
Minutes

Agenda item 5(a)
Drafted 28.1.10

Minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 26 January 2010 at 6 Middle Street, London EC1

Contents

- 1 **Apologies for absence**
- 2 **Chair's introduction and members' declarations of Interest**
- 3 **Chair's activities and Passenger Focus update**
- 4 **Minutes**
- 5 **Matters arising** (LTW 336)
- 6 **Actions taken** (LTW 337)
- 7 **Smoothing the traffic** (LTW 338)
- 8 **Enforcement of traffic regulations on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN)**
- 9 **Tottenham Hale gyratory system in focus and similar projects**
- 10 **Road maintenance**
- 11 **Membership of Committees 2010** (LTW 339)
- 12 **Recent adverse weather conditions** (LTW 340)
- 13 **Any other business**
- 14 **Resolution to move into confidential session**
- 15 **Glossary**

Present

David Barry; Terry Bennett (except min.12); Onjali Bodrul; Gail Engert (except min. 9); Daniel Francis (except min. 12); Sharon Grant (Chair); Sophia Lambert; Teena Lashmore; David Leibling (except min. 12); Lorna Reith (Deputy Chair) (except min. 9)

Guests

Felicity Beverley	Senior Programme Manager, Surface Transport, Transport for London (TfL)
Graham Nash	Senior Programme Manager, Surface Transport, TfL
James Mead	Head of Stakeholder Partnerships, Congestion Charging and Traffic Enforcement, TfL

4 Members of the public including Simon Mouncey (TfL Partnership Liaison and Development) and Matt Winfield (Stakeholder Engagement Manager, TfL)

Secretariat

Tim Bellenger	Director, Research and Development
Janet Cooke	Chief Executive
Mark Donoghue	Committee Administrator
Rufus Impey	Senior Policy Officer (min. 12)
Vincent Stops	Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer (min. 7 to 12)

1 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Sarah Pond and Kevin Davis.

2 Chair's introduction and members' declarations of interest

The Chair welcomed members, officers and guests to the meeting.

There were three declarations of interest in reference to items on the agenda. Lorna Reith and Gail Engert both disclosed that they were councillors in Haringey and would not be present at the Tottenham Hale gyratory presentation. The Chair disclosed that she was a trustee of the Bernie Grant Arts Centre.

3 Chair's activities and Passenger Focus update

3.1 Chair's activities

The Chair noted that she had been to regular stakeholder meetings, for example, with Valerie Shawcross AM (Deputy Chair, Transport Committee), a ministerial meeting with Chris Mole MP, a TfL Board meeting, a meeting with the Department for Transport (DfT) officials and London Underground Limited (LUL). A number of issues required press releases, particularly Oyster Extension Permits (OEPs). A submission was made to the current inquiry about the recent disruption to Eurostar services and work would continue with Passenger Focus.

3.2 Passenger Focus

Mr Leibling reported that the January Passenger Focus board meeting was cancelled due to poor weather. The previous board meeting had taken place in Liverpool, with local Train Operating Companies (TOCs) having given presentations at the meetings. On buses, agreement had now been reached to prevent ambiguity in Passenger Focus and London TravelWatch's remits when legislative procedures are taken forward shortly.

The Chair added that Passenger Focus would not be taking on appeals work for buses (this differs from London TravelWatch). The Chief Executive reported that the Safety and Policy Advisor would provide an update for the next board meeting on the remits of the two organisations.

4 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 25 November 2009 were agreed and signed for the record subject to the following amendment : to add Teena Lashmore and Sophia Lambert to the list of members attending the meeting.

A member asked if the secretariat could clarify the date that London Underground (LUL) upgrades would finish.

Action : Committee Services

On page 8, minute 12, paragraph 2, line 3, “centrally set targets” should read as corporate health targets. Members noted the change to the TfL travel information phone number to an 0843 number. The Chair would raise this along with other issues at a scheduled meeting with TfL.

5 Matter Arising (LTW 336)

Members suggested that the secretariat needed to update actions on the matters arising.

It was agreed to refer the matter of whether there had been an increase in income collection for buses on routes which have changed from an articulated to a double decker bus to the Fares and Ticketing committee.

6 Actions Taken (LTW 337)

The report was noted. A member asked about the changes to bus lanes in Ealing. The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer reported that Ealing Council felt that they caused problems to general traffic (variance in hours of service) and were taking some out. He confirmed that TfL are monitoring the progress and that London TravelWatch advocates the installation of bus lanes. A member asked if there was any guidance on the width of footway there should be. The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer noted that the DfT guidance was a minimum width of a footway, but to enable inclusive mobility they should be 2 metres.

The Chair noted the response to the draft Majors Transport Strategy and asked for the Boards thanks to be noted to the Research and Development team.

7 Smoothing the traffic (LTW 338)

The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer explained the work that TfL had done so far : creating a website, developing their strategy and had come up with a measure of success (this is included in paragraph 4.1 of LTW 338). He will attend a roundtable meeting on this subject on 2 February 2010. Traffic lights are being rephased (a presentation had been given to the Access to Transport Committee on 16 December 2009), but London TravelWatch want to be assured that it is transparent. He concluded his comments by noting that TfL are making progress and have now defined how smoothing the traffic would be measured.

A member suggested that improving the traffic flow helps buses, but that bus lanes and phasing traffic lights were amongst a range of techniques. There followed a discussion about the merits of grade separate junctions and selective vehicle detection.

Members felt that part of the problem was that bus lanes were not continuous and this reduced traffic flow. It was important to look at each route individually. This would create a better bus service and continue the trend of people making journeys they had previously made. It was important to make journey times across all modes more predictable. Members felt that the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and Strategic Road Network (Borough Roads) should work together more and have better co-ordination between the Major and boroughs. A member felt that it would be better for TfL to control orbital routes in outer London. The Chair noted that it had recently been announced that cyclists would be able to turn left at red lights, and that there might be implications for smoothing the traffic. Members discussed the issue and raised concerns on education (of both cyclist and pedestrians) and enforcement.

The Chair summarised the views of the Board. London Travelwatch supports the overall objective of there being more predictable journey times. London TravelWatch favours bus prioritisation and believes that a variety of means of achieving that should continue to be explored. On cyclists turning left at junctions there needed to be education for pedestrians and cyclists. There needed to be more integration between the TLRN and Strategic Roads Network and an increase in the use of intelligent traffic lights.

Members felt that LIPs (Local Implementation Plans) needed to be used to make bus stops more accessible. The Director, Research and Development noted that London TravelWatch wanted smoothing the traffic to be about numbers of people whose travel is facilitated, rather than the number of vehicles.

8 Enforcement of traffic regulations on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN)

The Chair welcomed Mr Mead, Head of Stakeholder Partnerships, Congestion Charging and Traffic Enforcement, TfL to the meeting. His presentation may be viewed in full at <http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/4059/get>

Mr Mead started by explaining that TfL sent out information packs to non-compliant vehicle owners prior to the launch of the Low Emissions Zone (LEZ). When penalty charges were sent out to vehicle owners, TfL accepted mitigation. There were around 300 Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) issued per week (by way of contrast there were 80,000 to 100,000 vehicle movements). There is a high rate of compliance for the LEZ and compliance for the two phases is, presently, over 98 per cent.

Mr Mead said there was preference for a warning to be sent to vehicle owners for the first time they are in contravention of a regulation. He felt this was particularly relevant for bus lanes where the operational hours varied across a route. If TfL receive reports of a high number of PCNs at particular locations they will work with organisations to resolve the issue.

The Chair thanked Mr Mead for his presentation. A member asked if there was a formal Drivers Charter. Mr Mead replied that it was a set of rules that TfL were abiding by internally. TfL have reviewed those areas which need enforcement on bank holidays, and were moving towards the exercise of discretion on bank holidays. A member commented that PCNs were not a revenue raising source and asked about what happened when junction cameras were issuing more PCNs than could be expected. Mr Mead replied that if a high proportion of PCNs were issued at a location they would look at the design of the location. Improvements can be, for example, relaying the yellow box of a junction. It was important to work with boroughs when charges occurred and harmonise enforcement.

The Chair asked Mr Mead to attend a further meeting of the board in 12 months to report on progress.

9 Tottenham Hale gyratory system in focus and similar projects

The Chair welcomed Mr Nash, Senior Programme Manager, Surface Transport, TfL and Ms Beverley, Senior Programme Manager, Surface Transport, TfL to the meeting. Their presentation

may be viewed in full at <http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/4058/get>. Lorna Reith and Gail Engert left the meeting for this item.

Mr Nash noted that 4,000 new homes were planned for the Tottenham Hale area. He reported that the scheme cost of the scheme had been reduced from £70 million to £37 million. The return on the project was 2:1. The bus station at Tottenham Hale would be rebuilt, so that it was larger and more accessible.

A member raised concerns on how the increase in dwellings, and changes to the gyratory would affect the school run. A member of the public felt that Phillip Lane needed a crossing and raised concerns about the lack of one in the plans.

The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer reported that he had discussed the plans with Transport for London. He had raised some concerns on the plans, which had mostly been resolved. The plan would benefit bus users.

The Director, Research and Development asked if the broad principles applied to this project would be applied elsewhere. Mr Nash replied that it was a challenge to remove gyratories. Demand at Tottenham Hale gyratory is currently operating at or above saturation levels. A member asked how the remodelled Aldgate gyratory was working. Mr Nash agreed to come back with further information on how this had worked.

Action : TfL

A member asked if the car journey round the gyratory would be shorter. Mr Nash replied that the journey time would be slightly shorter. Cars would reach the gyratory edge quicker, but take longer going through it. The Chair asked about the current speed of traffic and accident rate. Mr Nash replied that at Broad Lane, traffic was either in a solid jam or free running at high speed. This problem would be resolved by two way traffic which would reduce speed.

The Chair noted that London TravelWatch was broadly supportive, but had concerns about the pedestrian crossings. The reduction in the speed of vehicles was welcome. A member noted the lack of cycle provision currently in the area. Mr Nash replied that the plan had been amended for cyclists and a consultation had taken place.

The Chair asked whether the plans for an expansion in residential areas had been taken into account. Mr Nash replied that the scheme catered for local demand and other developments. TfL had liaised with the local boroughs, Enfield and Haringey, on the scheme. The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer was asked to produce a paper on gyratories and solutions to them for a future meeting.

Action : Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer

10 Road maintenance

The Chair introduced the item by noting that were concerns regarding the future funding for road maintenance. A member noted that central Government have a target on road maintenance which was published each year.

The Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer noted that the TfL business plan, 2009/10 to 2017/18, showed the percentage of roads not in good repair was expected to increase from 6.7 per cent in 2009/10 to 8.2 per cent in 2017/18. There appears to be a presumption that the condition of the road network will decline.

The Director, Research and Development noted that this was an important issue for passengers and pedestrians. Car users will pay more in the maintenance of their vehicle and bus drivers will not be able to provide a smooth ride for passengers. This could deter some using transport services, for example, the elderly and impose charges on others, for example, carers. A planned deterioration is worrying.

The Chair felt that pedestrians were also affected by poorly maintained roads (those with mobility impairments especially). A member reported that he had observed buses driving around pot holes. The Deputy Chair felt that TfL should prioritise main roads and pot holes. Busy routes should be monitored and problems likely to be dangerous noted. She advocated closer working together between boroughs and Transport for London on this problem, for example, contractors could be use to repair damaged roads for both Transport for London and boroughs roads where they are close-by.

A member felt that utilities should pay into a repair fund. Members felt that there was a problem of patchwork repairs and damage reoccurring. The Chair summarised the information the board would like to see : financial details; repair details on the TLRN; inspection system; prioritising links with Boroughs; and which Boroughs are taking part in the permit scheme.

Action : Committee Services

11 Membership of Committees 2010 (LTW 339)

The report was agreed.

12 Recent adverse weather conditions (LTW 340)

In this section of the meeting members discussed how transport providers coped with the adverse weather conditions.

They welcomed the improvements by TfL in comparison to 2009 and the better co-ordination between TfL and Boroughs in keeping London moving. The Deputy Chair asked if TfL had suspended PCNs on the TLRN.

Action : Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer

Members also wanted to know if any extra income had been received (with higher call volumes) by TfL from its telephone enquiry lines.

Action : Committee Services

National Rail had been the most affected mode of travel. Several TOCs had run emergency timetables, for example, Southeastern had finished earlier and started later. There had been problems on the dissemination of information to passengers. The National Rail Enquiries (NRES) website had periods where it was unavailable and First Capital Connect's website had not displayed the correct departure times on its website.

Members were concerned about the performance of Eurostar. London TravelWatch had made a submission to the Eurostar inquiry raising concerns about the problems experienced by passengers. Members felt that established risk management plans should have been in place and implemented during this disruption. The findings of the enquiry are awaited.

13 Any other business

None.

14 Resolution to move into confidential session

It was resolved, under section 15(2)(b) of schedule 18 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, that by reason of the confidential nature of the item(s) to be discussed, it was desirable in the public interest that the public should be excluded for the remainder of the meeting.

In confidential session, members approved the minutes for the confidential session of the Board meeting held on 25 November 2009 and reviewed the meeting.

The next meeting of the full Board will be held on 23 March 2010.

15 Glossary

DfT	Department for Transport
FCC	First Capital Connect
LEZ	Low Emissions Zone
LIPS	Local Implementation Plans
LUL	London Underground Limited
NRES	National Rail Enquiries Service
OEPs	Oyster Extension Permits
PCNs	Penalty Charge Notices
TLRN	Transport for London Road Network
TOC	Train Operating Company