

---

## Minutes

Agenda item: 4  
Drafted: 18.12.10

---

### Minutes of a meeting of the Transport Service Committee held on 16 December 2010 at 6 Middle Street, London EC1

#### Contents

- 1 Chair's introduction, pre-meeting announcements
- 2 Apologies for absence
- 3 Declarations of interest
- 4 Cycle hire scheme
- 5 Circle and Hammersmith & City line
- 6 Minutes
- 7 Matters arising (TS040)
- 8 Actions taken (TS041)
- 9 Lead Officer report (TS042)
- 10 Performance Monitoring reports (TS043)
- 11 Motorcycles in bus lanes (TS044)
- 12 Any other business
- 13 Resolution to move into confidential session
- 14 Glossary

#### Present

Members : Terry Bennett (Vice Chair); Gail Engert; David Leibling; Lorna Reith (Chair); Sharon Grant (Chair, London TravelWatch) (items 3 to 5)

#### Observer

David Barry (items 5 to 13)

#### Guests

Matt Ball	Stakeholder Communications, London Underground Limited (LUL)
Mick Hickford	Head of Special Projects, Surface Transport, Transport for London (TfL)
Dave Hughes	Strategy and Commercial Manager, LUL
David Millard	General Manager, Circle and Hammersmith & City Lines, LUL

#### Stakeholder representatives

Matt Winfield Stakeholder Engagement Manager, TfL

#### Staff

Committee Officer; Director, Research and Development (item 5); Streets; Senior Policy Officer; and Surface Transport Policy Officer (items 10 and 12)

## Minutes

### 1 Chair's introduction, pre-meeting announcements

The Chair welcomed visitors, members and staff to the meeting of the committee, and made standard housekeeping announcements.

### 2 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Teena Lashmore.

### 3 Declarations of interest

No additional declarations of interest were made. A public record of members' interests may be found on the London TravelWatch website (<http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/3861/get>).

### 4 Cycle hire scheme

The Chair welcomed Mr Hickford to the meeting. The video referred to in the presentation can be viewed at <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/roadusers/cycling/15025.aspx>.

Mr Hickford noted that currently cycling is 2 per cent of the total mode share in London. There are around 500,000 cycling trips a day. The proportion of people who cycle had doubled in the last decade in London. The Mayor's Transport Strategy has a 5 per cent target for mode share by 2026.

The cycle hire zone is roughly equivalent to the zone one area on the Underground. There are more docking points than bikes, to enable users to park their bikes. The current ratio is 1.7 docking points to bikes. There are plans to increase this up to 2 docking points to bikes. There is a big demand for the cycle hire scheme near national rail stations, for example, the demand near Waterloo in the morning peak is 2,000. There is a lack of space near national rail stations which limits the number of bikes available. Users have to pay an access fee and a usage charge.

Mr Hickford felt that the scheme had been a success. There are over 100,000 members of the scheme and there had been 2 million journeys since it went live. There are around 17,000 journeys per day, but during the strikes on the Underground this had gone up to 27,000. Demand is lower at the moment due to the weather. There are dips in usage at weekends. 58 per cent of users of the scheme had taken up cycling in the past 3 months.

The membership demographics are mainly male, white and in employment. A majority of users live in London or the South East. Around two thirds of members are aged from 25-44. In terms of modal shift 35 per cent of users had used the scheme instead of the Underground and 23 per cent had not taken the bus. A majority use the scheme for their commute or leisure trips.

Around 84 per cent of planning applications had been successful. Some of the areas in which the scheme operates have listed buildings which restricted the chance of success. Also some Boroughs had revenue issues, for example, giving up car parking spaces for a docking station would mean less income. There would be an additional 400 docking stations

by March 2011. Some of the construction of docking stations encountered problems when basements or utilities were not in plans.

There had been problems with the call centre. It had taken a while for some employees to get up to speed on the scheme. However, there had been improvements in the answering of calls.

Bicycle redistribution is a problem. There is a large movement of bikes at national rail stations towards Holborn and Soho. Serco (the company that operates the scheme) moves bikes between locations. The introduction of casual users into the scheme may cause more natural redistribution of bikes.

The scheme had lost only 8 bikes so far. Transport for London (TfL) had learnt lessons from the operation of the Paris scheme, for example, not putting a lock on bikes and informing users to return the bike to the docking station. There is also a different design for the docking stations in London. There had been some personal injuries, but none were severe. TfL is not complacent about safety.

The future plans include 2,000 more bikes and expanding towards the Olympiad Park (adding another 20 kilometres to the area). There will also be more docking points. The scheme would increase the coverage in Hackney, but Islington would remain the same. It is important to note that the scheme is not a mass transit scheme, it merely adds to the transport options in London. TfL is projecting 40,000 journeys per day by 2011.

There is a map of docking stations and an application for hand held devices.

The Chair asked whether companies could sign up to the scheme. Would the increase in usage encourage more cycling generally? Mr Hickford replied that at the moment there was no option for company membership, but they were looking to introduce this. The Chair felt that companies in the City would welcome such a move. On her second point, Mr Hickford noted that TfL is working to encourage more cyclists. There is no hard evidence that cycling had increased overall since the scheme had been introduced. However in Holland and Denmark there had been an increase when similar schemes had been introduced. He had observed a large number of cyclists at the end of one of the cycle highways near Southwark Bridge.

A member reported his problems with the scheme on one occasion and the expense of calling the 0845 telephone number. Mr Hickford noted that there is an 020 8 number.

Mr Hickford reported that it had cost around £80 million to implement the scheme. The Chair asked what the payback period would be? At the moment there was no surplus. However, with the sponsorship included, he felt that the running cost would be covered. The financial figures did not include the loss of ridership from other modes.

Members felt that there were benefits of the scheme, for example, reducing crowding on the Underground. Mr Hickford noted that the scheme would not be extended towards hilly areas just outside zone one. They had looked at other hubs, but there was insufficient demand to make them financially worthwhile. The Chair felt that there could be particular tourist sites, for example, Hampton Court. She felt that there could be 3 or 4 of these sites in the scheme. A member asked whether any promotion had been carried out to target tourists. Mr Hickford replied that at the moment TfL had only just widened the scheme to casual users. Some work had been carried out, for example, in-flight magazines.

The Senior Policy Officer noted that Oyster Pay As You Go (PAYG) did not lend itself to the

scheme entirely. However, the developments in credit and debit cards meant that Oyster could be loaded on to them. Had TfL tried to incorporate Oyster in the docking stations? Mr Hickford replied that TfL had looked at installing Oyster machines, but there was a high cost to make them compatible and Oyster would be changing in a few years. There were practical concerns, for example, the maximum £90 that could be stored on a card. Lastly the way the scheme operated, for example, the charging structure for the cycle hire scheme.

A member asked about the extension towards the Olympiad Park. Is there a risk post-Olympiad that no one would use it? Mr Hickford explained that they were a good link to the City and there was demand from Canary Wharf. They would change the density from a docking station every 300-400m to 500m-600m.

The Chair of London TravelWatch felt that there should be an Underground map included in the scheme map, to enable easy interchange. Mr Hickford would take that idea back. The scheme map had tried to get as much information in as possible.

A member of the public asked about further development of docking stations at national rail stations, for example, Euston. Mr Hickford replied that negotiations were continuing with Network Rail about a number of sites. There would be a docking station at Paddington and Victoria.

## **5 Circle and Hammersmith & City line**

The Chair welcomed Mr Ball, Mr Hughes and Mr Millard to the meeting.

Mr Hughes noted that there had been a service change on the Circle line with introduction of the 'T cup' last year. This had made the line more reliable. There had been a number of improvements for passengers on the Hammersmith branch during peak hours. There had been some changes on the other sub-surface lines to compensate for the changes throughout the Circle and Hammersmith & City lines. There had been similar changes to off peak services.

Mr Hughes noted that overall the timetable had been successful. Excess journey time had fallen to a historic low on all sub-surface lines. Reliability on the Circle and Hammersmith & City line had improved and there are fewer gaps between services. There is now faster recovery from disruption. The overall benefit had been £11.4 million in actual journey time. The Chair asked about the number of trains per hour to Olympia. Mr Hughes noted that the average number of people using these services was 22 leaving, with 24 boarding. Most people enter/exit at other stations in the local area.

The Senior Policy Officer reported that London TravelWatch had met with London Underground to look signage at Edgware Road. He felt that the current signage related to the old timetable. He had hoped that London Underground would have revised the signage. Mr Millard replied that he was happy to take away specific suggestions. He would then look at what work needed to be done and how to prioritise it.

Mr Millard noted that the excess platform waiting time was now lower than it had been in 2009. There had also been a reduction in the excess time passengers spent on a train. The new timetable had also improved the recovery time from disruption. There are more staff available at Paddington to cope with the increased number of passengers.

Mr Millard outlined improvements he wanted to make to improve services further, for example, improving train despatch at Uxbridge; problems at Finchley Road (a pinch point on

the network); and improving the gaps between trains (headway) at Embankment. There had been a team effort to make the new timetable work. It was easier to recover more quickly from disruption now. There are had been a decline in driver shortages. There would be further improvements from December 2011.

A member asked how much the Metropolitan line had contributed to decline in excess journey time in period 5 (2010/11) compared to period 4 (2010/11). Mr Millard noted that there had been some reliability problems with the new signalling on the Metropolitan line and stock availability. When would the new trains run to Aldgate? Mr Ball replied that the new trains would run to Aldgate from March 2011. Mr Millard noted that there had been some work carried out with drivers to enable them to sight signals. The new trains on this line would have CCTV in the driver cab.

A member asked about feedback that had been received from passengers. Mr Millard replied that the customer satisfaction levels mirror service performance. There had been a slight rise in complaints, but this was mainly explained by concerns about Edgware Road station.

The Director, Research and Development asked about the East London Line and whether there had been an increase in the number of passengers interchanging at Whitechapel on to the sub-surface lines. Secondly, had there been any changes to stations either side of Blackfriars, since that station had been closed. Mr Millard replied that he would confirm the interchange numbers for Whitechapel station.

**Action : TfL**

On Blackfriars, he noted that most passengers were using either the station before or after. The increases at the stations either side of Blackfriars had not affected capacity.

Mr Millard outlined the reasons why there would be a closure between Edgware Road and High Street Kensington from 23 July to 23 August 2011. The reason for the closure was water ingress. This causes signal failures and delays on the line. It is cheaper and more efficient to do the work in a one month closure rather than weekends. Most passengers will have alternative services to complete their journey. The work will replace the rails, improve the drainage and upgrade signalling.

The Senior Policy Officer noted that it was now LUL's stated aim to move to blockades. Were passengers from Wimbledon and passengers from other stations being catered for? Mr Millard replied that the modelling had been done and existing local bus routes will be reinforced to cope with the extra passengers. LUL would also look at staffing and platform flows.

## **6 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2010 were approved and signed for the record.

## **7 Matters Arising (TS040)**

The Chair asked for progress on the Northern line closure programme. The Senior Policy explained that the Director, Research and Development would be meeting with LUL today.

It was agreed that customer satisfaction across modes should not be compared as the methodology for each mode differed.

Members asked whether any response had been received from London Buses on the issue of commentaries in the TfL performance report (20.10.10, minute 7). The Senior Policy Officer reported that a response had been received and the Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer was meeting with London Buses today.

## **8 Actions Taken (TS041)**

The paper was noted for the record.

## **9 Lead Officer report (TS042)**

The Senior Policy Officer noted that there were two Route Utilisation Strategies (RUS) currently being consulted on : West Midlands and Chiltern and West Coast Main line. A London and South East RUS would be published shortly. The West Midlands and Chiltern RUS had not focused on London dimensions. Meetings had taken place with Passenger Focus on both RUS's to ensure that the responses did not cause any confusion. The West Coast Main line RUS had focused on increasing the capacity of the West London line.

Members felt that it would be useful to include a one or two sentence explanation of the meetings with transport providers and details of the agenda items.

## **10 Performance Monitoring reports (TS043)**

The Senior Policy Officer noted that the main issue affecting the LUL had been problems affecting the Victoria line, in particular the new trains not being as reliable as they were expected to be and the old signal system. LUL had not published performance as regularly as they had under the old Public-Private Partnership (PPP) schemes. The Chair felt that this should be raised with LUL.

The Senior Policy Officer explained that he felt that London TravelWatch should ask Transport for London (TfL) to have more robust targets. LUL is investing in infrastructure, carriages, etc. The Chair felt that following the investment, the performance targets should be revisited. As capacity and reliability had improved she had expected tougher targets. The Senior Policy Officer noted that in the New Year the details on complaints would be available from TfL. This would enable London TravelWatch to see how many complaints were reaching it at appeal.

The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer would produce a note on the comparison of each mode's customer satisfaction scores.

**Action : Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer**

The Senior Policy Officer noted that it would be useful to compare customer satisfaction scores over time to see longer term trends.

The Chair asked if the routes which had been bendy buses had seen any decline in performance. The Senior Policy Officer noted that there was no evidence of any decline. The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer reported that iBus would enable London Buses to monitor excess waiting times. The buses that had been highlighted in previous reports had improved.

There had been an overall decline in the performance of national rail. The Train Operating Companies (TOCs) total Public Performance Measure (PPM) had gone down slightly. London Midland had improved compared with the previous quarter. Both Southeastern and Southern had declined. The Official of Rail Regulation (ORR) is working on a scheme to disaggregate performance data by line. This would enable greater focus on particular lines. The Senior Policy Officer noted that the National Passenger Survey (NPS) results for London Overground were still not showing a great improvement. He felt that they should be compared with similar organisations, for example, Tyne & Wear Metro or Merseyrail.

## **11 Motorcycles in bus lanes (TS044)**

The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer reported that he had met with TfL about the motorcycles in bus lanes trial. He had also read the report by the Transport Research Laboratory on the first trial. He had concluded that the trial had not improved motorcycle safety. There is no evidence that cyclists are deterred from using the bus lanes or that it affected bus drivers.

Motorcyclists are the most vulnerable road users and now they are even more so. He had been told that TfL were now analysing the data they had received from the first 18 month trial. If the current trial obtained similar results, the trial should stop.

There are efforts to raise education for car drivers and motorcyclists about the scheme. Also there would be greater enforcement of speeding.

The Chair felt that if one group of road user was at greater risk then the trial should be stopped.

The committee agreed the paper's recommendations.

A member asked if there was any evidence from insurance companies regarding accidents. The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer would investigate.

**Action : Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer**

## **12 Any other business**

The Chair thanked the Senior Policy Officer for his work and wished him well in his new job.

## **13 Resolution to move into confidential session**

The Committee resolved, under section 15(b) of schedule 18 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, that by reason of the confidential nature of the next following item/s, it was desirable in the public interest that the public should be excluded from this part of the meeting.

In confidential session, the Committee reviewed the meeting and discussed upcoming meetings with transport providers.

## **14 Glossary**

Headway

Gaps between services

LOROL	London Overground
LUL	London Underground
NPS	National Passenger Survey
ORR	Office of Rail Regulation
Oyster PAYG	Oyster Pay As You Go
PPP	Public-Private Partnership (a way of funding infrastructure projects)
RUS	Route Utilisation Strategies
TfL	Transport for London
TOCs	Train Operating Companies