filters (CDPF) to diesel engines. With the LEZ in place, the increased adoption of certain types of pollution abatement equipment</p>	<p>To reflect updated information that suggests the LEZ may not assist in making progress towards the 2010 annual mean objective for NO₂.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
			could reduce any projected NO ₂ benefits of a LEZ. However, it should be noted that the LEZ would contribute to a reduction in total NO _x emissions.	
57.	New section		In terms of the key health-based objectives of the LEZ, by a large margin PM ₁₀ reductions generate more significant pollutant health improvements than an increase in the ratio of NO ₂ in NO _x . Indeed, the Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollution (COMEAP) does not consider the estimates of the health effects of NO ₂ sufficiently robust for quantification. TfL considers that the health benefits that would be brought about through reducing PM ₁₀ emissions outweigh the impact of an increase in the ratio of NO ₂ in NO _x . This approach supports the government's Air Quality Expert Group's recommendations that individual pollutants should not be treated in isolation and a wider, more holistic	To reflect updated information that suggests the LEZ will not assist in making progress towards the 2010 annual mean objective for NO ₂ and TfL's position in relation to the relative health benefits of reductions in PM ₁₀ and NO ₂ concentrations.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
			<p>approach to air quality management would be more effective.</p>	
58.	4G.179 4C.54	<p>The proposed LEZ is dependent upon the DfT retaining the Reduced Pollution Certificate (RPC) mechanism. The Government has indicated its intention to retain the RPC mechanism for operators who fit qualifying abatement technology to pre-October 2006 vehicles.</p>		No changes.
59.	New section		<p>Pollution abatement equipment is generally the most cost effective way to reduce particulate emissions from heavy duty vehicles, particularly for larger vehicles and those with a relatively large residual value. If fitted and maintained correctly, pollution abatement equipment such as diesel particulate filters typically reduce PM₁₀ emissions by over 90 percent. It is the responsibility of both pollution abatement equipment manufacturers and vehicle operators to ensure a vehicle's specification, age and</p>	New section provided for contextual information.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
			<p>duty cycle are considered when fitting abatement equipment and establishing maintenance procedures. In response to these issues, the abatement industry has introduced measures to improve customer service and to ensure operators are aware of maintenance issues. TfL will work with pollution abatement manufacturers to ensure these measures become standard practice.</p>	
60.	4G.180 4C.55	<p>With the proposed emission standards the LEZ would bring forward reductions in the level of PM₁₀ emissions by some four to five years. The level of the emission standard would remain subject to review, and could be broadened to include a standard for pollutants other than particulates and NO_x beyond 2015. This would be determined in light of the scheme's performance, and what national and EU air quality objectives were in place at the time.</p>	<p>With the proposed emission standards the LEZ would bring forward reductions in the level of PM₁₀ emissions by some three to four years. The level of the emission standard would remain subject to review, and could be broadened to include a standard for pollutants other than PM₁₀ and NO_x beyond 2012. This would be determined in light of the scheme's performance, and what national and EU air quality objectives were in place at the time.</p>	<p>Updated to reflect latest modelling work, notably recent work around NO₂ emissions. .</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
61.	4G.181 4C.56	<p>The preferred means of implementing the proposed LEZ is to introduce a substantial daily charge so that operators can make an economic decision as to whether or not they drive their vehicles in the LEZ. The charge would be set at such a level so as to encourage operators to modify or replace their vehicles, thus maximising the air quality and health benefits of the LEZ. At the same time, it would allow infrequent visitors operating non-compliant vehicles to drive within the proposed LEZ, albeit at a cost. The level of penalty charge for non-compliance would be proportionate to the level of charge, and both would remain subject to review.</p>		No changes.
62.	4G.182 4C.57	<p>It is proposed that the LEZ would be enforced using Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras similar to those used for Congestion Charging. Fixed cameras would be supplemented by mobile patrol units fitted with</p>	<p>It is proposed that the LEZ would be enforced using Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras similar to those used for Congestion Charging. Fixed cameras would be supplemented by mobile patrol units fitted with</p>	<p>To reflect recent work on building the proposed LEZ enforcement systems and the detail of how the boundary of the proposed LEZ would work.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>ANPR cameras. A database would be established to assist the identification and matching process, using data from licensing authorities such as the DVLA, and operators. TfL would only require registration from vehicles for which emission characteristics could not be determined from these records. Signs alerting drivers to the LEZ would be erected on roads at the boundary of Greater London, and on key roads beyond Greater London.</p>	<p>ANPR cameras. A database would be established to assist the identification and matching process, using data from licensing authorities such as the DVLA. TfL would only require registration from vehicles for which emission characteristics could not be determined from these records. Signs alerting drivers to the LEZ would be erected on roads at the boundary of the LEZ, and on key arterial routes outside Greater London. The zone boundary would be at locations where drivers of non-compliant vehicles could divert to other roads and advance warning signs would be erected to allow drivers to divert. It is also envisaged that there would be signs within the LEZ as a reminder to drivers.</p>	
63.	4G.183 4C.58	<p>There would be a very small number of exemptions from the LEZ. These exemptions would be based on the DVLA tax categories for Vehicle Excise Duty and vehicle body type. There are some</p>	<p>There would be a very small number of exemptions from the LEZ. There are some vehicles which are exempt from VOSA vehicle testing, and their emission levels cannot be determined and</p>	<p>To reflect intent to base vehicle standards as far as possible on European standards to ensure a consistent approach between UK and non-UK vehicles.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		vehicles which are exempt from VOSA vehicle testing, and their emission levels cannot be determined and so are outside the scope of the LEZ. There are also some highly specialist vehicles, for which abatement retrofit options are not practical.	so are outside the scope of the LEZ. There are also some highly specialist vehicles for which abatement retrofit options are not practical.	
64.	4G.184 4C.59	<p>The proposed LEZ is an environmental measure that seeks to achieve health and air quality benefits for Londoners and people who live, work, visit and do business in London. By reducing overall PM₁₀ and NO_x emissions emitted in London by diesel-engined vehicles, the proposed LEZ would help to reduce the overall area of London that exceeds the AQS objectives and EU limit values. This would have positive health benefits for communities in London. It would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ reduce the tonnage of pollutants emitted; and ▪ reduce the areas of London that exceed the AQS objectives and EU limit values 	<p>The proposed LEZ is an environmental measure that seeks to achieve health and air quality benefits for people who live in, work in, visit and do business in London. By reducing overall PM₁₀ and NO_x emissions emitted in London by diesel-engined vehicles, the proposed LEZ would help to reduce the overall area of London that exceeds the AQS objectives and EU limit values for PM₁₀. This would have positive health benefits for communities in London. It would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ reduce the tonnage of PM₁₀ and NO_x emitted; and ▪ reduce the areas of London that exceed the AQS objectives and EU limit values 	To update information on the expected impact of the LEZ.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		reduce concentrations of these air pollutants.	for PM ₁₀ .	
65.	4G.185 4C.60	Figure 3 shows the forecast annual mean concentrations of PM ₁₀ across Greater London in 2008 without the proposed LEZ. 100 km ² of Greater London is forecast to exceed the annual mean PM ₁₀ objective of 23 ug/m ³ in 2008.		No changes.
66.	4G.186 4C.61	Figure 4 shows the forecast annual mean concentrations of NO ₂ across Greater London in 2008 without the proposed LEZ. 80 km ² of London is forecast to exceed the annual mean NO ₂ objective of 40 ug/m ³ in 2008.		Delete section 4G.186, 4C.61. To reflect initial findings of recent research on vehicle emissions. See row 68 below.
67.	4G.187 4C.62	The 2008 LEZ proposals (with a standard of Euro III for PM ₁₀) would deliver reductions of around 8 percent in the area of London exceeding the annual PM ₁₀ objective, and around 12 percent reductions in the area exceeding the daily PM ₁₀ objective. In 2010, the proposed core scheme (a standard of Euro IV for PM ₁₀ for HGVs, coaches and buses) would deliver reductions of around 18	The 2008 LEZ proposals (with a standard of Euro III for PM ₁₀) would deliver reductions of around 6 percent in the area of London exceeding the annual PM ₁₀ objective, and around 9 percent reductions in the area exceeding the daily PM ₁₀ objective. In 2012, a standard of Euro IV for PM ₁₀ for HGVs, coaches and buses would deliver reductions of around 11 percent in the area of London	Updated with latest modelling figures.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>percent in the area of London exceeding the annual PM₁₀ objective, and 17 percent reductions in the area areas exceeding the daily PM₁₀ objective. Adding LGVs to the core scheme would reduce the area exceeding the annual PM₁₀ objective by a further 2 percent, and the daily mean by a further 3 percent.</p>	<p>exceeding the annual and daily PM₁₀ objectives. Adding heavier LGVs and minibuses to the scheme would reduce the area exceeding the annual and daily PM₁₀ objectives by a further 3 percent.</p>	
68.	4G.188 4C.63	<p>The 2008 LEZ proposals would also deliver reductions of around 7 percent in the area exceeding the annual mean NO₂ objective. NO₂ reductions would be achieved because the LEZ would encourage newer vehicles, which have a tighter NO_x emission standard. In 2010, the core LEZ proposals would deliver reductions of around 10.5 percent in the area of London exceeding the NO₂ annual mean objective. The inclusion of a standard of Euro IV for NO_x would reduce the area of London exceeding the 2010 annual mean objective by around 28 percent.</p>	<p>TfL is working with Defra to investigate and understand any implications of recent work which suggests that some Euro III and some retrofitted vehicles may emit a higher proportion of NO_x as NO₂ than previously thought. The projected impact of the LEZ proposals on the area exceeding the annual mean NO₂ objective is sensitive to this ratio. The effect of this recent work is uncertain and subject to other factors such as how operators choose to comply with the LEZ, adding uncertainty to the impact of the LEZ on NO₂ concentrations. The predicted reductions in emissions</p>	<p>To reflect initial findings of recent research on vehicle emissions.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
			of NO _x and PM ₁₀ are unaffected by this work.	
69.	4G.189 4C.64	While the introduction of the proposed LEZ would not necessarily lead to the meeting of the 2010 objectives in all locations, it should reduce the areas of London that exceed these objectives, and most importantly the exposure of people who live, work and visit London to these pollutants. The health benefits from the LEZ are likely to be wide-spread across the Greater London area, and outside London. The reduced PM ₁₀ emissions would improve the quality of life for many thousands of people who live, work and visit London, especially those already suffering from symptoms that restrict their daily activities. The LEZ would also reduce the number of premature deaths, the number of life years lost, respiratory hospital admissions and the need for medication for adults and children suffering from these diseases.	While the introduction of the proposed LEZ would not necessarily lead to the meeting of the 2010 objectives for PM ₁₀ in all locations, it should reduce the areas of London that exceed these objectives, and most importantly the exposure of people who live, work and visit London to PM ₁₀ and NO _x . The health benefits from the LEZ are likely to be wide-spread across the Greater London area, and outside London. The reduced emissions would improve the quality of life for many thousands of people who live in, work in and visit London, especially those already suffering from symptoms that restrict their daily activities. The LEZ would also reduce the number of premature deaths, the number of life years lost, respiratory hospital admissions and the need for medication for adults and children suffering from these diseases.	To update information on the expected impact of the LEZ.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
70.	4G.190 4C.65	<p>The monetary value of health benefits from the LEZ have been estimated. Using the DEFRA methodology, these are estimated at between £130 million and £180 million over the period 2008 to 2015. These benefits would accrue from the core LEZ scheme, which has a standard of Euro III for PM₁₀ in 2008 and Euro IV for PM₁₀ in 2010. Should the 2010 standard for NO_x be included and LGVs also be included in the LEZ, the estimated health benefits according to this methodology would be between £150 million and £210 million. The health benefits from the LEZ, using the EU Clean Air for Europe (Café) Methodology are estimated at between £190 million and £260 for the core LEZ scheme, and between £230 million and £310 million for a 2010 standard of Euro IV for PM₁₀ and NO_x including LGVs.</p>	<p>The monetary value of health benefits from the LEZ have been estimated. Using the Defra methodology, the net present value of benefits within London are estimated at around £100 million over the period 2008 to 2015. Benefits outside London are estimated at around £70 million over the same period. These benefits would accrue from the LEZ scheme, which would require HGVs, buses and coaches to meet a standard of Euro III for PM₁₀ in 2008 and Euro IV for PM₁₀ in 2012, and would target heavier LGVs and minibuses from 2010. The health benefits from the LEZ scheme within London, using the EU Clean Air for Europe (Café) Methodology are estimated at around £160 million, and around £100 million outside London.</p>	Updated to reflect latest modelling results.
71.	4G.191 4C.66	<p>The estimated cost of the core LEZ scheme to TfL is between £125 million and £130 million, from</p>	<p>The estimated cost of the core LEZ scheme to TfL is between £125 million and £130 million,</p>	Updated to reflect latest estimates based on changes proposed to scheme design.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		development of the scheme until 2015/16. This range reflects different scenarios around how operators would respond to the proposed LEZ, and the scope and cost of services from DfT. The capital costs are approximately £45 million, which include all development, consultation and implementation costs. The total operating costs of the scheme from early 2008 to 2015/16 are estimated at between £80 million and £85 million.	from development of the scheme until 2015/16. This range reflects different scenarios around how operators would respond to the proposed LEZ, and the scope and cost of services from DfT. The capital costs are approximately £60 million, which include all development, consultation and implementation costs. The total operating costs of the scheme from early 2008 to 2015/16 are estimated at between £65 million and £70 million.	
72.	4G.192 4C.67	There would also be costs to operators from complying with the LEZ. The costs to operators of the core LEZ scheme are estimated as being between £195 million and £270 million for the period to 2015/16. If the standard in 2010 was Euro IV for PM ₁₀ and NO _x , and LGVs were included, the costs to operators would increase to between £250 million and £390 million. In the absence of any other LEZs elsewhere in the UK, all these costs would be attributed	There would also be costs to operators from complying with the LEZ. The costs to operators of the LEZ scheme as proposed following consultation are estimated as being in the order of £300 million for the period to 2015/16. In the absence of any other LEZ schemes elsewhere in the UK, all these costs would be attributed to the London scheme.	Updated to reflect latest estimates based on changes proposed to scheme design.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		to the London scheme.		
73.	4G.193 4C.68	TfL has also assessed the costs and benefits of three of the most feasible LEZ alternative options. Figure 5 below sets out the results of this assessment. None of the alternatives achieve the same magnitude of reduced emissions in terms of the balance between costs and benefits though the TLRN comes close. The implementation risks with the TLRN approach, however, are high.	TfL has also assessed the costs and benefits of three of the most feasible LEZ alternative options. Figure 4 below sets out the results of this assessment. None of the modelled alternatives achieved the same magnitude of reduced emissions in terms of the balance between costs and benefits as the proposed scheme (i.e. scheme consulted on).	Updated to reflect the inclusion of LGVs and minibuses in the scheme.
74.	Figure 5 [now 4]			Renumbered – NB this tabled reflects the scheme as consulted on and is not updated to reflect the scheme revised scheme following consultation. It is presented here for purposes of comparison.
75.	4G.194 4C.69	The proposed LEZ is not designed to be a revenue generating scheme and the revenues would not offset the costs of implementing and operating the scheme. Air quality improvements would be maximised by high levels of operator compliance. There		These figures have been reviewed in the light of the new scheme proposals. The reduced revenues as a result of deferring the HGV Euro IV standard for PM ₁₀ to 2012 are offset by the introduction of LGVs in 2010.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>would, however, be some revenues from the LEZ through charge and penalty charge payments. Revenues are expected of between £30 million and £50 million during the life of the scheme, from 2008 to 2015, and these would contribute towards the operating costs of the scheme.</p>		
76.	4G.195 4C.70	<p>The LEZ would have a range of broader impacts on London society and the economy, which would be assessed as the proposals are developed.</p>		No changes.
77.	4G.196 4C.71	<p>Should the proposed LEZ be agreed, it would be supported by a programme of impacts monitoring to understand the impacts of the various stages of the scheme. This would commence in mid-2006, if the strategy revisions are agreed, with the collection of data representing pre-LEZ conditions, against which data collected after implementation could be compared. There would be a programme of reporting throughout</p>	<p>Should the proposed LEZ be agreed, it would be supported by a programme of impacts monitoring to understand the impacts of the various stages of the scheme. This programme would commence in mid-2006 with the collection of data representing pre-LEZ conditions, against which data collected after implementation could be compared. There would be a programme of reporting throughout the life of the scheme.</p>	To reflect the stage the proposal is at.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		the life of the scheme.		
78.	4G.197 4C.72	The key element of the monitoring strategy is measuring change in profiles of emission standards for vehicles within the scope of the LEZ scheme. This would then feed into complementary assessments designed to quantify air quality benefits. The monitoring would focus on identifying and quantifying change in vehicle numbers and type and fleet composition, for example, changes in the "Euro" profile of vehicles entering London. This would then provide data to assess the actual impact of the proposed LEZ on the environment, health and potentially other economic impacts. The impacts monitoring would also include the potentially significant impacts of the LEZ outside of Greater London, which would arise from the use of cleaner vehicles as they travel throughout the rest of the UK.		No changes.
79.	4G.198 4C.73	If a decision is made to implement the proposed LEZ, this would be	If a decision is made to implement the proposed LEZ, this would be	To align with other publicly available information on the LEZ.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>done by an Order. The earliest consultation with stakeholders and the public on an Order could take place is Autumn 2006. Depending on the outcome of consultation, the earliest an Order could be confirmed would be spring 2007 and the earliest a LEZ could be operational would be early 2008. The actual implementation date would depend therefore on a number of issues, including the outcome of the consultation and the potential impacts of the proposed LEZ.</p>	<p>done by an Order. The earliest consultation with stakeholders and the public on an Order could take place is late 2006. Depending on the outcome of consultation, the earliest an Order could be confirmed would be spring 2007 and the earliest a LEZ could be operational would be early 2008. The actual implementation date would depend therefore on a number of issues, including the outcome of the consultation and the potential impacts of the proposed LEZ.</p>	
80.	Proposal 4G.27 and 10	<p>The Greater London area should be designated a Low Emission Zone (LEZ). The proposed LEZ would target the worst polluting Heavy Goods Vehicles, buses and coaches, based on their emission standards. By so doing it would accelerate the introduction of cleaner vehicles and reduce the numbers of more polluting vehicles driving within the Greater London area. The LEZ would be implemented from</p>	<p>The Greater London area should be designated a Low Emission Zone (LEZ). The proposed LEZ would target the most individually polluting vehicles (HGVs, coaches, buses, heavier LGVs and minibuses). By so doing it would accelerate the introduction of cleaner vehicles and reduce the numbers of more polluting vehicles driving within the Greater London area. The LEZ would be implemented from</p>	See above (number 34).

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>early 2008; it would require certain heavy duty vehicles (referred to above) to meet a proposed emission standard of Euro III for PM₁₀, which would change to Euro IV for PM₁₀ or the relevant particulate standard in force in 2010.</p>	<p>early 2008; it would require certain heavy duty vehicles (HGVs, buses and coaches) to meet a proposed emission standard of Euro III for PM₁₀, which would change in 2012 to Euro IV for PM₁₀. Should the European Commission set a new standard covering ultra-fine particles or PM_{2.5} TfL will consider including such a standard within the LEZ. Appropriate standards to address emissions from heavier LGVs and minibuses would also be set to take effect from 2010.</p>	
81.	<p>Proposal 4G.28 and 11</p>	<p>Transport for London will consider further the environmental, health, economic and other impacts of the proposed LEZ when considering whether to make an order. The outcome of these investigations and other factors, including consultation results, will also be taken into account by the Mayor in deciding whether or not to confirm an order.</p>		<p>No changes.</p>

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
82.	Proposal 4G.29 and 12	Transport for London will continue to investigate further the options for the proposed LEZ, including the additional option of Euro IV for NO_x in 2010, and extending the LEZ to Light Goods Vehicles in 2010.	Transport for London will continue to investigate further the options for the proposed LEZ, including the additional option of Euro IV for NO_x and the range of vehicles covered by the scheme.	Updated text following representations made during consultation.
83.	Proposal 4G.30 and 13	Transport for London will monitor and assess the performance of any London Low Emission Zone that is established, to understand the range of impacts and to inform decision-making.		No changes.
84.	Footnote 1	The Mayor of London, Greater London Authority <u>The Mayor's Air Quality Strategy: Progress Report to March 2005</u> . Available at www.london.gov.uk .		No changes.
85.	Footnote 2	NO _x is the symbol for a generic group of chemicals called oxides of nitrogen, including both NO (nitric oxide) and NO ₂ (nitrogen dioxide), though the emissions of NO ₂ emitted in this direct way is small. NO _x is also produced by high temperature combustion processes. Tailpipe emissions		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		include NO (nitric oxide) and NO ₂ . NO ₂ is also formed from the reaction of NO with ozone. This reaction is thought to be responsible for the majority of NO ₂ originating in London.		
86.	Footnote 3	These predictions are based on the London Atmospheric Emissions Inventory (2002), an annually updated database of emissions sources. The emissions from these sources for 2005 were estimated using traffic flow and speed data, industrial emissions, and estimates of domestic and other common small sources of emissions.		No changes.
87.	Footnote 4	There are nine pollutants for which AQS objectives are set with the aim of protecting human health, of which seven are managed at local level. They are benzene, "1,3-butadiene", carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, PM ₁₀ and sulphur dioxide. In addition, there are objectives set for two pollutants for the protection of vegetation and eco-systems (nitrogen oxides and		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>sulphur dioxide). PAH (polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons) have also been recently included (2003) for regulation through the AQS. Ozone and PAH are not set as a statutory requirement at the local level as they are considered trans-boundary pollutants beyond the effective control of local authorities.</p>		
88.	Footnote 5	<p>Provisional data for 2005 indicates that levels of PM₁₀ and NO₂, when averaged over the entire year, exceeded the PM₁₀ and NO₂ annual objectives in London. The annual objective for PM₁₀ failed to be met at one national network site, London Marylebone Road; the NO₂ annual objective for NO₂ failed to be met at 17 sites. These do not include the Borough network of sites. The daily mean objective for PM₁₀ allows for the limit of 50 µg/m³ to be exceeded up to 35 times per year before the objective is breached. Provisional monitoring data indicates that at several sites pollution levels rose above 50 µg/m³ on more than 35</p>	<p>Data for 2005 indicates that levels of PM₁₀ and NO₂, when averaged over the entire year, exceeded the PM₁₀ and NO₂ annual objectives in many parts of London. The annual objective for PM₁₀ failed to be met at one national network site, London Marylebone Road; the annual objective for NO₂ failed to be met at 17 sites. These do not include the Borough network of sites. The daily mean objective for PM₁₀ allows for the limit of 50 µg/m³ to be exceeded up to 35 times per year before the objective is breached. Provisional monitoring data indicates that at several sites pollution levels rose above 50 µg/m³ on more than 35</p>	Updated information and clarifications.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		<p>days. The PM₁₀ objectives were required to be achieved from 31 December 2004. Exceedances of these standards in 2005, by ratified data, would cause a legal breach of the EU directives and UK regulations. Fully ratified data should be available from April 2006.</p>	<p>days. The PM₁₀ objectives were required to be achieved from 31 December 2004. Exceedances of these standards in 2005, by ratified data, would cause a legal breach of the EU directives and UK regulations.</p>	
89.	Footnote 6	<p>The proposed directive leaves unchanged the limit value for PM₁₀ which became binding on the UK in 2005, and which London is expected to have exceeded. It would, however, remove the limit value for PM₁₀ which applies from 2010, and replace it with a concentration cap for PM_{2.5} which must be achieved by 2010. PM_{2.5} are fine particulates that are thought to have particularly damaging impacts on respiratory and cardiovascular health. The proposed LEZ would assist London to meet the limit values for 2010, and would also assist in meeting any new limits introduced for PM_{2.5}. Road transport is estimated to be</p>	<p>The proposed directive leaves unchanged the limit values for PM₁₀ which became binding on the UK in 2005, and which London is expected to have exceeded. It would, however, set a new standard for PM_{2.5} to be met by 2010. PM_{2.5} are ultra-fine particles that are thought to have particularly damaging impacts on respiratory and cardiovascular health. The proposed LEZ would assist London to meet the limit values for 2010, and would also assist in meeting any new limits introduced for PM_{2.5}. Road transport is estimated to be the largest source of PM_{2.5} in London. Should the European Commission</p>	Updated information reflecting policy changes the European Commission.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		the largest source of PM _{2.5} in London. The strategy revisions have been drafted to provide for the LEZ to meet whichever particulate standard is in force in 2010.	set a new standard covering ultra-fine particles or PM _{2.5} TfL will consider including such a standard within the LEZ.	
90.	Footnote 7	The GLA group are the Greater London Authority, the London Development Agency, Transport for London, the Metropolitan Police Authority and the London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority.		No changes.
91.	Footnote 8	The European Union sets "Euro standards" for vehicle emissions that all new vehicles must comply with from a set date – Euro IV will become mandatory for new HGVs, coaches and buses from October 2006. Euro III became mandatory from October 2000.	The European Union sets "Euro standards" for vehicle emissions that all new vehicles must comply with from a set date – Euro IV will become mandatory for new HGVs, coaches and buses from October 2006 and for manufacturers of heavier LGVs and minibuses from January 2007. Euro III became mandatory from October 2001 for HGVs buses and coaches and from January 2002 for heavier LGVs and minibuses.	Consequential to revisions to 4G.176 and 4C.51.
92.	Footnote 9	AEA Technology <u>The London Low Emission Zone Feasibility Study,</u>	AEA Technology <u>The London Low Emission Zone Feasibility Study,</u>	Updated information.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		July 2003. The full final report and annexes are available at http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/low-emission-zone/www.tfl.gov.uk .	July 2003. The full final report and annexes are available at http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/low-emission-zone/ .	
93.	Footnote 10	Within London, Greenwich Council has granted outline planning permission for the re-development of the Millennium Dome and associated land on the Peninsula with a requirement for the developers to implement an approved LEZ strategy. This would target vehicles for which an effective control and enforcement regime could be established (for example, including an emissions element in charges for residential and office parking).		No changes.
94.	Footnote 11	Deloitte <u>London Low Emission Zone – Strategic Review of Feasibility Options</u> , February 2005.	Deloitte <u>London Low Emission Zone – Strategic Review of Feasibility Options</u> , February 2005, available at http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tfl/low-emission-zone/	Updated information.
95.	Footnote 12	See the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Pre-Budget report, December 2005, setting out his support for continuation of the		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		Reduced Pollution Certification (RPC). See Box 61 to 62 http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/FA6/45/pbr05_chapter7_173.pdf		
96.	Footnote 13	There would be a small number of these vehicles, and most are unlikely to visit London, for example, Island Goods Vehicles. These are not DVLA tested and operate on some small outer UK islands.		No changes.
97.	Footnote 14	The differences in the methodologies are explained more fully in the Supplementary Information. The Defra methodology for estimating health benefits is more “conservative” and is consistent with the guidance given by the UK Department of Health’s Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants (COMEAP). This method captures only the serious health impacts of air pollution, for example, premature deaths and respiratory hospital admissions. The EU methodology takes into account a		No changes.

No	Section	Original text	Revised text as recommended by TfL	TfL's reason for change
		wider range of health effects, for example, restricted activity days and respiratory symptoms and the costs of medicine.		
