

Budget Monitoring Sub-Committee – 21 October 2014**Transcript of Item 5 – Delivery of the Mayor’s Cycling Investment Programme**

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Our first substantial item is the Mayor’s Cycling Investment Programme. We have got five guests here, Andrew Gilligan, Patrick Doig, Nigel Hardy, David Rowe and Lilli Matson. I will start off the questioning. Could our guests tell us what they do?

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London): I am Lilli Matson, I am head of Strategy and Planning for Surface Transport, so my team is responsible for doing the planning and strategy for cycling, walking, road safety and surface transport modes.

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): David Rowe, I head up the Borough Projects and Programmes team at Transport for London (TfL) and my team manage the funding to the London boroughs for the delivery of a range of schemes: road safety, Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) as well as cycling.

Nigel Hardy (Head of Road Space Management and Sponsorship, Transport for London): Good afternoon, I am Nigel Hardy, I am Head of Sponsorship in Road Space Management - my team are responsible for sponsoring the programme of improvements on the TfL road network (TLRN), which includes the cycling programmes which are TRLN-related.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): I am Patrick Doig, I am the Director of Finance at Surface Transport.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor’s Cycling Commissioner): I am Andrew Gilligan at the Mayor’s Office, Cycling Commissioner.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): OK, so you are the political overlord of all of this?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor’s Cycling Commissioner): Yes.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): OK, that was a very quiet yes!

I know there is quite a lot of interest in this topic as well, so we will start with you, Andrew, I think. The Mayor has told us that he is planning to spend £913 million on cycling over the next few years, so can you tell us, how much of this will he have spent by the end of his term?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor’s Cycling Commissioner): We are moving now from a planning phase, which was necessary, into a delivery phase and you are starting to see consultations really proliferating on significant numbers of new routes. Of course, the well-known East-West and North-South Superhighways, which are creating the most noise, but also a whole number of other routes, the upgraded Cycle Superhighway 2 [CS2], one of the most controversial of the existing superhighways. You are seeing major junction schemes being consulted on, nine of those, Vauxhall, Elephant and Castle, Oval, Lancaster Gate, Parliament Square, Blackfriars, Tower and a whole series are in consultation or their consultation is already finished. Today we have announced the results of the consultation on the Oval Junction and we are pleased to say it was a very

favourable consultation response and we are about to get building on it. You will see similar announcements over the next few weeks.

On the Quietway side of the piece we have just applied for planning permission for the Quietway 2, which is the first of our pilot phase Quietway routes, running from Waterloo to Greenwich, includes a new segregated track behind the Millwall football ground, which has just gone out for planning permission to Lewisham Council. Lewisham is also consulting, a live consultation at the moment, went live last week, about its stretch of the route. Southwark's consultation on its stretch of that route is finished, so that is on course to be delivered by spring, as is another route through Islington and Hackney, with a later extension to Walthamstow.

We are seeing significant work progressing on the Mini-Hollands. As you know Waltham Forest, one of the three successful Mini-Holland boroughs, has already started its Mini-Holland project. They have done some trial closures in Walthamstow village and the response to those was quite mixed, about 50/50, but actually there has been a lot of favourable response since they were taken out saying, "Can we have them back?" So I think we will probably see some more of that.

I have just seen a scheme for a major gateway, we designed a major gateway to the borough. Kingston and Enfield are also in train with theirs, and we are today announcing a whole range of new funding awards, funding commitments, to unsuccessful boroughs which did not make it in the Mini-Holland competition, so that is another seven or eight schemes in outer London, including the Hammersmith and Fulham and Hounslow of Cycle Superhighway 9. It is going to be funded through the Quietway programme. It includes the remodelling of Twickenham and Ealing town centres. It includes, under a separate programme, the LIPs programme, the remodelling of Wimbledon town centre in line with what it wanted in its Mini-Holland bid and includes a scheme along the A316. In southwest London it includes two potentially new bridges across the north circular, one at Brent and one potentially at Redbridge, if we can agree with the Council where it should be. It includes a major new segregated route in Barking, which is the centrepiece of Barking and Dagenham's Mini-Holland bid. It includes the new cycle super hub and better links to Thamesmead at Abbeywood in Bexley.

So a really large variety of schemes getting the go-ahead, or in consultation and ready to proceed, and more coming as well. We have written to all 32 boroughs over the last week saying what we want to do for phase 2 Quietway.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): If I could pause you, it sounded like a superb example of not answering the question, although it was quite comprehensive and I want you to read it in the record of the meeting, but the question was how much of the £930 million will you have spent by the end of the Mayoral term?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It is just about £300 million, just under £300 million.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): No, well actually we will spend about £370 million of that Mayoral term, which is broadly in line with what we said originally in the Mayor's Cycling Vision, which was "almost £400 million".

John Biggs AM (Chairman): So by Election Day 2016, £370 million of the £913 million will have gone out the door?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): Yes, that is our calculation.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Given it is a ten-year programme, I suppose that is actually ahead of the curve, is that right?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): That is certainly correct. What we are doing is we are frontloading a lot of the investment spending, in terms of the infrastructure, because when it on the ground it has to be working for us, and that is more frontloaded over the ten years, but it is a ten-year programme.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): The Mayor, indeed, said almost £400 million would have been spent by April 2016. There is quite a bit of catching up to do on that, is there not, because you have slipped in this year at least. Can you tell us a bit about that?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): In our submission we gave our latest forward --

John Biggs AM (Chairman): I do not want to stop you speaking, Andrew, as well. You are allowed to speak as well.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): OK.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Go on. This is about the man with the numbers, so you can tell us that.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): I will do the numbers first. Just in terms of this year, the committee has written in its cover note that we are forecasting to spend £11 million less than our original budget. I think it is important that the Sub-Committee understands and we are better explaining that not all underspends are bad. Actually around half of that underspend we are forecasting for this year is savings, which is a savings on the cycle highway expansion intensification and some other cycle highway improvements. I know savings will be reinvested into the programme and to fund future improvements.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): We want to dig a bit later into the quality of what you have done, but you are saying that underspend is a good thing because it is about getting it right, is that right?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): What I said was that underspends are not necessarily bad. I think the Sub-Committee need to dig into them and actually what we are doing is being more transparent in our reporting. You will notice in our quarterly progress reports, later on your agenda, we are now being much more transparent about our cycling expenditure, to help you understand what is driving the financials.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Let me put it this way, John, our purpose is not to spend money for its own sake, or to meet an annual spending quota. That would risk waste, it would risk failure, and our purpose is to deliver high quality cycling facilities. Having spent the time planning them we are now in a position to start delivering them and you will see the year ahead being a year of significant delivery.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): So you do not actually need increased activity, you were always planning to ramp this up and have a massive splurge next year? We have a nod at Lilli's end of the table there.

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London): Well, I am just agreeing with that Patrick said.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): I think that what you see is that we are going through the planning cycle on this project because we have been through a planning phase, a design and modelling phase and we are now in consultation. You see a number of schemes out on consultation at the moment. The spend really kicks in when delivery will start. We are very much at that tipping point in the next few months, those schemes will start and our spend rate will significantly increase.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I have been meeting various boroughs and saying that if there are other things that they want to do and they think they can do, but capacity is a really important issue for them, given the amount of reductions and capacity they have suffered, then we would be happy to see if we can fund them.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): I was just going to ask you another high-level question then, because you have hinted at one of them. What are the greatest risks to delivery of this? Because quite often there are agents doing this for you. You say capacity might be a problem. Maybe our project overlord at the end of the table might know better, but go on, Andrew. Give it a stab, Andrew and then someone from TfL will correct you. Go on.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): There are different elements of the programme. There are elements which have been delivered by TfL directly. Most of the superhighways and the junctions are, not all of them but most of them.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): That is because most of them are on TfL roads?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Most of the superhighways are, I believe, although again not all of them. One is almost entirely not on TfL roads, for instance. The big high intervention segregated ones are nearly on TRLN roads. CS2 upgrade, the replacement south Merton nearly all on TfL roads.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Anyway, I diverted you, go on.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): The risks there I think are principally political, that if the opposition to some of the schemes kind of derails it. We have seen overwhelming support from both businesses and the public for the East-West, 73% if you exclude don't-knows in a YouGov poll in the *Standard* last week I saw. Even if that means removing traffic lanes, two to one support, even if it means slowing down traffic, which I was enormously encouraged by.

We have also seen huge support from businesses, 100 major businesses now signed up including Royal Bank of Scotland, Unilever, Orange, Deloitte, big, big names, more coming in all the time. Equally we have seen some fairly --

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Risks. Keep risks in mind.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Yes, I am just enumerating the risks. There is some opposition to the East-West Superhighway.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): I think you were enumerating opportunities actually. Try to stick to risks.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): The risk to the delivery of the East-West Cycle Superhighway is essentially political. There is a project team in place. There are a couple of delivery issues but the main risk is essentially political that those seeking to derail the projects succeed in doing so. The risk in the borough programmes is capacity, both on our part and the borough part. What we are doing is appointing a delivery agent, probably within the next three or four weeks, to deliver the Quietway programme and we hope that that will provide some of the capacity that we are going to need to delivery that programme.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Mr Rowe, can you correct Mr Gilligan's presentation?

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): As Andrew said, we are in the process of appointing contractors to help work with the boroughs. What we found from the first seven Quietways that we have been working with the boroughs on, and that involves 15 of the 33 London boroughs, is that there are different requirements in different areas. It might be a particular borough needs help in terms of consultation and engagement with the local community, another one needs help with detailed design of schemes. The delivery agent we are putting in place is effectively a call-off contract and the boroughs can come to us and say, "We need help with this particular part of the programme". We can make that support available so that that does not become a constraint in terms of the delivery of the routes.

Nigel Hardy (Head of Road Space Management and Sponsorship, Transport for London): I think Andrew is absolutely right to point out the political side of things. Just to confirm on the Cycle Superhighway side, the vast majority of the routes, whether they are on TRLN or not, will be delivered through TfL's term contractors, so we are limited in the risk in that context.

We also for any infrastructure scheme will take a view on where we can quantify risk, both in terms of programme and in terms of cost, we will do that so each of the schemes will have an element of risk built into them, both time wise and budget wise.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): No one has mentioned a serious project risk in terms of actually building the things. They are pretty simple to build when you want to build them, is that right?

Nigel Hardy (Head of Road Space Management and Sponsorship, Transport for London): In engineering terms, they are not massively difficult projects to build. They all have their challenges and obviously with a cycling route you have to deliver and end-to-end route in one go. It is difficult to leave part of a route with a hole in the middle and not deliver that, so we do have to ensure that we get that right in terms of delivery. There are always some challenges - I think we all know the issues around London's road system. We have statistics - gas pipes, electricity cables, that sort of thing, which we are not always 100% certain around, so we always build in time and budge to enable us to deal with those unknown factors.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): OK, broadly TfL, for its projects has in place a very effectively delivery team which has considered all these issues in exhaustive detail and has factored them in to its calculations of how long the routes will take to build. The thing that is unpredictable is the politics.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): I will let you guys in a second, but I have two wicked questions. One is I remember several years ago we were talking about cycling and it was seen as very much a second-division activity and so there is a question about the quality and the skillset within TfL, whether you had your most experienced transport planners or novices straight out of the transport planning kindergarten, or whatever the nomenclature is, who were doing it. You know what I mean. You need to have people who can understand and drive these things through, so there is a not a skills issue within TfL.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): I certainly would disagree that the cycling is seen as a second-division activity.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): I think in the past it would have been seen as that, for all sorts of bad political reasons or whatever.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): As it has been very much a key transport and political priority for a number of years now, that ought to be reflected in the quality of staff that we have working on these projects and very much our best people are here today and working back in the office to delivery these things.

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London): I would say that, in fact, because of the excitement of this programme, I am just doing some recruiting at the moment and it is for these roles that you get most applicants and the most talented applicants applying, because it is seen to be a Mayoral high priority, it is something interesting. It is also something that does capture the public opinion. I think maybe that perception has significantly changed from a couple of years ago.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): I think that is very welcome. My other wicked question of Andrew is: which is the most sinful London borough then?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): You know, I do not want to single anyone out actually. On the whole they have all be pretty good. It is not a question of will, like I said, it is a question of capacity. They are all pretty willing.

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): Just to come back on that point about support, we are very conscious that is not just the skills within TfL that are relevant, it is the skills in the London boroughs. We have put in place an extensive training programme that is available for our staff as well as borough staff that primarily revolves around the London Cycle Design Standards that we published earlier this year, and application of those standards in different environments. We also have a dedicated training budget that we use to support boroughs to help them bring their staff up to speed. So we are very conscious it is not just TfL, we do need to think about that wider delivery planning.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Some boroughs that get criticised by cyclists I found extremely helpful, like Westminster for instance. We have got excellent relationships with Westminster and they have been extremely helpful over the superhighways and the Central London Grid, which is what the Quietways are called in central London.

Darren Johnson AM: Yes, thank you, Chair, and thank you for allowing us to come along to this meeting today.

Just going back to the point about the ten-year investment programme, it is obviously, very, very welcome to have a long-term investment programme for cycling, but one of my concerns is so much of it is reliant on delivery outside of the current Mayoral term. There was a quote in the Politics UK website last month, an interview with a senior source at TfL. I do not know if one of you are the senior source this afternoon, but it did say:

"The source said the new lanes would take longer than expected to implement and suggested that the mayor's ten year budget for the programme could be scaled back in future years."

A cynic would say that it is just a matter of trying to do enough to keep Andrew Gilligan happy in the short term, knowing that he will be out of your hair in the next term, and that you can just quietly start scaling things back. What is the response from TfL?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): Certainly I think this is a long-term political priority. TfL exists to deliver the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the long-term target in that to have a 5% cycling road share was first set under the previous Mayor and has been retained by this Mayor. It is a long-term commitment to delivering that aim. The investment that we are currently in the process of delivering was first put in our business plan in 2012. It has been through annual business rounds ever since and intense scrutiny during the spending review at Department for Transport (DfT) and the Treasury. It stayed in there because there is very robust analysis that supports it and it is an incredibly well-thought out business case.

Darren Johnson AM: It is easy to keep the figures in there and the budget line in there and all the rest of it, but then hoodwink the next Mayor with underspends and so on, as to how much is actually being delivered.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): There is just one more point and then I will hand over to Nigel. As we just talked about with the Chair at the start of the meeting, we will be spending almost £400 million of that £930 million in this term, so there will be a significant amount delivered and in train. I think this is a long-term priority for TfL and presumably any future Mayor.

Darren Johnson AM: That £400 million delivered, not simply committed but delivered, is what you are anticipating.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): It is £370 million but, yes, that was spent, not committed.

Nigel Hardy (Head of Road Space Management and Sponsorship, Transport for London): Just to try to give some level of reassurance for stuff that is in my area, just because there is a set number of things to be delivered by May 2016 does not mean that that is all that is being worked on at the moment. Many of these schemes are quite a long delivery horizon. They take a number of years to plan and get out and implement. We are by no means scaling back any of those plans. We are working to a programme that runs well beyond May 2016 and we are fully occupied in doing that at the moment.

Darren Johnson AM: So you totally refute this view from this off the record interview by some senior person?

Nigel Hardy (Head of Road Space Management and Sponsorship, Transport for London): I do not know where that would have come from but that is not part of our --

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London): If I could just pick it up from the strategy point of view. I think what is absolutely clear in TfL is that cycling is a very major mode of transport, which supports the rest of the network. There is more daily cyclist than there are users of the London Overground, for example. That is now very much accepted in terms of how we put together our investment. We do not know what will happen with future national Government spending rounds or whatever, but we do have an absolute commitment to investing in this and keeping on that investment, so I do not think we should be swayed by perhaps comments on that website, for example.

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): I think the other important point to note is that with the publication of the Mayor's Vision for Cycling there was a need to think about the delivery of those new programmes, so the Quietway, the Mini-Hollands, the Central London Grid, for example is in the area that I manage, where we had to work with those boroughs and say, "OK, what are these going to look like, what does it make sense in terms of the schemes that go forward?" We need to get those designs right so that they address the issues that cyclists need to see resolved at those critical points on those routes. We are now moving from that point into the delivery. Andrew gave you a flavour of where we are with all that, but it does take a bit of time, but you want to get it right. What we do not want to be accused of is just spending money for the sake of it and not delivering the solutions that cyclists need.

Darren Johnson AM: Andrew, have you encountered any reluctance on TfL's part to delivery on the Mayor's programmes?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): No Mayor can commit his successor, obviously. My wish is to get as much as we can humanly deliver before this Mayor leaves office, in order that, let us say, another Mayor came in and decided that actually he or she did not want to support cycling, that at least we would get what we have got out the door.

Darren Johnson AM: In terms of the different aspects of the overall investment plan from the Cycle Superhighways, the Quietways and Mini-Hollands and so on, which would you have the most concerns about in terms of actually getting them delivered and TfL having the capacity to deliver it?

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Aren't we delving into this a little bit later on?

Darren Johnson AM: It was still a general scene setting question, but I will not go into any further detail on that.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): A general scene setting answer then.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Those which TfL are directly responsible for delivering of course we have more control over than those which they are not directly responsible for delivering.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I just wanted to pick up the issue of risk, because this is a very ambitious, very bold programme. It is very exciting indeed but clearly, as you have already touched on, the noise we have heard from very influential lobbying groups. Is there a risk that the Mayor could wobble on this?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): On which?

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: On the decision to go ahead with so much segregated cycle lane taking away the road space, which has caused so much controversy.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It is, to be fair, a consultation, and the purpose of a consultation is to consult, like I said to you last week. I do not think we should automatically assume that the result is absolutely set in stone, as the Mayor has himself said. I do not think I would characterise it as wobbling though.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: OK, but is there a risk that you could end up watering down the plans to try to keep some organisations and others happy, lobby groups happy and the impact of that is that you lose some of this bold vision that you have?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): We have been subject to intense pressure from some quarters to reduce the scope of the plans. We genuinely have not taken any kind of decisions, or even looked at any kind of options yet, myself, for doing that, but we will see what happens at the end of the consultation.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Is the consultation for TfL to determine or for the Mayor to determine?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It is for the Mayor to determine.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: In terms of your overall risk plan, what other areas do you have red lights against, rather than green lights that you are worried about, that we have not mentioned already?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I think I mentioned the main risks as I see them. As I said, and I absolutely repeat in answer to your previous question, the main risk of delivery of the superhighways, particularly the big ones in central London, is political, and the main risk to the delivery of the borough stuff is capacity. As I say, I hope the delivery agent we are about to appoint for the Quietways will help the boroughs who are very stretched, and it is not fault of their own, with any capacity issues they may have.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: OK, and there are no other issues apart from those two, just to be absolutely clear, that you have reds against?

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): I think the issue that is important to understand is that there are always risks associated with individual projects and we hold risk registers looking at each of them. One of the first Quietways is from Waterloo to Greenwich, and it involves construction of a new link, as Andrew said, by Millwall Football Club that uses Network Rail land. That is subject to planning permission. Not receiving planning permission is a potential risk. We recognise all these risks in relation to projects, it is just understanding them and what we need to do.

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London): There are some third parties that are planning and other broader issues that could cause problems to this project as well.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: OK, that is fine.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Without repeating the work of the Transport Committee, which we are very keen not to do, there could be some areas where you mitigate risk by descoping things which are too difficult or unfundable. I suppose we should record that that might be the case. The one that always come to my mind would be the Bow Roundabout, because there is a project but it is potentially stupendously expensive and will take a lot of planning to happen, so in terms of timescale planning, funding, it is something that probably cannot be concluded. You will have the Cycle Superhighway ending each side of it, but the thing itself is currently too difficult. So, there are some risk areas which are mitigated by accepting that you cannot really resolve those straight away.

Nigel Hardy (Head of Road Space Management and Sponsorship, Transport for London): I am not sure I quite agree with the description of a Cycle Superhighway being either side of it. We have a very safe solution that we have installed for cyclists on Bow Roundabout at the moment, and we have an interim scheme which we aim to deliver by May 2016, which will provide signalised pedestrian facilities at the roundabout as well.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): We have made a number of improvements at Bow already as you know and they have resulted in a reduction in the number of incidents there, but it is a difficult location because in order to make the inner section of the superhighway upgrade work we have to ideally reduce the traffic coming down that intersection and, therefore, maintain the --

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Again we are at risk of becoming the Transport Committee. As a global question, are there other areas where you have said, "We would like to do this but it is too difficult and, therefore, we need to de-scope to address it"?

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London): I think if you remember Patrick's point about over-programming it, it helps to address your question, Caroline, in that there will inevitably be within many, many schemes we are delivering, little hiccups or hitches on the way and some of them will need to be pushed back, but if we have taken a degree of over-programming into account, we can keep the global programme moving forward, while other projects might have different delivery dates, because that --

John Biggs AM (Chairman): You are stealing Darren's next question. You can repeat that sentence in about 30 seconds. Just to complete the first question, there is obviously another risk which we have never spoken about and we assume is not going to happen, which is TfL has been relatively immune from the spending cuts in local government elsewhere. If there was a catastrophic change in that funding situation that would obviously be a risk. So we can just record that that is the case but we are currently are not anticipating it.

Darren Johnson AM: Yes, if we move specifically on to the issue of underspend in the current period. Firstly, I will put it to Lilli first off then. Why at the end of quarter 2 is TfL forecasting an underspend of £11 million for 2014/15?

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London): I am actually going to ask Patrick to respond.

Darren Johnson AM: Given all the assurances that we have had in the past that you have learnt the lessons and that you are over-programming and so on, how come we still have an underspend of £1 million for 2014/15 forecast?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): As I said in my opening remarks, around half of the underspend is through delivering savings on the Cycle Superhighway expansion intensification project and the phase 2 system improvements. That is about delivering efficiencies in a project, doing the same for less money. That money does not get lost in the programme, it will be reinvested into future improvements. That half of it is definitely a good news story and certainly as a finance director I am pleased with types of savings.

The other half is due to rephasing of projects, primarily Cycle Superhighways where we have updated the programme in the quarter 2, which accounts for the other half, the other £5 million or so of that variance.

Darren Johnson AM: Last year Andrew shared his frustrations about underspends, and I think Peter Hendy [Commissioner of Transport] did as well, with the Transport Committee. Andrew told us last year that the slippage problem would go away in future years. Obviously efficiency savings we welcome, if a project can be

delivered of good quality for less funding than envisaged, we welcome that; however, in terms of slippage, why is it proving more difficult to keep the spending plans on track than you suggested last year, Andrew?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Underspends are falling. I am looking at the numbers we gave you. We have an underspend forecast of £7 million in non-TRLN infrastructure, that is going to an overspend of £20 million actually, which shows that underspends of previous years are being picked up. TRLN infrastructures £10 million coming down to £7 million. As I said to you before, I am really concerned to ensure that we get good schemes going before the Mayor leaves office, in order to make sure that this money cannot then clawed back under a future Mayor.

Darren Johnson AM: Does that mean that we need more over-programming then? Are we doing enough, given the inevitable slippages, and the welcome efficiency savings and so on that can be found along the way, given that objective, are we actually doing enough programming? Should we be planning more?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): In the end how much we can do depends on the capacity of those people that are doing it. TfL's capacity is fairly --

Darren Johnson AM: You have the money and we are told there are bright, enthusiastic people queueing up wanting to work for TfL to take these projects forward.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): TfL's capacity is currently quite heavily occupied with the East-West, North-South Cycle Superhighway upgrade of CS2, enormous schemes, which have huge stakeholder implications as much as anything else, and the junctions.

What I have been doing is going around the boroughs, particularly the central London boroughs saying, "Actually, is there anything more you would like to do, and you think you have the capacity to do, before 2016 and we can give you some more money for that?" I have had such meetings with Camden, Lambeth and Islington. I have got meetings with all the Central London Grid boroughs arranged, where I am going around to them saying, "Is there anything more you think you can do?" But ultimately we are in their hands on that because it is their roads and it is their officers and staff who will have to implement the changes. If they say, "Yes, we would like to spend some more money" I would be happy to give them some of the underspend. If not, well, we are in their hands essentially.

Darren Johnson AM: Can you be confident that in a year's time the underspends will be less than what is currently forecast for this cycling budget?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): I am confident about that fact, and increasingly so. Just looking at all our investment programmes at a global level, the level of an underspend from any particular programme or portfolio is directly correlated to its maturity and its progression. I think we have seen that over the three years since the publication of the cycling vision and the development of this programme, it is now increasing assurance in that delivery phase. In that phase the level of underspend average decreases quite significantly.

We have looked at these things, we factored it in. Also, to answer your initial question, we have increased the level of over-programming over the last year to compensate for some of that, as well as trying to increase our delivery, make sure we have got the right level of over-programming there. We are trying to tackle it from both sides and that gives us certainly increased confidence. That is evidenced results, if you exclude the saving slippage of around £5 million, which will be significantly better than certainly where we were 12 months ago.

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): Can I just provide a simple example of rephrasing? So if you look at the Mini-Hollands budget, based on the figures we gave you, we were starting at the start of the financial year to forecast £4 million spend and we have revised that to £2 million. The reason being that we only announced who the successful boroughs were at the end of March, and there was then a process of sitting down with each of those boroughs to look at their delivery plans and say, "OK, well what can take place when in terms of capacity to build this?" From that we have phased the budget so we have moved some of the money into 2015/16, but we have also pulled money from 2016/17 in to 2015/16, because there is a lot of work happening now in terms of the design, but the bulk of the delivery is moving into 2015/16 and 2016/17. You need to factor in those sort of practicalities around, OK, when do these decision points be made and then what does that mean in terms of the profile of the delivery of these projects.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Let me say I am acutely conscious of the issues that you raise and I am extremely clear that I want as much money as can be delivered on good, good value schemes - and not spending money for the sake of it - as much money as can be delivered on good, good value schemes out the door before the Mayor also goes out the door.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Would it not, therefore, be more prudent to say that you anticipate you will come in under budget this year because you are maintaining the quality of delivery?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): Certainly that is part of what the overall programming is there to do, to counterbalance your point.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): You are undershooting on the over-programming because you will probably come in under budget in the end? If you are £11 million down now, then what tends to happen with budgets of public authorities is that they tend to do worse as the year progresses, unless you fundamentally change the way in which you are working on that.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): There are two things, just to clarify. I am not anticipating that we bring that back and spend £81 million. Our forecast is for £70 million for this year. As I said, as we move into that delivery phase, which we are on the tipping point to do, there is a much lower risk of underspend, so I am more confident in that quantitative figure.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I just want to pick up, Andrew, you said you are going around the inner London boroughs talking to them about what things they have that they can spend by 2016, but we know that outer London has the potential to see more people cycling, in sort of those short journeys. Are you also talking to the outer London boroughs, because I know lots of them worked up stuff for the Mini-Holland bids? A lot of people focused their thinking around cycling and actually, I know we have not got the details yet, but you have said that you funded various things from that, but there may be stuff in outer London that is ready to go, so that you would not have this underspend and you could build that into your over-programming.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): That is absolutely right. We have written to all the boroughs, in fact, inner and outer, over the last two weeks - mostly the week before last, a few went out last week - giving them the good news as to what they were going to get. As you know, there are 20 outer London boroughs, 18 of those took part, applied for Mini-Holland funding. We could only give it to three, but we promised the runners up that they would get things out of the programme as well, out of that and other programmes. Last week and the week before was when we wrote to them to say what they would get. That was the list of things I gave at the beginning of the meeting, so there are some very major schemes involved in that. Ealing, Twickenham town centres, the list anyway, but also in that all 32 boroughs got letters saying,

“We would also be interested in funding the following Quietway routes in your borough”. The Quietways programme is going to cover all 32 boroughs in central London, it is called Central London Grid

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor’s Cycling Commissioner): No, this is essentially what I am telling outer London boroughs.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: You are saying you would look at funding other things in the outer boroughs.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor’s Cycling Commissioner): Yes, we have made a commitment to allocate substantial funding for these major schemes, and for the second place Quietways. The Quietways are in two phases, the first phase is in delivery now and the first routes will be delivered in spring and the rest thereafter – that is seven routes entering a total of 15 boroughs. Then the second phase is a couple of dozen routes entering all 32 boroughs. I hope a significant portion of that will be either delivered or in delivery before 2016, and that is where we are going to try to get the extra money.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: That is good, thank you.

Roger Evans AM: It was reassuring, Andrew, to hear you say earlier that the target was achieving things, rather than spending money. This is quite a large investment programme. How do you ensure the projects that you have selected represent good value for money?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor’s Cycling Commissioner): There is an internal independent advisory group, which is examining and has examined the --

Roger Evans AM: Is this Independent Investment Programme Advisory Group (IIPAG)?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor’s Cycling Commissioner): IIPAG indeed. So there is a level of, I don’t know, what you would call it, ‘internal autonomous grouping’, they are not part of TfL. TfL can explain exactly what they are and what they do. I have had a number of discussions with them and they have satisfied themselves that it reflects value for money.

I do think there are sometimes difficulties, as we have always said from the beginning, in measuring cycle schemes by traditional benefit cost ratio (BCR) type metrics, because not all the benefits are immediately quantifiable. I think some of the disbenefits are all too quantifiable.

To give you an example, on the East-West Cycle Superhighway, the modelling we have issued does not in fact include any numbers at all for what we believe would be one of the biggest benefits of the scheme, that is modal shift. The modelling actually assumes there will be no modal shift whatever. That is a standard artefact of modelling, but it is clearly wrong, because modal shift is one of the major points, major purposes of the scheme. That is one of the reasons why traditional indicators do not always capture the full benefits of cycle schemes. I can tell you that previous cycle schemes have seen significant benefits in terms of modal shift, shifting from modes which are both more expensive and less sustainable to provide, like car, bus and train.

On CS7, for instance, they did a survey after it had been in operation for a year and found that 32% of people using CS7 were new to cycling or had previously used other modes, and that represents about 750 cyclists in the peak three hours, and that is the same as about ten full busloads of people. Clearly transporting those people in ten buses would cost the taxpayer, and indeed the planet, a lot more than transporting them on bicycles, so that is a benefit, but it was not captured in traditional benefit-cost analysis.

Roger Evans AM: The buses sound like a lot, but when you look across the whole of London --

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It is quite interesting actually. Let us take these big schemes. The East-West and North-South Cycle Superhighways together will have the capacity for 6,000 people and hour, now that is the same as 82 full buses of people, 72-seat double-deck busses. It is the same as, I think, 20 Tube trains based on seating capacity. It is a huge amount of capacity added to the transport network, and it is really important to see cycling holistically as part of the transport network. Every extra person who is on a bike creates a space for another person on the Tube and on the bus. That is what some of the opponents of cycle schemes sometimes miss.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): If you did a proper value for money you would work out whether it was more cost effective to buy another bust or to build a cycleway.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Yes, we can capture this to some extent and Lilli [Matson] can talk about it. Like I say, at the moment our traffic modelling that we issued for the East-West, North-South Cycle Superhighway does not account at all for modal shift, which will be one of the major benefits.

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London): Just very briefly, the disciplines of our own governance structures, which do include IIPAG obviously critically going over things, does demand that we provide business cases for all of our schemes. Indeed we did do this for the whole £913 million vision portfolio and it went to the TfL Board last February. Using the type of business case assessment and valuation, even with its faults, which Andrew has rightly pinpointed, did allow us to identify journey time reliability benefits, safety benefits, the benefits in terms of improved journey flow to other users and overall using the recognised business case methodology. The vision portfolio as a whole has as a business case, as Patrick [Doig] said, of around three to one, which is very good value. We do rigorously try to do that for all of the programmes, the Quietway programmes, the Cycle Superhighway programmes. So even within the constraints of sometimes these benefits are hard to quantify, we do work to demonstrate that we are driving value for money and identifying not only the best schemes but the best alignments within those schemes to make sure that we are going to capture the most users, for new projects. I think that is then demonstrated, as Andrew is saying, in terms of the users that we are now seeing on schemes that we have not put in place like CS7, which have definitely returned on their business case, in terms of what we thought they would deliver.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): The actual BCR might well be in excess of three to one.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): It might not be.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): To give another example, the East-West Cycle Superhighway runs along the --

John Biggs AM (Chairman): You say it might be, but you do not know.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): We have established the BCR of three to one for the overall cycling programme, based on the conventional modelling, whose flaws I have explained. As I say, if we believe there is going to be some modal shift, as there always has been in the past, and almost certainly will be in this, then the business case improves even further.

Roger Evans AM: I think we accept that there are some uncertainties in this because we are doing something new, and that means it is an opportunity to learn as well. Will there be a review in a couple of years' time? Will you be able to come back to this Committee and say, "We set ourselves these targets to achieve value for money and we have achieved them" or possibly, "We have fallen short"?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): I was going to say the same thing. We have committed to the TfL Board that we will do an annual review of the overall cycling programme. So, as I said, as we mentioned in February we took them the overall business case and then each year after we will be going on with a progress report of how it is going and a reassessment and re-evaluation of the overall portfolio to assure ourselves that we are heading in the right direction.

Roger Evans AM: What are the targets? I mean, you may not have numbers there but what are the sorts of things you will be looking at.

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): Can I just give an example? For the Quietways, the first seven routes that we spoke about, we have counts running at the moment for 110 sites across those seven routes, to understand the current levels of cycling. We also have surveyors who are intercepting cyclists on those routes to understand their origins and destinations, why they have chosen to cycle, what are the characteristics of those routes, is it safe for them, are there issues that need to be addressed. We will be doing similar after. We are interested obviously in the uplift in the number of cyclists and where those cyclists are coming from so we can understand what has happened in terms of that mode shift. So every part of the programme has that information in terms of monitoring, it is a critical part of our understanding.

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London): In terms of doing that annual overview we would be looking at both achievement against overall outcomes. Are there people cycling more, and we should say that there are more people cycling in London now than there have ever been, and we know that from our counts; are people getting safer. So those are some of the overarching ones but we would also look at outputs in terms of have we actually delivered the seven that we said we were going to do. The board will be interested in both progress against the overall outcomes, which is about the growth and the use and people being safer, in terms of when they are cycling, as well as actually the achievement of certain programme milestones, which we will track with them. On both of those we had hoped to keep the programme as a whole on track and on target.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): I am crabby about this, I want to burrow into this question a bit more, and I will start with Lilli Matson.

As I understand it, there is a fairly established Green Book methodology for evaluating projects and it is a fairly flexible methodology as well, so people will learn in their life's experience and you can give value to previously untested quantities, in terms of evaluating a project. There are emotive issues, so the cost of safety for example, and there are saved minutes and so on and transport schemes tend to be over-dominated by saved minutes, possibly at the cost of safety. I think you lot are far better at this than I am, because you do it for a living, but I suppose the problem one has in terms of value for money is that you could quite easily imagine over-engineering bits of it and under-engineering other bits of it. You could have a nice straight piece of road and say, "We've got to spend the money, let's build a super-duper superhighway along this piece of road". Everyone finds it crystal clear safe and it is a wonderful piece of highway, but when you get to the tricky junction, which is a lot more difficult to sort out, you end up with something which is possibly relatively under engineered, and these are the sorts of things where we tend to have accidents and anxieties.

Without doing the job of the Transport Committee, which has done its job perfectly well on this issue last week, I would like to understand what you have in terms of host project evaluation and in terms of real independent peer monitoring and evaluation of these things, because we are talking about almost £1 billion of public money on this to ensure that it is safe, that it is value for money, that it works and that we learn from experience on it. Just droning on a little bit more, if you take the example of the superhighway in my patch along the Mile End Road, without going into all the technicalities of it, the fact is that it was put in pretty cheaply and it did not maintain public confidence. A new one is being proposed now, which looks a lot better, but we need to make sure that we are spending the right amount of money to make it safe, without creating future hostages where people will analyse it and say, "Is it really value for money? Has it really achieved those objectives?"

What have you got within TfL that ensures this is the case?

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):

At the London-wide level, I think, what you are mainly referring to also is, is the need to ensure that our designs are appropriate for the types of routes that we are designing. We went out to consultation this summer on the new revised *London Cycling Design Standards* and it is a massive document, so I will not go into detail, but in a very simple way what it is very clear about is that the levels of segregation, the levels of infrastructure that you put in need to be relevant to the type of road that you are putting it into.

When we talk about superhighways, which tend to be, as we said, on our own road network carrying heavier flows of perhaps faster moving traffic then higher degrees of segregation are required. The *London Cycling Design Standards* is also very clear that on quieter roads, where the safety can be assured through less intrusive designs, you do not need to spend so much money and you do not need such intrusive schemes. We did an international benchmarking study of 12 different countries to devise the best approach to cycle design. We will soon be publishing that study.

Just in terms of post-project monitoring, we have a very comprehensive monitoring plan put into place. One of the questions you flagged in your letter was that you might ask about the central London metric. There is a new measure that we are now measuring quarterly across central London, so that we can track the growth in cycling and we can see where the Central London Grid or Quietways or Superhighways coming into central London are or are not delivering cycling growth. We are also doing that across outer London and inner London.

The monitoring plan that underpins this is very important, because I want to know, when I make case for future investment, that the things we have done have been value for money and they have driven growth. Who knows? Some of them might not be as effective as we would have hoped. We would need to learn those lessons so that when we go back in future business planning rounds we can make an even better case for more investment. So, that monitoring programme is very much in place. It is about counts, it is about qualitative information and it is about some project-specific monitoring that will go on for like the Mini-Hollands, we will have special bespoke studies because the Mini-Hollands were such significant investments.

Nigel Hardy (Head of Road Space Management and Sponsorship, Transport for London): I think that does, as Lilli described, have to be at many different levels, so at the macro level an understanding of what is going on right the way across London and what is happening for individual projects. For example, on Stratford High Street, we introduced the CS2 extension, that was the first fully segregated section of route that we have put in. We have already gone back in to have a look at the numbers of people, the numbers of cyclists who are actually using that segregated facility, how many choose to be out in the road, how many choose to be in the segregated facility. The percentage is actually very high of people who are using the segregation. We also

introduced some new features for Cycle Superhighways like bus stop bypasses, where the cycle path goes around the back of bus stops. We have undertaken video monitoring and customer research already in terms of how those types of facilities have been received and whether there have been any problems or anything like that.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Going back to Roger's [Evans AM] earlier question about IIPAG. IIPAG did a high-level review of the vision, are they doing more detailed stuff on individual projects? Because I think the individual projects would probably have fallen below their threshold for normally looking at projects.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): Certainly IIPAG take a direct interest in cycling and that is something which we very much welcome. They are doing it at actually three levels in this portfolio. They are doing the overall review of the portfolio, and they will be involved in that every year. Also for all our major projects and programmes they will do their normal gate reviews, but they have actually also looked at programmes below the usual threshold, just to give us that extra assurance.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Are those reports shared? Are they available?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): The comments are certainly reflected in the Finance and Policy Committee, both minutes and papers. I am not sure if their formal papers are available to read. One final layer that IIPAG are actually providing is they have done some very detailed workshops on the Cycle Superhighways and have really helped us facilitate some of that.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): OK, that is very helpful. For the record, because there are bound to be lots of cyclists watching this, I am a great enthusiast, but our job as a Committee is to try to ensure we scrutinise and ensure there is value for money. I am not trying to shoot things down, I just want to make sure, we are spending almost £1 billion of Londoner's money and we need to make sure that we are spending it wisely.

Tom Copley AM: Andrew, how many of the Cycle Superhighways will be fully completed by May 2016?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): We are still doing the same number, but they are not all going to be in the same places and they will not all be finished by May 2016. We have deleted, as you know, two from the programme, CS6 and CS12 and they have been replaced by two rather more ambitious ones, the East-West and the North-South. We have also taken out CS10 because it goes to the same place as the East-West will go, into the quadrant of northwest London and the East-West is going to serve it much more effectively along the A40.

We are still doing CS9, it is one of the ones I announced at the beginning of the meeting. On the Hammersmith and Fulham and Hounslow sections of the route, which is the vast majority of the route. That is one of the funding commitments we had made today.

Tom Copley AM: This is additional, because this is not in what TfL have submitted?

John Biggs AM (Chairman): You are using this meeting to make announcements about your future spending? I am very happy if you are.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Absolutely, yes.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): If you give us a copy of the press release that would be very good.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It was the first thing I said at the meeting, this is what we are announcing, these extra schemes in the suburbs, one of which is the Hounslow and Hammersmith and Fulham portions of CS9.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Good.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): OK, the others, East-West and North-South, subject to the politics, they will be delivered by May 2016.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Partially.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): East-West: the section of the Westway will probably be in build by May 2016, it will probably be delivered later that year, but some of that depends on how the consultation on the other bit goes.

The CS1, which is from the City to Tottenham, that will be delivered by 2016. CS2, the upgrade of that will be delivered by 2016. CS5, the inner section, the consultation on that has already finished and we, subject to the consultation, which I think has been very positive, we should be able to actually get going on that pretty soon, so that will be pre-2016, and that includes a superhighway segregated track through Vauxhall Cross - where somebody died of course in the summer - and over Vauxhall Bridge --

Tom Copley AM: Hasn't CS5 been rescheduled for 2016/17, that is what we have here?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): You are thinking about the extension.

Tom Copley AM: Sorry, the extension, yes.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): There is a proposal to build an extension to the Cycle Superhighway down to Lewisham and that would involve a new bridge across the tracks at New Cross Gate, which is complicated and is going to mean it takes longer. The core part of CS5, the most dangerous bit will be finished next year, I hope. It is one of the earlier schemes. As I say, consultation has already finished on that, it finished last month.

CS11, Brent Cross to the West End, we expect to consult on that early next year. We might try to bring it forward a bit, but I think it is more likely to be next year, and that will be finished in 2016, but not, I do not think by May.

There is another superhighway in Waltham Forest, part of Waltham Forest's Mini-Holland bid, which they hope to deliver by 2016.

Tom Copley AM: CS4, that is 2018?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): CS4 is going to be delivered in phases. Just remind me of the dates again, Nigel? I mean we are talking that, none of it, is probably pre-2016.

Nigel Hardy (Head of Road Space Management and Sponsorship, Transport for London): Three phases, the first two we expect to deliver within 2017 and the final phase by 2018, but these dates are within the submission that we have put in to --

Tom Copley AM: Yes. Why was that rescheduled?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): We are doing quite a lot in south east London already. As you know, our first Quietway I mentioned, Quietway 2 going from Waterloo to Greenwich, and then the second phase of that route will extend it to Bexleyheath. Therefore, there is going to be a really good cycle route from central London to southeast London by roughly this spring, what is that, six months' time or less, subject to the kind of planning permission type risks that David [Rowe] mentioned. That is why that is later in the programme, because there is already going to be some good provision to help people in that area. We want to try to spread the benefits as much as possible around the quadrants of London.

Tom Copley AM: However, overall, it does mean that the Mayor's manifesto pledge for 12 Cycle Superhighways by 2016 will not be --

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): He did not pledge that.

Tom Copley AM: That was a manifesto pledge I believe, was it not?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): No, he pledged to do three Dutch-style cycling schemes and to upgrade the existing superhighways. That was his pledge on cycling.

Tom Copley AM: I am not sure about that. Anyway, we have established that 12 will not be done by 2016, fine.

Why are some of them now being delivered through the --

John Biggs AM (Chairman): I can give you a quote, para 3.2 of the briefing, 2012 manifesto, the Mayor committed to triple the number of Cycle Superhighways to 12 by the end of 2015.

Tom Copley AM: So, I have already given him a year extra, or six months, extra.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Anyway, the answer is the answer.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): What I am going from is the Vision.

Tom Copley AM: I did say 'manifesto'.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): What happened in the Cycling Vision was that there was a widespread recognition that previous superhighways, although mixed in quality, were not always good enough and they have had to be extensively redesigned. Therefore I suppose we can put 12 blue-paint superhighways by 2016; however I do not think anybody will want that.

Tom Copley AM: Why are some of the Cycle Superhighways now being delivered through the Quietways programme?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Because they are basically borough roads and they are being given under the borough programmes, therefore one of them is being delivered through the Quietways programme, CS9, the other one that is being delivered by the borough is the one in Waltham Forest and Lea Bridge Road, which is part of their Mini-Holland bid, therefore it is sort of sensible to let them do it.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): Yes, I think, if you have not seen our press release yet, it should be out today, and that will be available, it certainly makes clear that we have set aside funding for these and that we share Andrew's enthusiasm for these schemes, however to make clear that it will be subject to our normal design and consultation and modelling that we do with all highway schemes and cycling schemes.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): However, we have made an explicit commitment, we have written to the boroughs in terms saying that substantial funding has been set aside for these schemes and each of the boroughs has now received those letters.

Tom Copley AM: It is now up to the boroughs at the speed at which these schemes will be completed?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): To give you an example, in Hounslow --

Tom Copley AM: Can you put pressure on them though to --

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Let me give you an example. The Hounslow element of the A315 scheme, the Cycle Superhighway there, I have said to them from the beginning that they need to be more ambitious in what they want to do for that scheme and at the moment their existing proposal is largely for painted lanes. There are some substantial improvements in that, however I say, "We want you to be more ambitious because the expectations of what people want have improved". Equally, an element of it involved going through the Chiswick roundabout; that roundabout where the motorway crosses the A315, and again I did not want to do that, I thought we would probably be better off going another way around it, which there is. Therefore, that is the kind of thing, and there is now money for them to deliver a good segregated scheme.

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): In developing the Quietways programme, what we did was work with each borough in terms of looking at where their key trip generations were and where we wanted to link through to key town centres and try to identify where there were direct back-streets that form part of the Quietways network. In most areas of London that has proved very fruitful in terms of identifying routes, however in areas like Hounslow, feeding through to that corridor in Hammersmith, it has not been possible to identify suitable back-street routes that could be used, however there is a very strong flow of cyclists along that A315 corridor and therefore it made sense to consider that as part of the Quietways programme.

Tom Copley AM: There are no parallel routes or back streets --

John Biggs AM (Chairman): We are moving into transport here.

Darren Johnson AM: Could we just have a map circulated of the routes?

John Biggs AM (Chairman): That would be very helpful, yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I was just saying that all this stuff keeps coming out and it is very difficult to visualise and all these roads, I am afraid I am really rubbish on A3-this and A2, it would be useful, particularly as you are coming before Transport in December, to be able to visualise where the Mini-Hollands are --

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): That is an excellent idea. TfL loves maps as well.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I know, therefore I think it would be a useful thing and tell us when it is going to be built, that would be helpful.

Tom Copley AM: This one is for TfL, , which is, where will the additional £59 million of funding allocated to the Cycle Superhighways programme since 2013 come from?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): That is certainly not a number that I immediately recognise. I do not believe it is a number from our submission.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): OK, the budgets for the 2013 cycling budget set aside £150 million, it was raised to £174 million in 2013 and raised again to £209 million following the CS2 extension? You ramped it up a couple of times, therefore it has gone up by £59 million. Where does that come from?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): As I say, I do not have those numbers in front of me, however I think there are specifically two things that have happened with the Cycle Superhighways programme, the first is that we have moved in the upgrades of the existing routes, which in the very first iterations of division work was a separate budget line; that was £20 million. We have moved that into the Cycle Superhighways programme. That is now additional funding which is the tidying up of our budgeting and accounting. However, there has been an underlying increase in the overall budget for Cycle Superhighways.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Therefore it is magic money. The overall £900 million has not changed, however it is being spent on something else, therefore less must be spent on something.

Tom Copley AM: Yes, it is within the existing budget, you are saying?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): My first point is that £20 million was moved within the existing budget for the upgrades of the existing routes. My second point is there has been an underlying increase in the Cycle Superhighways budget, because, as Andrew [Gilligan] talked about earlier, with the publication of the Vision and the review that he has led, and we have worked with him on, we have increased the standards of the Cycle Superhighways, which has come with a commensurate increase in costs.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Taken from where?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): One of the main primary factors has been the delivery of the cycle hire improvements were significantly under-budget, therefore we submitted out project forms on Cycle Superhighways phase 2 and the expansion and intensifications to the Finance and Quality Committee last week. That showed that those two programmes came in around £25 million under budget. They are public papers and you are more than welcome to scrutinise those. Therefore, where we made savings, they are being invested into the programme --

Tom Copley AM: So you have £20 million, then you have £25 million from underspending on the cycle hire.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): Savings.

Tom Copley AM: Savings, sorry, savings. So that leaves, what, another £14 million?

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): I am not quite working with your numbers; I am not going to agree to any kind of specific numbers, however certainly the broad principle is that we have, as the programme has developed, looked at each budget line and there have been some small movements from some of the non-infrastructure lines into the infrastructure programmes, which is the main priority --

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Maybe if we write to you, you can tell us where we are wrong.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): I am able to clarify that if you give me a bit more time on it.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Can I just ask why is it that in how you present the cycle budget, you do not separate out cycle hire from the other infrastructure investment, because I think that would be a lot clearer for a lot of us. Cycle hire is one distinct scheme, it is like the cable car, it is like whatever, I think that should be presented one way and then the rest of the cycle investment should be seen as the investment in the roads and the highway and the stuff that Andrew is really leading on. Is it possible that you could do that because I think it would be a lot more transparent?

Darren Johnson AM: Also things like Tour de France as well.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Yes.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): Certainly, in the submission that you should have in front of you, we have separated out those infrastructure lines.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Is that not something you could do routinely as part of your accounting?

John Biggs AM (Chairman): I assume it is separated out. I am sort of assuming, naïve as I am, that the Mayor wanted to make a high-level political announcement, therefore he rolled it all together and said it is £900 million. However you guys on the ground had to then manage it as several separate budgets.

Patrick Doig (Surface Transport Director of Finance, Transport for London): Yes, of course, it is a hugely complicated portfolio that we manage in individual programmes, therefore it is something certainly we have increased the level of transparency and disclosure on the cycling expenses, certainly in our progress reports. If the Committee has any feedback on how we can further improve that, it is something we can take on board.

Gareth Bacon AM: I would like to talk about other infrastructure programmes, getting away from Cycle Superhighways. We have touched on Quietways variously throughout the afternoon. How was the allocation of funding for the Quietways programme decided among the boroughs, ie how much each borough gets?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It depends to some extent on the availability of routes. Therefore some boroughs are getting more, Hounslow typically, Hounslow are getting a lot, because we are paying for the main road route on the A315 out of the Quietways programme. However, that is because Hounslow's geography is such that, without that central spine, it cannot work as a borough very well for cycling. There is no other east-west route through Hounslow, it is a long thin borough, as you know, and it goes from pretty much near the centre of London, it goes from Chiswick or Stanford Brook, all the way out to pretty near Heathrow, and there are not any other east-west routes in that borough. Therefore, because it is

the main road and that is going to cost more, they are going to get more from the Quietways pot than some other boroughs who have good side streets that could do the job just as well, but at a lot less expense.

Gareth Bacon AM: Therefore Hounslow, that is a Quietway?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): That route, the A315, is coming out of the Quietways budget, yes.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): There are some boroughs where no one cycles though. This is an outrageous question; however, there are some boroughs where relatively few people cycle, they might be outer suburbs.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): That is part of the purview of the Mini-Holland. It is to exploit the enormous potential for growth that exists. That is a politer way of putting it.

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): Just out of that, to explain how it works, for a Quietways route, once we have agreed with a borough that the route should be progressed, the first thing we do is produce what is called a route delivery plan, which is a series of concept designs that are necessary to address the points along that route where improvements are needed for cyclists. From that, we can then cost up what those improvements will be, what proportion of that relates to each local authority, and then we can allocate funding to that borough to say, "You need this level of support in order to progress on those lines". It is then a process with their contractors just to confirm that those costs are reasonable and once the designs are agreed then they move forward to implementation.

Gareth Bacon AM: OK. The Quietways programme is £115 million, is it not?

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): It is £123 million.

Gareth Bacon AM: £123 million. How much did Hounslow get for that project you have just described?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): The A315 route is more than £10 million in total. I cannot remember how much of it is split between Hounslow and Hammersmith and Fulham. There are a number of routes leading off it.

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London): Sorry, Andrew, we have now written to them saying, "We want to work with you on this route", therefore the next stage is to do some feasibility and to get a much clearer sense of costs. If it was to be confirmed in any of these places there was an insurmountable hurdle that we could not get over for a reasonable cost then we obviously need to go back out and reconsider. David's [Rowe] team now are fully focused on those boroughs that we have written to, to take those routes through the feasibility basically.

Gareth Bacon AM: So the £123 million is split. I thought you said at the beginning, Andrew, that all 32 London boroughs have been contacted to take part in the Quietways programme, is that correct?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): That is right. There are two phases, there is a pilot phase, which is seven routes, which are basically now in delivery, most of them, and that entails 15 boroughs, and then the letters we wrote last week and the week before were about the second phase of Quietways, so we are saying we want to deliver a further few dozen routes, "These are what we would like in your borough", and that is the result of a long process of engagement with the boroughs, both with me, with TfL and also with

Sustrans, who we engaged as an interim delivery partner to have discussions with the boroughs and work out where the best routes were.

Often these are relatively low-cost low-intervention routes. Quietways are essentially a series of discrete end-to-end interventions at specific points, linked together with paint on the roads, not continuous lines of paint I might add, but just painted signs on the roads. Therefore, most of those interventions will be fairly small; there will be a dropped kerb here or a removal of an obstacle there. Some of them will be medium sized, like where you cannot get a direct enough route without going on a main road for a bit, you will have a bit of segregation on that. Some of them will be large, and the larger ones are what we have announced today, the big announcements.

It is like, to give you an example, in Richmond, another reason why we are funding the A316 scheme in Richmond, I said to you this morning, is that the main barrier in Richmond of course is the Thames, it cuts the borough in two, and the main way across the Thames is Richmond Bridge. That is impossible to do anything for cycling on because it is a historic structure and it also has a rather nasty right turn into the bridge when you are coming towards the Twickenham direction, therefore what we are going to do is segregate a track in line with Richmond's Mini-Holland bid on the A316 on the Twickenham Bridge, and there is enough room on that without taking a hatchet to the road, I might add. That is one of the reasons why we are funding that particular big-ticket scheme in Richmond because that is the way to join up that borough for cycling.

Equally, in Brent, for instance, Brent is a borough divided in two by the North Circular. There are quite significant levels of cycling in the south of the borough, which is more like inner city, and very low levels of cycling in the north of the borough, Wembley and places like that, which is much more suburban. The North Circular marks the barrier, therefore if we can get people across the North Circular more easily - it is very difficult to get across the North Circular by bike at the moment - then we can improve cycling across a whole swathe of Northwest London.

That is why all these projects have been thought out in a kind of holistic programme of engagement with all the boroughs and we have sat down over a period of months and put it all together. That is why it has taken a while, because it is just such an enormous job of work. I personally have ridden quite a lot of these routes. Somebody at TfL has ridden every single one of them and there are literally thousands of kilometres of route.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Have you rejected bids because they are just not up to standard?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): In terms of what, Quietways?

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Yes.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Sometimes boroughs have projects, which we do not think offer sufficient value for money, such as they want to do big segregated schemes on a stretch of road, which we think: there is a side street right by, which would be just as good and you could get it for a lot less money; that kind of thing.

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): Just to add to that, we initially did a trawl with the boroughs of possible routes, which identified something in the order of 240 potential Quietway routes. Now, part of the challenge of that is that they did not necessarily all join up across borough boundaries, so there was a process of then going around that again to ensure that network made sense in terms of coherent routes through different areas. That has been narrowed down now to a set of routes that link together.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): We are going to motor on with this question, or pedal on with this question.

Gareth Bacon AM: I think it was you, Patrick, said it is a phenomenally complex model that you are trying to deliver, and I think that is quite right. You collectively have just appointed a delivery agent, have you not? Who is most directly responsible for delivery of the Quietways programme; is it TfL, the boroughs, the delivery agent, or is it a combination of all three depending on where we are talking about?

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): The delivery agent has not quite yet been appointed, they will be appointed from mid-November. TfL holds the budget for the delivery of the Quietways, therefore ultimately the responsibility rests with us in terms of the overall programme. That said, the boroughs are the highway and traffic authorities for the roads on which these routes run and it is their responsibility in terms of the approvals, the designs, being assured locally, local engagement and consultation. Therefore, we absolutely need to work with the boroughs on it. It is not a case of TfL being able to impose any of this; this is a programme that is being developed with the boroughs.

Gareth Bacon AM: Yes, so will it be the boroughs themselves or their contractors who have to build whatever the interventions happen to be?

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): Yes, that is correct.

Gareth Bacon AM: Therefore the process will be that they decide what they want to do, they come to you to draw down the money, you approve it, they contract someone, and that is how it works?

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): Yes. There are a series of checks as we go, therefore once they have done the design that then comes to us and we check that against the London Cycling Design Standards as well as other requirements, such as, "Has it gone through a red safety audit" and so forth, and providing those requirements have been met then, yes, we say, "Let us move to the next stage", and we release the money for implementation.

Gareth Bacon AM: What is the role of the delivery agent? Is this a co-ordinating role?

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): It is partly co-ordinating; however it is also a call-off resource for the London boroughs. Therefore if any London borough needs help with any particular part of the life cycle of a scheme, be it from consultation, for detailed design, or for traffic modelling, then we can make that resource available so that the issue of manpower to do this stuff is not the constraint in terms of the delivery of the routes.

Gareth Bacon AM: OK. The Mini-Holland programme, we touched on this a bit earlier on. I think it is four runners-up. Is it four runners-up or three?

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): Three successful, ten were shortlisted, so seven runners-up.

Gareth Bacon AM: Seven runners-up - they were all promised consolation prizes, I think it is fair to say.

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): They received them today.

Gareth Bacon AM: Yes, which is clearly good. Now, the pot was £100 million for Mini-Hollands and I think the boroughs each received £30 million or thereabouts, did they not? How much of the remaining funding has been used for the consolation prizes and how much have you had to use the Quietways money?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): They received between £24 million and £30 million, I cannot remember the exact figures. David, do you have them? They were mostly sub-£30 million, were they not, they were in the high-20s?

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): Kingston was slightly higher, £34 million.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): The total amount, I think we had about £11 million left once we had promised the three winners their funding, it has not all been given to them yet, it is being given in phases. There was that £11 million and then some of the rest is coming out of the Quietways, however they will have major benefits for areas wider than their own boroughs.

Gareth Bacon AM: We were discussing earlier on the issue of junctions, and you have a better junction programme as well, with 33 that have been identified.

As discussed earlier on, junctions are where most of the accidents happen, and therefore obviously there is a priority for fixing those, which is why you have that scheme. How many of those 33 junctions that have been identified in the programme will be delivered by the end of 2016, or by May 2016?

Nigel Hardy (Head of Road Space Management and Sponsorship, Transport for London): We have 11 locations that will be delivered by May 2016. Two of those locations are preliminary schemes, one at Bow roundabout and one at Kings Cross, where we have a much wider more visionary scheme coming on afterwards. However we are still delivering benefits for the road users in advance of those larger schemes coming forward.

Gareth Bacon AM: Around about a third of those identified will be delivered by May 2016?

David Rowe (Head of Borough Projects and Programmes, Transport for London): There will be some more later in 2016.

Nigel Hardy (Head of Road Space Management and Sponsorship, Transport for London): Yes, a further seven that will be under construction during 2016.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): Are you publishing that today?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): No, because we have not defined the outer end of the programme yet.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): OK. There is a lot of stuff you can send us after this meeting in terms of the Quietways, the borough allocations, the identifying stuff, and I am sure that the Transport Committee will be interested in seeing those as well, however there are other bits as yet unresolved. OK.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I mean we know what we are doing in the inner end of the programme, we can be reasonably certain that the number Nigel [Hardy] gave you will be delivered by 2016.

Gareth Bacon AM: The final question I have, Andrew, is around the Central London Grid. I think you said earlier on today that the Central London Grid is what you are calling Quietways but for the central London boroughs, is that a fair assessment?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Yes.

Gareth Bacon AM: Is it £55 million for the Central London Grid?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): £54 million, yes, and the plan is to deliver about half of it by 2016, as we have always said. I have been going around some of the central London boroughs - I am going around all of them - I have gone around some of them so far, saying, "If you want to do more and you think you have the capacity to do more then we can probably find you some money to do more from the underspend", and that is where we are with that. Basically the boroughs have to do the Quietways and the Central London Grid and then we are doing the Superhighways element in central London, however they all join together.

Gareth Bacon AM: Thank you.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): I think we will write to you with some questions about detailed breakdowns of things.

Darren Johnson AM: It was just one small question; it follows on from a question that came up last week at the Transport Committee. Is Andrew able to update us on the chairing arrangements of TfL's Finance Committee and when it comes to consider funding for Cycle Superhighways, the conflict of interest.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I just realised you had asked this question and I literally emailed Howard Carter [General Counsel, Transport for London] while we were in the meeting asking him if he had an answer and I have not heard back from him yet, therefore I cannot give you an answer yet. My answer for the moment is the same.

Darren Johnson AM: Yes, you told us last week you were seeking legal advice. When can we expect that?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It was about a week ago that we asked, was it not, so quite soon I should hope.

Darren Johnson AM: OK.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): I think that is slightly off-topic.

Darren Johnson AM: It is Finance Committee of TfL, very budget-related.

John Biggs AM (Chairman): I will accept that you are being naughty in a very positive way. I will compound your naughtiness by saying that there may be a legal answer about conflicts; however I think that there is a very widespread question about the perception of conflicts as well, so someone needs to address both of them.

Can we thank our guests for coming today and for giving us such answers as they gave us, although they were very good answers by and large, we might write to you with some more supplementary questions. Thank you very much for coming.

