

---

**Secretariat memorandum**

Author : Mark Donoghue

Agenda item 5

TS020

Drafted 6.1.10

---

**Actions taken**

**1 Purpose of report**

- 1.1 To advise members of matters dealt with by the Chair, Deputy Chair, the Chief Executive and/or the secretariat since the last meeting.

**2 Recommendation**

- 2.1 That the report is received for information.

**3 Information**

- 3.1 Bus diversions in the Tottenham Court Road area

On 12 October 2009 Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer responded to proposals from Transport for London on the diversion of bus routes due to the Crossrail and London Underground works at Tottenham Court Road station. A copy is enclosed in Annex A of this report.

- 3.2 East Midlands Rail Utilisation Strategy (RUS) response

On 11 November 2009 the Senior Policy Officer sent London TravelWatch's response to this consultation to Network Rail. It may be viewed on the London TravelWatch website (<http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/3949>).

- 3.3 Great Western Rail Utilisation Strategy (RUS) response

On 27 November 2009 the Senior Policy Officer sent London TravelWatch's response to this consultation to Network Rail. It may be viewed on the London TravelWatch website (<http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/3972/get>).

- 3.4 London Bus retendering 2011/12 response

On 18 December 2009 the Director, Research and Development sent London TravelWatch's response to this consultation to Surface Transport, Transport for London. A copy is enclosed in Annex B of this report.

**4 Equalities and inclusion implications**

- 4.1 In accordance with London TravelWatch's duties under the Disability Discrimination Act and other legislation, account is taken when responding to consultations on proposals from external bodies of their particular impact (if any) on the needs of people whose access to transport may be restricted by reason of disability or social exclusion.

## **5 Financial implications**

- 5.1 No specific financial implications for London TravelWatch arise from this report.

## **6 Legal powers**

- 6.1 Section 248 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 places upon London TravelWatch (as the London Transport Users Committee) a duty to consider - and where it appears to the Committee to be desirable, to make recommendations with respect to - any matter affecting the functions of the Greater London Authority or Transport for London which relate to transport (other than of freight). Section 252A of the same Act (as amended by Schedule 6 of the Railways Act 2005) places a similar duty upon the Committee to keep under review matters affecting the interests of the public in relation to railway passenger and station services provided wholly or partly within the London railway area, and to make representations about them to such persons as it thinks appropriate.

## Annex A

Our Ref:  
Your Ref:

12 October 2009

Matt Winfield  
Stakeholder Engagement Manager - Group Public Affairs  
Transport for London  
Windsor House  
42-50 Victoria Street  
London SW1H 0TL

Dear Matt

Oxford Street bus diversions from mid January 2010

Thank you for briefing me on the proposal to divert bus services consequential to the Crossrail / London Underground works at Tottenham Court Road.

London TravelWatch is the statutory body representing transport users in London.

We are supportive of both Crossrail and the works to upgrade the London Underground facilities at Tottenham Court Road, however we are conscious that this will cause major disruption to both bus users and local residents. These proposals will disrupt many journeys, particularly the passengers of bus route 25 which may result in trips transferring to the Central Line. We urge TfL to do everything it can to reduce the time that these works will take.

Generally when buses are diverted we want to see buses follow, as close as possible, their existing route. We have considered the proposals and accept that they represent the best option for bus passengers given the works proposed. However, would you please consider the following in order to lessen the impact of the route 25 proposal on passengers :

- i) Could bus route 25 set down further west on Oxford Street and also before its stand on Tottenham Court Road? This would help some passengers to travel a little closer to their travel objectives.
- ii) Would you consider increasing the capacity of bus route 8 as this overlaps with route 25 and could provide an alternative to passengers wishing to travel through to Oxford Circus?

Yours sincerely

Vincent Stops  
Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer

## Annex B

Our Ref:

Your Ref: GB/1011/Stage1/

18<sup>th</sup> December 2009

Peter Bradley  
Head of Consultation and Engagement Centre  
Surface Transport Communications  
Transport for London  
11<sup>th</sup> Floor, Zone G2, Palaestra  
197 Blackfriars Road  
London SE1 8NJ

Dear Peter,

### **2010/11 Bus Service Review Programme – Stage 1 Consultation tranches 343 to 361**

Thank you for inviting us to comment on the proposed bus service review programme for 2011/12.

I have set out our observations in the attached appendix in order of tranche.

I hope that these comments are constructive and helpful in your deliberations. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me at the above address.

Yours sincerely

Tim Bellenger  
Director - Research and Development  
Direct Dial: 020 7726 9959  
Fax: 020 7726 9999  
Switchboard Telephone: 020 7505 9000  
Email: [tim.bellenger@londontravelwatch.org.uk](mailto:tim.bellenger@londontravelwatch.org.uk)

## Appendix

### General comments

The bus network must be responsive to changes in demand brought about by the construction and introduction of new rail services such as Crossrail, the East London Line extension and the Thameslink upgrade, and by the substantial changes in healthcare provision that are proposed during the period that contracts for the bus services included in this review will be operational. The opening of the East London line in 2010 should include a review of all bus services that intersect with this line.

### Routes 28, 31/N31 and 328 – tranche 343

We have previously commented on recent proposals to change these routes and have no further comments to add.

### Routes 68, N68, 468 and X68 – tranche 344

These routes were studied by our consultants JMP as part of our research project on reducing out of service bus mileage. We concluded that, on routes 68, N68 and 468, some additional journeys could be provided at little or no extra cost.

All of these routes, plus route 196 (and route 322 not subject to consultation in this round of tenders), suffer from a lack of bus priority southbound at the junction of Norwood Road with the Tulse Hill Gyratory system. At peak times this leads to excessive delays, with buses often having to wait three, four or often five cycles of the traffic signals between joining the end of the traffic queue to clear the junction.

#### Route 68

We note the comments from Lambeth Council about the stand arrangements at West Norwood. If route 315 was to be diverted at West Norwood and thus vacate its stand (see below), route 68 could use the stand instead. This would have the added advantage of providing some more relief to route 468 at its busiest point.

#### Route 468

This is a very well-used service (particularly over the section between Herne Hill and Croydon Town Centre), and is busy at peak times throughout the week. There are often capacity issues in both the morning and evening peaks; in the evenings going outward from Herne Hill, Tulse Hill and West Norwood toward Croydon; and on Sundays during shopping hours. A feature of this route is the large numbers of people making long distance journeys between the borough of Croydon, Herne Hill and Elephant & Castle. This route is particularly important to the Afro-Caribbean community, but is also a reflection of poor rail links in this area, which, since the withdrawal of direct services between Tulse Hill, West Norwood and East Croydon, are much worse. We note the comments by Croydon Council regarding the current stand at South Croydon, but we do not believe that it would be wise to consider an extension to Croydon Airport as this would introduce the possibility of additional unreliability on an already long service.

## Route X68

This route performs two very important functions. Firstly it provides a fast direct link to an area of central London which is difficult to access from the corridor that it serves, particularly between Thornton Heath and West Norwood, where there are no nearby rail services. Secondly, in the morning relieves various other services between Waterloo and Russell Square, and in the evening it performs the same function between West Norwood and Croydon to the 468 (and 196). The service is very well used, and is highly rated by its regular passengers of students, academics and diplomatic staff. We are aware that many passengers use this service as an informal park and ride service for central London, driving from other areas and parking in areas close to X68 bus stops not subject to parking restrictions. One way in which where the service could be improved would be for the routing between Tulse Hill and Waterloo to be standardised. It would be helpful too if additional stops could be considered at Lambeth North Underground Station (for interchange with the Bakerloo line and buses to Whitehall, and to serve the large number of voluntary sector offices in this locality), and southbound just south of Lancaster Avenue in West Norwood. At this locality the X68 currently picks up northbound but southbound does not set down and it would be helpful to iron out this inconsistency.

## **Routes 424 and 485 – tranche 345**

We believe that introduction of a late evening and Sunday service could be justified on these routes.

## **Route 481 – tranche 345**

We believe that this route could be substantially developed because of a number of developments such as reorganised health care facilities in Whitton and the West Middlesex Hospital which will generate additional demand. For example we believe that the daytime service could operate at a much higher frequency, particularly along the Sandy Lane section where the previous 465 service ran every 20 minutes. We would also urge consideration of later evening and Sunday services.

## **Routes 69/N69, 147, 241, 330 and 474/N474 – tranche 346**

We have previously supported the extension of route 330 to Canary Wharf. We would expect a full review of these services to take place in the light of developments at Stratford and elsewhere in the vicinity. The TfL London Travel report (2007) highlighted the very low bus and public transport usage to local district centres in the areas served by the routes in this tranche, and very high car usage. This is against the overall London trend and suggests a need for either a fundamental review of the network, a sustained marketing campaign or a smart travel initiative.

## **Route 67 – tranche 347**

We have had a number of comments from our board members that this service is unreliable especially on the St. Ann's Road solo section of this route.

## **Route 95 – tranche 347**

We have no comment on this service.

### **Route 127 – tranche 347**

We would wish to see this service extended to St.George’s Hospital in Tooting, because it serves a significant part of the Hospital’s catchment areas for staff and visitors, where there are no direct links by public transport. We note comments that this service has a poor reliability record and that there are requests for an increase in frequency.

### **Route 129 – tranche 347**

This route suffers from the lack of bus priority in Greenwich Town Centre, and solving that problem should be considered a priority before any extension towards Peckham is implemented.

### **Routes 389 and 399 – tranche 347**

We have a long-standing request that these services are altered so they provide direct links to Barnet Hospital. We also recommend an extension of the operating hours of these services.

### **Route 171/N171 – tranche 348**

We have previously commented that it would be desirable to have an identical day and night route on this service rather than the variations that occur at present. We also note previous requests for a restoration of a night service to the Hither Green area.

### **Route 196 – tranche 348**

This service is very well-used and has attracted more custom in recent years. However, frequencies in the early morning, late evening and Sundays are quite poor given the level of demand. On Sundays especially this route is well used by large numbers people attending Pentecostal Churches in Brixton from both Norwood Junction and Elephant & Castle directions. Norwood Junction station is increasing in importance with the advent of the East London Line and inclusion of regular stops there on services to Gatwick Airport. The reduction in direct rail services to East Croydon from West Norwood and Tulse Hill means that improving the 196 may be desirable.

The early morning frequency of services to Norwood Junction (and later on Saturdays) are in need of improvement, if passengers from the areas served by the 196 are to take advantage of the increased train frequencies at Norwood Junction. It should be noted however, that much of these improvements could be made at little extra cost by making available journeys that currently run out of service to and from Stockwell bus garage. You will have previously noted our comments that we believe that the Norwood Junction area would benefit from a night bus service to and from Central London and Brixton. Please note comments above under route 68 relating to bus priority at Tulse Hill.

Some comments have been received about links between Vauxhall and London Bridge in relation to route 77. Route 77 is already a long service and we suggest that a solution might be to extend route 156 via the 196 route to Elephant and Castle and on to London Bridge. The Kennington Lane route is densely populated and should be able to support a much greater volume of bus service. Alternatively a separate service could be considered, perhaps linked to the Battersea Power Station and the Chelsea Barracks developments.

### **Route 315 – tranche 348**

TfL has acknowledged that the Knights Hill estate in Tulse Hill is relatively isolated from the bus network. Route 315 is a local service which has little usage south of West Norwood High Street. We suggest that this service is diverted via Robson Road, Rosendale Road and Thurlow Park Road to Peabody Hill.

### **Route P5 – tranche 348**

This service provides essential local links in the area it serves. An extension to the Battersea Power Station development should be considered to provide local links to Stockwell and Brixton especially prior to any extension of the Northern Line to that development.

### **Route 12/N12 – tranche 349**

You will already be aware of London TravelWatch's position in relation to the replacement of articulated buses.

### **Route 37/N37 – tranche 350**

We note the comments by London Borough of Lambeth that a frequency increase would be desirable on this route.

### **Routes 44/N44, 77, 87, 219, 270, 639 and 670 – tranche 350**

Our main comment on these services is in relation to capacity on the Wandsworth – Earlsfield – Tooting corridor, and night services. We have had a number of comments that capacity on this corridor is at a premium, and that there is a demand from this area for direct services to Fulham Broadway, South Kensington and Knightsbridge. We therefore reiterate our previous position that we believe an extension to route 414 from Putney Bridge would be an appropriate means of satisfying both requirements.

On night services we believe that it would be helpful to consider :

- a) a night service on route 77 to link the night time economies of the South Bank, Clapham Junction and Garratt Lane and
- b) to provide a more comprehensive service on route N44 with earlier and later journeys from both Victoria and Sutton to cover the long gaps that currently exist between last train services both in and out of central London and the first night bus journeys. We understand that currently route N44 is worked by buses off daytime route 154 which finish at West Croydon. You will be aware of our concerns about the withdrawal of night buses between West Croydon and Sutton; we propose that consideration is given to either delinking the N44 and 154 operationally and instead adding later and earlier journeys to route 154 or to extending route N44 from Sutton to West Croydon via route 154.

### **Routes 268, H1, H2 and H3 – tranche 351**

We note the importance of route 268 in providing access to the Royal Free Hospital from the north for patients, staff and visitors from the London Borough of Barnet. It would be helpful if an accelerated programme of bus stop accessibility works and bus stop clearways were implemented on this route because of the regular clientele of wheelchair users.



### **Routes 26/N26 and 30 – tranche 352**

Route 30 is subject to comment about its reliability, and both routes should be extended to Stratford City shopping complex when it opens.

### **Routes 230 and 377 – tranche 352**

We would like to see a Sunday service on route 377.

### **Routes 9/N9, 209 and 609 – tranche 353**

We have no comments on these services.

### **Routes 274/N274 and 390/N390 – tranche 353**

We want to be consulted on any proposals to change these services in relation to access to Oxford Street. We are also conscious of the needs of the Kings Cross land development and wish to see this effectively served by bus.

### **Routes 105/N105, 140/N140, 182, H9/H10, H11, H12, H14, H17 and H18/H19 – tranche 354**

We believe that there is a good case for providing additional direct links to Northwick Park Hospital and so would like to see an extension from Harrow Town Centre of one or all of the routes in this tranche that currently terminate there.

We are also aware of the ongoing dissatisfaction about links between Southall Lane and Hatton Cross and Heathrow Terminal 4 following the withdrawal of route 435/805.

### **Routes 467, K4 and K5 – tranche 355**

We note the comments of local councils and user groups on these services, who wish to see these routes retained and enhanced.

### **Route 53/N53 – tranche 356**

We note the requests for a night service to Upper Belvedere.

### **Routes 137/N137 and 417 – tranche 357**

We note that there is still some local disquiet about capacity on route 137 in the peak times between Streatham Hill and Battersea Bridge.

### **Routes 146, 336 and R9 – tranche 358**

Services 146 and R9 generally work very well and we would not wish to see any reduction of service on these routes. Route 336 however does not enjoy a good reputation for reliability, particularly on the original route through Bickley. This has occurred since the introduction of the extension to Catford and we wonder whether, with the introduction of route 320 through to Catford, the section of the 336 between Bromley and Catford might be better served by a separate service from the main 336.

### **Routes 60, 689 and 690 – tranche 359**

We have previously commented on the structure and reliability of this service, and we note the consistent commentary from local groups that the current terminus of route 60 at Streatham is inconvenient for most passengers wanting to go to the main shopping and activity areas in Streatham.

We note the aspirations for a service linking the Streatham Vale area to St. George's Hospital in Tooting. In this context it may be helpful to consider reviewing routes 60, 109 and 255 to see if either of these routes could be altered to cover either part of route G1 or to provide the link between Streatham Vale and St. George's. Route 60 has since its inception been a difficult service to operate reliably, particularly on the core section between Thornton Heath and Purley. It may be worth considering a core network along the lines of route 60 Balham – Streatham Hill – Streatham – existing route – Croydon, 109 Brixton – existing route – Croydon – Purley, 255 Springfield Site – G1 route – Norbury – existing route - Pollards Hill, new service Croydon – Purley – Coulsdon, and G1 Tooting station – existing route – Clapham Junction.

### **Routes 370D, 608, 646, 648, 652, 656, 679, 953 and 958 – tranche 360**

We support the view of the London Borough of Havering that route 953 should operate via the Queens Hospital in Romford.

### **Routes 117, 203, 697 and 698 - tranche 361**

We have no comments on these services.

Date 18/12/09  
Author Tim Bellenger