



# Borough monitoring guidance for Healthy Streets schemes

October 2021

MAYOR OF LONDON

## Table of contents

1.	About this guidance .....	2
2.	Introduction.....	2
3.	Monitoring TfL funded schemes.....	3
4.	Key considerations for monitoring Healthy Streets schemes .....	5
4.1	Monitor the impacts of schemes on all groups .....	5
4.2	Gather consistent data .....	5
5.	Developing a monitoring plan .....	6
5.2	Set monitoring objectives .....	6
5.3	Produce a monitoring timeline.....	6
5.4	Define indicators/measures and choose the appropriate survey tools or techniques .....	7
6.	Tools and Techniques .....	9
6.1	Pedestrian and cycle counts .....	9
6.2	Bus performance.....	9
6.3	All-vehicle traffic counts .....	9
6.4	Pedestrian comfort.....	10
6.5	Cycle Route Quality Criteria .....	10
6.6	Safety.....	10
6.7	Individual surveys .....	11
6.8	Business surveys .....	11
6.9	Taxis .....	12
6.10	Network impacts.....	12
6.11	Air quality.....	12
6.12	Penalty charge notices issued.....	13
6.13	Review of ongoing public feedback .....	13
7.	TfL surveys and data sources .....	14
7.1	TfL surveys.....	14
7.2	TfL data sources.....	14

## 1. About this guidance

- 1.1.1 This document provides guidance for boroughs on the monitoring and evaluation of Healthy Streets schemes funded by TfL, including those delivered through the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) process. The guidance builds on the requirement for benefits appraisal of LIP schemes as set out in paragraph 4.29, chapter 4 of the Guidance for Borough Officers on Developing the Third Local Implementation Plan (March 2018)<sup>1</sup>. This monitoring guidance should therefore be read alongside that March 2018 guidance as well as, the Draft guidance on developing LIP three-year delivery plans for 2022/23-2024/25 (October 2021)<sup>2</sup>, Guidance for delivery of experimental Healthy Streets schemes (October 2021)<sup>3</sup> and the Department for Transport's statutory guidance Traffic Management Act 2004: Network Management in response to COVID-19<sup>4</sup>, updated on 30 July 2021.
- 1.1.2 For clarity, the term 'monitoring' in this document refers to the process of collecting data to measure the impacts, benefits and disbenefits of a scheme (outcomes). This document does not cover the tracking of the delivery of schemes or elements of schemes (outputs).

## 2. Introduction

- 2.1.1 London's streets and the way Londoners use them changed at an unprecedented rate during the coronavirus pandemic. Moving into the recovery phase of the pandemic, schemes that support active and efficient modes should continue to be delivered in order to work towards the outcomes of the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) and the recovery missions set by the Mayor's recovery board<sup>5</sup>. This is supported by national policy for example through Bus Back Better and Gear Change, for ambitious bus, cycling and walking schemes. Updated guidance published by the Department for Transport<sup>4</sup> provides direction to local highway authorities to continue to take measures to reallocate road space towards people walking and cycling. Much of this change is expected to come via experimental schemes, alongside permanent schemes.
- 2.1.2 Delivery of experimental schemes using Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETRO) requires clear objectives to be set at the start of the experiment and therefore to have associated monitoring plans and formal processes of consultation in place. Even where a scheme is delivered on a permanent basis from the start, high quality monitoring is important to support future case making and inform decision making about the relative value for money of different interventions.
- 2.1.3 This document provides guidance on developing monitoring strategies for Healthy Streets schemes, relevant for both experimental and permanent schemes. The purpose of this guidance is to:

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://content.tfl.gov.uk/lip3-guidance-for-borough-officers-preparing-lip3-2018.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/boroughs-and-communities/local-implementation-plans>

<sup>3</sup> <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/boroughs-and-communities/streetspace-funding>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/reallocating-road-space-in-response-to-covid-19-statutory-guidance-for-local-authorities/traffic-management-act-2004-network-management-in-response-to-covid-19#network-management-duty-guidance>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.london.gov.uk/coronavirus/londons-recovery-coronavirus-crisis/recovery-context>

- provide details of the requirement for boroughs to monitor TfL funded Healthy Streets schemes, including when and how data and evaluation reports should be shared with TfL
- support boroughs with the development of new monitoring plans, or strengthening of existing ones
- provide examples of the surveys and tools that can be used to measure the key outcomes of Healthy Streets schemes
- provide information on the datasets held by TfL that can support local monitoring, including how to access these

### 3. Monitoring TfL funded schemes

3.1.1 Monitoring is both necessary to fulfil the requirements of experimental scheme orders and to build the evidence base for Healthy Streets schemes across London to build the evidence for future investment. Therefore, on top of a requirement to monitor all experimental schemes, the Guidance on developing LIP three-year delivery plans for 2022/23-2024/256 asks boroughs to monitor the outcomes of schemes within their programme to support local case making and further evidence the value of Healthy Streets investment. For example, the impact of a new pedestrian crossing (measured qualitatively and/or quantitatively) in one area can help make the case for a similar intervention in an analogous location.

3.1.2 Although ideally all scheme outcomes would be monitored, the cost and effort involved in isolating and analysing the effects of some schemes – particularly smaller schemes – can be disproportionate to the scale of the intervention and/or the potential to add to the existing evidence base. Monitoring is therefore expected on schemes which are:

- Subject to an Experimental Traffic Order
- High impact or high value
- Innovative (monitoring would add to the collective understanding of scheme impacts), or
- Where early public and stakeholder engagement suggests that a scheme may generate significant public discourse regarding the benefits or impacts of a scheme.

3.1.3 Through their three-year programme submissions boroughs are asked to identify those schemes whose outcomes they intend to monitor. In some cases, TfL may ask boroughs to consider monitoring a scheme they had not initially intended to monitor.

3.1.4 For schemes delivered using TfL funding, boroughs are required to inform TfL of intentions to monitor within their three-year programme submission, by indicating which schemes will undergo outcome monitoring. TfL will review these submissions and contact boroughs individually to discuss monitoring intentions further if required. Boroughs are reminded to include the cost of monitoring within the project and staff cost of each scheme within the programme table as part of the project cost; monitoring should not be a separate line within the programme.

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/boroughs-and-communities/local-implementation-plans>

- 3.1.5 Boroughs may also be asked to submit to borough sponsors monitoring plans for the schemes that are funded. A monitoring plan should be in place for all schemes where outcome monitoring is intended. This can be a brief document, at a minimum including details of the key objectives of the scheme, measures/indicators of success, survey tools/techniques that will be used and a timeline for data collection (including baseline measures) and reporting. See section 5: Developing a Monitoring Plan, below.
- 3.1.6 TfL is currently developing the process for boroughs to submit the results of outcome monitoring to TfL and these will be communicated in due course. There is no standard format to submit results: the submission could be a standalone monitoring report or a local decision report that will contain the key insight. It is important to report on the metrics outlined in the monitoring plan.

#### Example of borough outcome monitoring

The [Enjoy Waltham Forest walking and cycling account](#) brochure provides an annual update on walking and cycling activity in Waltham Forest, presenting information on outputs (schemes delivered) and outcomes (impacts of some schemes) and borough wide data.

This document provides TfL and other boroughs with easy to access information that can help with case making activity for Healthy Streets schemes. This approach for sharing monitoring data is recommended.

- 3.1.7 In addition to the above requirements, TfL would welcome submissions of the following data and information:
- Borough cycle and pedestrian count data, plus local traffic counts and flow monitoring
  - Safety data, recognising that for some sources this will need to be reported over a longer time period (see section 6.6)
  - Summaries of public and stakeholder feedback, including an explanation of how engagement and/or consultation was undertaken. This should focus on the impact of the scheme on people's views of safety and the environment, as well as encouraging more active travel
  - The experiences of local older and disabled people, and others with protected characteristics, of these schemes. Insights into how boroughs have undertaken this engagement, and increased participation if possible, would be welcome
- 3.1.8 Boroughs should discuss availability of this data with their Network Performance Delivery Manager who will advise on whether TfL would like the data and how to transfer it.

## 4. Key considerations for monitoring Healthy Streets schemes

### 4.1 Monitor the impacts of schemes on all groups

- 4.1.1 Monitoring strategies should be designed to understand the impact of schemes on all groups, including those with protected characteristics, because the experience of travelling in London varies across demographic groups. It is useful to draw on existing research, such as [TfL's Understanding our diverse communities report](#) and [Transport for All's Pave the Way report](#).
- 4.1.2 The [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) (s.149 of the Equality Act 2010) requires that public authorities such as TfL and London Boroughs have due regard to the objectives set out under s149 of the Equality Act 2010. This can be achieved by undertaking high-quality Equality Impact Assessments (EqIA). However, this needs to be an active and ongoing process, and therefore engaging with stakeholder groups and monitoring the impacts of schemes on groups with protected characteristics is an important part of the EqIA. An early EqIA can identify monitoring or engagement needs and enable boroughs to develop schemes informed by knowledge and insight into potential barriers. This allows mitigations to be incorporated into design from the outset.

### 4.2 Gather consistent data

- 4.2.1 Monitoring needs will differ between each scheme and therefore it will not be possible for TfL and all boroughs to use the same survey tools and techniques. However, there are benefits to taking a consistent approach within boroughs and across London. For example, data can be collated and compared between schemes to identify the relative impacts of schemes in different locations or to compare specific types of intervention or delivery methods.
- 4.2.2 In this regard, TfL has recently delivered a programme of London-wide surveys including:
- School Streets parent/carer survey on attitudes and behaviour
  - Low Traffic Neighbourhood resident survey on attitudes and behaviour
  - Pedestrian and cyclist intercept surveys on attitudes and behaviour
- 4.2.3 These surveys will be available on the borough SharePoint site ([see section 6.2](#)). To enquire as to whether London-wide data is available for comparison contact your borough sponsor.
- 4.2.4 The [Department for Transport's Transport Survey Question Bank](#) holds questions asked in national Transport Surveys since 2000 and is searchable by topic.

## 5. Developing a monitoring plan

- 5.1.1 The exact monitoring requirements of each scheme will vary locally, and the scope of monitoring should reflect the scale of each scheme. The monitoring plan should be broad enough to show the full picture of impacts of the scheme and collate data to address common concerns and complaints of local stakeholders.
- 5.1.2 The proportion of the budget allocated to monitoring will vary between schemes. A greater proportion of the project cost will be needed to monitor temporary or experimental schemes, as the cost of building the scheme itself is likely to be lower. Also the monitoring requirements of schemes delivered using ETROs are more extensive, due to the ongoing nature of monitoring required.
- 5.1.3 As a minimum, monitoring plans should include the following (these are detailed in the following sections of this guidance):
- A clear set of objectives that are linked to the strategic aims of the programme or scheme
  - An overview of the metrics that will be measured and the data that will be collected for each scheme, including a description of the methodology for data collection at a high level, e.g. traffic volume counts to be collected by video survey
  - A timeline for the availability of data that is linked into decision-making processes, e.g. review points for ETROs; dates for surveys.

### 5.2 Set monitoring objectives

The first step is to define the objectives for each scheme, linked to the strategic aims for the project and local needs. The success or failure of schemes delivered using ETROs will be judged against the objectives of the scheme, therefore objectives should be set carefully. For example, objectives for a Low Traffic Neighbourhood could include reducing the volume of traffic in a residential area, mode shift from car to active travel, efficient and sustainable modes for people within and traveling through the LTN, improving the experience of pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers, improving safety (and the perception of safety), improving satisfaction of a local area amongst residents, or increasing physical activity.

Each objective should be clear and measurable. The goal is to weigh up the best available data on the positive impacts (or benefits) against data on the negative impacts (disbenefits) to provide a holistic picture of the effect of a scheme. When setting objectives, it is useful to set out the time frame in which the benefits or disbenefits are expected to occur and ensure monitoring covers this period. Data from similar schemes can be used to set realistic expectations, e.g. the length of time it took for cycle flows to increase along a new route in a similar location.

These objectives then naturally suggest what monitoring will be needed to assess the scheme's performance against them.

### 5.3 Produce a monitoring timeline

- 5.3.1 Surveys and data collection should be planned so that data is available as required at key decision points. The monitoring process should be conducted openly, for example by

publishing a monitoring timeline online alongside all other relevant information about the scheme as part of the stakeholder engagement process or committing to a timeline in a key decision report to a scrutiny/ decision committee. Further details on the decision processes and timelines are provided in the guidance for delivering experimental schemes<sup>7</sup>.

- 5.3.2 While some impacts may be immediately apparent many impacts take time to bed in. For example, the traffic impacts of some schemes will take time to reach a stable level as people adjust their journeys, switch modes or re-route. Final evaluation of larger experimental schemes should take place a minimum of six months after delivery but preferably after 12 months. Some permanent infrastructure schemes such as safety schemes may take longer than this to establish a trend but should be kept under review.
- 5.3.3 For temporary or experimental schemes, DfT guidance states that final evaluations must not take place before the end of the TTRO, or ETRO, and at least 12 months of traffic data must be available and published. Safety impacts can also take a longer time to become apparent (this does not preclude changes when required).

#### **5.4 Define indicators/measures and choose the appropriate survey tools or techniques**

- 5.4.1 The appropriate tools for measuring impacts, benefits and disbenefits should be determined by the objectives of the scheme. It is crucial to remember that all groups and communities are given the opportunity to provide feedback on a scheme and that specific measures are included to target those representing groups with protected characteristics.
- 5.4.2 It is important to avoid collecting unnecessary data; data collection should be adequate, relevant and limited, in line with the UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) principle of data minimisation. To do this it is necessary to consider how each dataset/insight will be used within the evaluation to determine which surveys are necessary and will add value to the monitoring process. Similarly, when designing survey questionnaires only essential questions should be included where there is a clear use for the data to keep them short and improve response rates.
- 5.4.3 The surveys and techniques chosen should include those that will identify any inadvertent negative impacts of the scheme on groups with protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act. Monitoring should highlight when a scheme has not equally impacted all groups and communities, or when there are unintended consequences for minority or disadvantaged groups. Sociodemographic indicators should be looked at to allow boroughs to assess how representative survey results are of the community and whenever possible analysis of survey results should be disaggregated to understand the impact on minority groups.
- 5.4.4 Many surveys and monitoring techniques will not pick up the experience of those who aren't able to use or access the schemes, therefore targeted engagement with disability or stakeholder groups will be needed. Methods such as access audits, focus groups and walking tours should be considered, and the representativeness of the respondents to these activities borne in mind. This should help ensure that the scheme is accessible and inclusive and contributes to greater inclusion of Londoners in the street.

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/boroughs-and-communities/streetspace-funding>



5.4.5 Table 1 provides examples of suggested monitoring activity that should be considered for selected scheme types. These are presented as examples and are not intended to represent all scheme types delivered. In practice, the scope of monitoring activity should reflect the objectives of the scheme.

**Table 1. Suggested monitoring activity for sample schemes**

Examples of monitoring activity	Cycleways	Low-traffic neighbourhoods	School streets	Bus lanes/bus priority	Behaviour change activity e.g. bike markets
All-vehicle traffic counts	✓ Link counts	✓ Cordon counts	✓ Cordon counts	✓	✗
Pedestrian and cycle counts	✓ Link counts	✓ Cordon counts	✓ <sup>8</sup>	✓	✗
Pedestrian comfort evaluation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Individual surveys	✓ User	✓ Resident	✓ Pupil, parent/carer and/or resident	✓	✓
Business surveys	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
Traffic speeds	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Parking counts (car and cycle)	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗
Bus speeds / journey times	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
Safety data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Penalty Charge Notices issued	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗
Air Quality	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Review of ongoing public feedback	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Ongoing liaison with emergency services	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗

5.4.6 Section 6 Tools and Techniques suggests some frequently used survey tools and techniques. These monitoring activities may help quantify the impact of schemes. Implementing each of these activities for a location or an area would require careful design and detailed planning, using local knowledge of the area, scheme and context. The suggestions are not exhaustive, but present examples based on the types of surveys and tools that are frequently used by TfL. It is also recognised that not everything can be monitored, and that sometimes data can be reasonably used as proxy indicators for other impacts.

<sup>8</sup> School Hands Up Surveys could be used and submitted via the STARS system, so results can be compared between Schools with and without School Streets

5.4.7 Further examples of survey tools and techniques can be found in the DfT's Monitoring and Evaluation Guidance and their Active Travel Fund Public Opinion Surveys Good Practice Guidance.

## 6. Tools and Techniques

### 6.1 Pedestrian and cycle counts

Quantitative assessment of the number, flow or density of cycles and pedestrians can be appropriate across a range of active travel-related projects. Within this, it may be useful to capture the type of cycle used, e.g. private, hired, cargo or cycles adapted for mobility impairments. Pedestrian counts could also capture whether pedestrians are using assistive tools, such as a white cane. It is important to note that many impairments are invisible, e.g. learning difficulties and hearing impairments, so observational data alone may not identify disproportionate impacts on specific groups.

Flow counts can be conducted on links and/or at junctions as turning counts, cordon/screenline counts, parking counts, or even 'density' counts (on a specific area), such as mapping stationary activities. Counts can be conducted manually (on site or from recordings) or automatically through video analytics and in some cases sensors. The accuracy of sensors varies significantly by technology and some may not be suitable for all purposes. For some types of layout, it may be appropriate to collect additional behavioural information such as observational analysis or pedestrian / cycle interaction surveys, such as where a shared-use layout is to be trialled.

It is important to note that pedestrian and cycle counts are unlikely to capture demographics and therefore may miss potentially differing impacts across minority groups. Counts can be supplemented by individual surveys for greater depth of survey results (see [5.3.7 Individual Surveys](#))

### 6.2 Bus performance

Given the important role of buses in London, the performance of buses should be monitored if it is likely that a scheme will impact the bus network, not simply for bus priority schemes. It is important to consider buses as part of any experimental scheme objectives. A severe adverse impact on buses is likely to be an example of evidence against making a scheme permanent. Where schemes set out to improve bus performance, for example an increase in bus lane hours or new bus priority, decreases in bus journey times and increases in bus speeds and reliability would indicate success.

Improvements in bus passenger experience and convenience may also indicate success. Potential data sources could include iBus data, public perception survey data, customer correspondence and bus operations feedback.

TfL can provide weekly aggregated average bus journey times for corridors that are adjacent to a scheme or routes on corridors affected by a scheme upon request. Borough sponsors can submit a data request on behalf of their boroughs. Boroughs will need to let their sponsors know the corridor sections, including a definition of the start and end bus stops and dates for the provision of the data. Bus stop codes are available on Surface Playbook. For enquiries relating to Surface Playbook contact [SMBPlaybook@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:SMBPlaybook@tfl.gov.uk) Users are provided with a link and password after applying for access.

### 6.3 All-vehicle traffic counts

The quantitative assessment of general traffic flows and speeds may be necessary to evaluate the impact of certain schemes, particularly those aimed at restricting motorised traffic or improving safety. These can be classified (usually by vehicle type, e.g. LGV, HGV, taxi) and be conducted on links, junctions and as cordon, screenline, or turning counts. Traffic counts can also be used to understand queues and delays at junctions, travel times and traffic speeds. Some of these can be

done manually (through enumerators or video recordings) but most are automated using various technologies. Unlike the pedestrian and cycle counts, in this case the automated solutions tend to be sufficiently accurate (particularly when the aim is to understand motor vehicle flows and when accuracy on the number of cycles is not a main objective). When designing traffic counts it is important to choose enough carefully selected locations to be able to understand traffic displacement from some streets onto others and the overall impacts of the scheme beyond their immediate footprint. It is also important to classify by vehicle type to be able to understand the benefits and impacts of a trial scheme on all road users including taxi journeys.

TfL can provide some traffic counts upon request if the scheme affects portions of the TLRN. Details of the location of TfL's automatic traffic counters are available on Surface Playbook. For enquiries relating to Surface Playbook contact [SMBPlaybook@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:SMBPlaybook@tfl.gov.uk). Users are provided with a link and password after applying for access. Borough sponsors can submit a data request on behalf of their boroughs. Boroughs will need to let their sponsors know their data requirements. Boroughs or sponsors can submit these requests to [TrafficData@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:TrafficData@tfl.gov.uk).

#### 6.4 Pedestrian comfort

A possible method for assessing the benefits of changes that impact on pedestrians is to assess pedestrian comfort, details of which are provided in TfL's [Pedestrian Comfort Guidance](#).

#### 6.5 Cycle Route Quality Criteria

The Cycle Route Quality Criteria (CRQC) process should be used before a scheme is implemented to review whether the street conditions are appropriate for the route to be classified as a 'Cycleway'. It can also be used post-implementation to check that the quality criteria are being met. In order to complete the Cycle Route Quality Criteria assessment, spot counts, site observations and/or informed estimates may be used as required in the absence of formally recorded data. Detailed guidance is provided in [TfL's Cycle Route Quality Criteria Technical Note](#) and data should be collated in the [Spreadsheet Tool](#).

#### 6.6 Safety

All boroughs can now access the Collision Statistics App (CollStats) and self-serve collision reports to the most recently available provisional figures. In addition, where required TfL can provide data that is unavailable in CollStats on request, such as CSV data extracts for analysis. In-year provisional quarterly data is also available on the Vision Zero dashboard.

Boroughs are now able to add and monitor schemes using the Traffic Accident Diary System (TADs) module within CollStats. Reviewing the latest collision data over the course of the monitoring period will help understand changes in collision patterns over the footprint of the scheme. The standard full monitoring period is for 36 months before and after delivery, although some schemes may require longer. Schemes can have their collision history reviewed each month after completion when data is available and measured against the same number of months for the before period using TADs.

Seasonal matching and significance testing are applied to scheme collision data monitored using TADs. However, due to small numbers, caution should be taken in interpreting meaningful trends in road safety when comparing short periods of time before and after the implementation of schemes. If concerning trends are observed, the number of collisions that would trigger a scheme review should be defined.

Please note that there is a time delay which is required to validate data sent to TfL from the police. TfL is working with the police and the DfT to reduce this time lag.

The safety assessment should also seek to understand the user experience and perception of safety gathered through road user surveys and / or customer feedback (including from protected characteristic groups), alongside wider data and traffic surveys. Attitudinal and observational insights could potentially demonstrate changes in risk levels and that people feel safer following the implementation of the scheme. This is equally important as collision data, since the perception of safety can impact significantly on mobility and access to services. Survey data should be able to be segmented by group, e.g. ethnicity, disability, pregnancy/maternity, where possible (though survey participants provide this information voluntarily), in order to investigate any benefits or unintended consequences for specific groups and to ensure equality of access across groups. Stakeholder engagement should be carried out in order to evaluate any safety concerns.

The monitoring strategy needs to collect disaggregated data to ensure benefits are realised equally and provide ways for reporting, recording and collating complaints, issues raised and near-misses.

Where a scheme design has introduced a new routing of vehicles (resulting from a turning or no-entry restriction), or where a movement has not been restricted but needs to be studied, video analytics or on site-site observational surveys to assess road user behaviour and risk are recommended.

### **6.7 Individual surveys**

Quantitative and/or qualitative assessment of travel behaviour and/or satisfaction with the schemes. These surveys can help explore the use and impact of schemes across sociodemographic groups. These could include trip purpose, mode shift, physical activity levels and demographic details. They can target users (intercept surveys done on site to people as they use the facilities) or a broader population that may or may not have used the facilities but whose direct or indirect experience may be relevant, e.g. local residents. Interviews and focus groups can be used to gather deeper insights where relevant.

It may sometimes be necessary to ensure that certain groups of users are over-represented in the survey population i.e. response rates from minority groups are boosted so there is sufficient data to interpret their experience. This may be particularly important for any groups identified as being impacted during the Equality Impact Assessment. For example, if 'intercept' surveys are generally handed out on the road to the general population, then it may be necessary to partner with local community groups to hand out surveys to people from target groups to ensure that their experience is documented.

Survey data may be complemented by interviews or focus groups for deeper insight on perceptions, experiences and attitudes. This can be useful to explore any significant positive or negative outcomes that may be identified for particular groups to better understand the reasons for those outcomes. Surveys often provide the 'what' of what people experience but fail to adequately address the 'why.' The 'why' can be very important when responding to customer feedback and making decisions based on the data collected.

### **6.8 Business surveys**

It is difficult to disentangle survey data on the impact of schemes on footfall, sales or economic output from the ongoing impacts of the pandemic. However, qualitative surveys are a useful tool for capturing the views of shopkeepers and business owners. It may be beneficial to include specific business-related questions in overall surveys/consultations, as well as considering other engagement techniques.

This activity should include capturing information from minority-led businesses located in or impacted by new schemes. Understanding these more subtle impacts will help to inform the EqIA and relevant mitigations.

## 6.9 Taxis

Taxis have a distinct legal status and should be considered within monitoring plans. Where a monitoring plan is collecting road user data, TfL recommends that a fully classified approach is taken in order to be able to understand the benefits and impacts of a scheme on taxi journeys, as well as other classes of traffic including private hire journeys if possible (see [3.3.2 All vehicle traffic counts](#)). Where taxis are likely to be impacted, flow and classified turning count data that distinguishes taxis from other vehicles will show the scale of these impacts. Public surveys should seek to understand the outcomes of a scheme on taxi passengers, and particularly older and disabled people.

## 6.10 Network impacts

Some vehicular journeys are essential to keeping London functioning. For example, London needs freight, servicing and emergency services to function effectively. Traffic flow and journey time data should be collected to understand whether road network performance has been unreasonably impacted by a scheme, in order to comply with the Network Management Duty, set out in the Traffic Management Act 2004.

TfL can supply some general traffic journey times from Inrix data, including historic data back to January 2019. TfL will have this data for roads on the London Network of Interest, all strategic roads, including the TLRN, Borough Principal Road Network (BPRN), and all roads that buses travel on. This dataset will not include local borough residential roads other than those described here. Please forward a data request via a sponsor or directly to [TrafficData@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:TrafficData@tfl.gov.uk).

## 6.11 Air quality

Air quality monitoring should only be considered where there is likely to be a significant impact on emissions. It is difficult to attribute changes in air quality to specific schemes during the pandemic, as there are wider influences on travel demand, e.g. travel restrictions and more working from home.

Air quality monitoring takes place across London and there are monitors in place that have been detecting changes in air quality over the long term, including the past year where changes in travel behaviour (and therefore emissions) due to coronavirus haven't taken place. The [London Air Quality Map provides more information](#).

The emissions impact of temporary schemes can be reviewed on schemes that have a significant impact on the network. Traffic data will need to be collected for emissions impact modelling to take place. Where possible this should include information on speeds and vehicle types. Information on structural/physical changes should also be identified – such as pavement widening or traffic lane removal or reduction. Diffusion tubes can also be installed, but ideally, they should be in place for a year before a scheme is introduced. However, diffusion tubes and other indicative monitors can be a useful tool for tracking changes in air quality over time. Boroughs should speak to their Air Quality or Environment teams for further advice on local air quality monitoring if it is required.

Positive impacts on air quality will also be relevant to the EqIA given we know that for example ethnicity is strongly correlated with pollution exposure, with ethnic minorities more likely to live in polluted areas<sup>9</sup>.

### 6.12 Penalty charge notices issued

Data on the number of penalty charge notices issued can show levels of compliance where vehicle access is restricted (but not physically filtered), and whether the number of PCNs issued reduces over time as a scheme beds in and drivers adapt to the change. Where the number of PCNs remains high, changes may be needed to the scheme to improve compliance.

### 6.13 Review of ongoing public feedback

Stakeholder engagement and customer feedback may be sought on schemes in a way that is commensurate to the scheme scope and impacts. It is especially important as part of the monitoring process for experimental schemes.

The use of ETROs where consultation is carried out once the scheme is live rather than prior to delivery, means that monitoring and engagement are closely linked. Engagement strategies should ensure that the impact of schemes on all users is considered. Targeted engagement with some user groups will be necessary in order to determine the impact that the scheme has on that group, particularly groups with protected characteristics. Guidance published by the Department for Transport<sup>10</sup> sets out that engagement, especially on schemes where there is public controversy, should use objective methods, such as professional polling to British Polling Council standards, to establish a truly representative picture of local views and to ensure that minority views do not dominate the discourse.

In those cases where public perception surveys are appropriate, they should be issued with a strong engagement strategy to ensure that a representative sample of the local population have an opportunity to comment on the scheme, but also so that the impact on the whole population can be measured (not just those who typically respond to surveys). It may be necessary to over-represent certain groups in the sample so that there is sufficient data to analyse their results. This type of engagement gives the best chance of a scheme succeeding, as data is not skewed to represent only those who are strongly in favour of, or opposed to, the scheme. Steps should be taken to maximise engagement and achieve a sufficient response rate.

Further guidance on stakeholder engagement are provided in the guidance for delivery using experimental schemes<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> Office for National Statistics . (2020). *Does exposure to air pollution increase the risk of dying from the coronavirus (COVID-19)*. Available: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/environmentalaccounts/articles/doesexposuretoairpollutionincreasetheriskofdyingfromthecoronaviruscovid19/2020-08-13> Last accessed 17/02/2021

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/reallocating-road-space-in-response-to-covid-19-statutory-guidance-for-local-authorities/traffic-management-act-2004-network-management-in-response-to-covid-19#network-management-duty-guidance>

<sup>11</sup> <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/boroughs-and-communities/streetspace-funding>

## 7. TfL surveys and data sources

### 7.1 TfL surveys

7.1.1 TfL will not undertake monitoring for all schemes on borough roads. However, the impacts of some borough schemes on the TLRN will be assessed against the data TfL has readily available. For example, where modal filters have been installed to create Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, the impact of some of these schemes will be monitored using data such as local bus journey times, local general traffic journey times and flows and cycle flows, using existing sensors such as iBus, Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras, Automatic Traffic Counters and Automatic Cycle Counters.

### 7.2 TfL data sources

7.2.1 Where TfL monitoring includes a borough scheme we will communicate with boroughs openly about this and share data as early as possible.

7.2.2 Boroughs are reminded that the following data sources are available:

- **City Planner Tool**<sup>12</sup> - This provides strategic level data and can be interrogated to test where policy outcomes are most required throughout London. It also contains multi-modal origin and destination data that can be explored
- **Surface Playbook**<sup>13</sup> - Contains over 700 geospatial related layers inclusive of TfL assets, networks as well as products specifically focused on the coronavirus Pandemic.
- **Borough LIP data pack** - This contains data relating to borough performance against LIP and MTS targets e.g. mode share and air quality data. Access the borough LIP packs at: <http://planning.data.tfl.gov.uk/>
- **Cycle counts data** - Annual cycle counts are on a folder titled “CycleCountsProgramme” at <https://cycling.data.tfl.gov.uk/> That folder contains spreadsheets with the disaggregated, validated data for all the strategic (central/inner/outer) and route (by ‘legacy’ investment programme) counts from 2014 until now. There is also one file called “X – Count sites list” which contains relevant metadata about the count sites (e.g. coordinates or borough). For information and data about automatic cycle counters please contact [TrafficData@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:TrafficData@tfl.gov.uk).
- **Bus performance data** - TfL regularly publishes bus performance data on a borough and route level <https://tfl.gov.uk/forms/14144.aspx>
- **TfL Road danger reduction dashboard, factsheets and research:** The Road Danger Reduction dashboard, road collision data, factsheets, annual reports and research is available online: <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/road-safety>
- **Collision Statistics App (CollStats)** All boroughs can access CollStats to access a number of reports and data extracts and we encourage you to do this where

---

<sup>12</sup> For enquires relating to the City planner tool, contact [CPT@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:CPT@tfl.gov.uk)

<sup>13</sup> For enquiries relating to Surface Playbook contact [SMBPlaybook@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:SMBPlaybook@tfl.gov.uk), users are provided with a link and password after applying for access.

possible. Requests for access to our personal injury database CollStats can be made at [CollstatsHelpdesk@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:CollstatsHelpdesk@tfl.gov.uk)

- **Travel in London reports:** An annual report summarising key data on travel and behaviour across London and progress towards the MTS targets. The most recent report includes data from surveys issued during the pandemic and may be useful for contextual information. <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/travel-in-london-reports>
- **Borough SharePoint:** TfL has developed a new SharePoint site to help borough officers working on TfL-funded programmes. The following data can be viewed on this site:
  - Automatic Traffic Counter dashboard showing key flows on the strategic road TLRN, and also differences in flows in central, inner and outer London.
  - A weekly report which provides an up-to-date situational awareness of flows, journey times, summary of bus journey times and changes in cycle flows, all relative to a 2019/20 baseline which we will maintain for the new financial year.

Anybody with an active portal account<sup>14</sup> can access the SharePoint site once they have logged onto the TfL OneLondon domain via the following link:  
<https://transportforlondon.sharepoint.com/sites/BoroughsProjects>

---

<sup>14</sup> To request a borough portal account email: [bpsupport@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:bpsupport@tfl.gov.uk)