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1  **Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements**

To receive any apologies for absence and any announcements from the Chair.

2  **Declarations of Interests** (Pages 1 - 4)

The Committee is recommended to:

(a)  Note the offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, as disclosable pecuniary interests;

(b)  Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s); and

(c)  Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority’s register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA’s Monitoring Officer set out at Agenda Item 2) and to note any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s).

3  **Minutes** (Pages 5 - 56)

The Committee is recommended to confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Transport Committee held on 8 September 2016 to be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

The appendices to the minutes set out on pages 9 to 56 are attached for Members and officers only but are available from the following area of the GLA’s website: [www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/transport](http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/transport)

4  **Summary List of Actions** (Pages 57 - 80)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact Dale Langford, [dale.langford@london.gov.uk](mailto:dale.langford@london.gov.uk), 020 7983 4415

The Committee is recommended to note the completed and outstanding actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee.

The appendices to this report set out on pages 61 to 80 are attached for Members and officers only but are available from the following area of the GLA’s website: [www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/transport](http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/transport)
5  **Action Taken Under Delegated Authority** (Pages 81 - 92)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact: Dale Langford; dale.langford@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 4415

The Committee is recommended to:

(a) Note the action taken by the Chair under delegated Authority, namely to agree:

(i) A response to the Network Rail consultation on the draft West Midlands and Chilterns route study; and

(ii) A letter to London TravelWatch requesting details of the terms under which it was commissioned to undertake a review into the Tube ticket offices closure programme; and

(b) Note the response from London TravelWatch regarding the review into the Tube ticket offices closure programme.

6  **Traffic Congestion** (Pages 93 - 108)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact: Richard Berry, scrutiny@london.gov.uk, 020 7983 4199

The Committee is recommended to:

(a) Note the report, put questions on traffic congestion to the invited guests and note the discussion; and

(b) Note the records of its visit to the Transport for London surface transport and London Underground control centres, its visit to the Go-Ahead iBus hub, and its meeting with High Speed Two Limited.

7  **London TravelWatch Business Plan and Budget Bid 2017/18**  
(Pages 109 - 130)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact: Mark Roberts, mark.roberts@london.gov.uk, 020 7983 4428

The Committee is recommended to consider London TravelWatch's proposed budget and business plan for the next financial year and to recommend a budget for London TravelWatch for 2017/18.

The annex to this report set out on pages 111 to 130 is attached for Members and officers only but is available from the following area of the GLA's website:  
www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/transport
8 **Transport Committee Work Programme** (Pages 131 - 134)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat
Contact: Richard Berry, scrutiny@london.gov.uk, 020 7983 4199

The Committee is recommended to agree its work programme for the 2016/17 Assembly year, including the schedule of topics for forthcoming meetings set out at paragraph 4.8 of the report.

9 **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Wednesday 9 November 2016 at 10.00am in the Chamber.

10 **Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent**
This page is intentionally left blank
Subject: Declarations of Interests

Report to: Transport Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 11 October 2016

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report sets out details of offices held by Assembly Members for noting as disclosable pecuniary interests and requires additional relevant declarations relating to disclosable pecuniary interests, and gifts and hospitality to be made.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table below, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests;

2.2 That the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s) be noted; and

2.3 That the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority’s register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA’s Monitoring Officer set out at below) and any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s) be noted.

3. Issues for Consideration

3.1 Relevant offices held by Assembly Members are listed in the table overleaf:

---

1 The Monitoring Officer advises that: Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct will only preclude a Member from participating in any matter to be considered or being considered at, for example, a meeting of the Assembly, where the Member has a direct Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in that particular matter. The effect of this is that the ‘matter to be considered, or being considered’ must be about the Member’s interest. So, by way of example, if an Assembly Member is also a councillor of London Borough X, that Assembly Member will be precluded from participating in an Assembly meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about the Member’s role / employment as a councillor of London Borough X; the Member will not be precluded from participating in a meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about an activity or decision of London Borough X.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Arbour AM</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennette Arnold OBE AM</td>
<td>Committee of the Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gareth Bacon AM</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Bexley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemi Badenoch AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun Bailey AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sian Berry AM</td>
<td>Member, LB Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Boff AM</td>
<td>Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonie Cooper AM</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Copley AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmesh Desai AM</td>
<td>Member, LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Devenish AM</td>
<td>Member, City of Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Dismore AM</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len Duvall AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Eshalomi AM</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Lambeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicky Gavron AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kurten AM</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne McCartney AM</td>
<td>Deputy Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve O’Connell AM</td>
<td>Member, LB Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Prince AM</td>
<td>Member, LB Redbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Russell AM</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Islington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Onkar Sahota AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navin Shah AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Twycross AM</td>
<td>Chair, LFEPA; Chair of the London Local Resilience Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Whittle AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note: LB - London Borough; LFEPA - London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority. The appointments to LFEPA reflected above take effect as from 17 June 2016.]

3.2 Paragraph 10 of the GLA’s Code of Conduct, which reflects the relevant provisions of the Localism Act 2011, provides that:

- where an Assembly Member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered or being considered or at
  (i) a meeting of the Assembly and any of its committees or sub-committees; or
  (ii) any formal meeting held by the Mayor in connection with the exercise of the Authority’s functions
- they must disclose that interest to the meeting (or, if it is a sensitive interest, disclose the fact that they have a sensitive interest to the meeting); and
- must not (i) participate, or participate any further, in any discussion of the matter at the meeting; or (ii) participate in any vote, or further vote, taken on the matter at the meeting UNLESS
- they have obtained a dispensation from the GLA’s Monitoring Officer (in accordance with section 2 of the Procedure for registration and declarations of interests, gifts and hospitality – Appendix 5 to the Code).

3.3 Failure to comply with the above requirements, without reasonable excuse, is a criminal offence; as is knowingly or recklessly providing information about your interests that is false or misleading.
In addition, the Monitoring Officer has advised Assembly Members to continue to apply the test that was previously applied to help determine whether a pecuniary / prejudicial interest was arising – namely, that Members rely on a reasonable estimation of whether a member of the public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, could, with justification, regard the matter as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member’s judgement of the public interest.

Members should then exercise their judgement as to whether or not, in view of their interests and the interests of others close to them, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA. It remains the responsibility of individual Members to make further declarations about their actual or apparent interests at formal meetings noting also that a Member’s failure to disclose relevant interest(s) has become a potential criminal offence.

Members are also required, where considering a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom they have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25 within the previous three years or from the date of election to the London Assembly, whichever is the later, to disclose the existence and nature of that interest at any meeting of the Authority which they attend at which that business is considered.

The obligation to declare any gift or hospitality at a meeting is discharged, subject to the proviso set out below, by registering gifts and hospitality received on the Authority’s on-line database. The on-line database may be viewed here: http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/gifts-and-hospitality.

If any gift or hospitality received by a Member is not set out on the on-line database at the time of the meeting, and under consideration is a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom a Member has received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25, Members are asked to disclose these at the meeting, either at the declarations of interest agenda item or when the interest becomes apparent.

It is for Members to decide, in light of the particular circumstances, whether their receipt of a gift or hospitality, could, on a reasonable estimation of a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, with justification, be regarded as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member’s judgement of the public interest. Where receipt of a gift or hospitality could be so regarded, the Member must exercise their judgement as to whether or not, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA.

4. **Legal Implications**

4.1 The legal implications are as set out in the body of this report.

5. **Financial Implications**

5.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>List of Background Papers:</strong> None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Officer:</strong> Dale Langford, Principal Committee Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone:</strong> 020 7983 4415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-mail:</strong> <a href="mailto:dale.langford@london.gov.uk">dale.langford@london.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Page 3
MINUTES

Meeting: Transport Committee
Date: Thursday 8 September 2016
Time: 2.00 pm
Place: Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA

Copies of the minutes may be found at:
www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/transport

Present:
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair)
Tom Copley AM
Steve O’Connell AM
David Kurten AM
Joanne McCartney AM
Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman)
Caroline Russell AM
Navin Shah AM

1 Apologies for Absence and Chair’s Announcements (Item 1)

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Kemi Badenoch AM.

2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

2.1 Resolved:

That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests.
3 Minutes (Item 3)

3.1 Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Transport Committee held on 13 July 2016 be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

4 Summary List of Actions (Item 4)

4.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

4.2 The Chair reminded Members that she had written to the Mayor, following consultation with the party Group Lead Members, setting out the Committee’s views on emerging plans for pedestrianising Oxford Street. The letter is attached to the minutes at Appendix 1.

4.3 Resolved:

(a) That the completed and outstanding actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee be noted; and

(b) That the letter to the Mayor setting out the Committee’s views on emerging plans for pedestrianising Oxford Street, signed by the Chair following consultation with the party Group Lead Members, be noted.

5 Action Taken Under Delegated Authority (Item 5)

5.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

5.2 Resolved:

That the action taken by the Chair under delegated authority be noted, namely to agree:

- The appointment of John Stewart as Deputy Chair of London TravelWatch;

- The scope and terms of reference for the Committee’s investigation into road congestion in London;

- A letter to the Secretary of State for Transport to request an update on plans for the devolution of suburban National Rail services to the Mayor and Transport for London; and

- A letter of support to the Secretary of State for Transport in connection with the Transport and Works Act Order for the proposed extension of the London Overground to Barking Riverside.
6 Traffic Congestion (Item 6)

6.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat as background to putting questions on traffic congestion to the following invited guests:

- Dr Rachel Aldred, Reader in Transport, University of Westminster;
- Grant Davis, Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club;
- Professor Stephen Glaister CBE, Emeritus Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London; and
- Edmund King OBE, President, The Automobile Association.

6.2 A transcript of the discussion is attached at Appendix 2.

6.3 The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3.22pm to allow time for the second panel of guests to take their places. The meeting reconvened at 3.24pm.

6.4 The Committee put questions to the following invited guests:

- Paul Gerrard, Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group;
- Stephen Joseph OBE, Chief Executive of the Campaign for Better Transport;
- David Leam, Infrastructure Director, London First; and
- Dr Aruna Shivakumar, Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London.

6.5 A transcript of the discussion is attached as Appendix 3.

6.6 Resolved:

That the report and discussion be noted.

7 Transport Committee Work Programme (Item 7)

7.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

7.2 Resolved:

(a) That the work programme for 2016/17 be noted; and

(b) That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to respond to the Network Rail consultation on the draft West Midlands and Chilterns route study.
8 Date of Next Meeting (Item 8)

8.1 The next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Tuesday 11 October 2016 at 10.00am, in the Chamber, City Hall.

9 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 9)

9.1 There was no other business.

10 Close of Meeting

10.1 The meeting ended at 4.45pm.

Contact Officer: Dale Langford, Principal Committee Manager; Telephone: 020 7983 4415; Email: dale.langford@london.gov.uk; Minicom: 020 7983 4458
Sadiq Khan  
Mayor of London  
City Hall  
The Queen’s Walk  
London SE1 2AA

Dear Sadiq,

I am writing to share the views of the Transport Committee on your emerging plans for pedestrianising Oxford Street. As you may be aware, the committee has been discussing this topic with a wide range of stakeholders in recent months, including representatives of local businesses, residents, road users, Transport for London and Westminster City Council.

In summary, in this letter I will set out:

- The need to take a strategic approach to managing traffic around Oxford Street and across the West End.
- The importance of developing a shared vision for pedestrianisation across the full range of local stakeholders.
- The immediate priority for TfL to reduce the number of buses on Oxford Street without creating additional congestion elsewhere.
- A number of other issues that need to be addressed, including wayfinding at Crossrail stations and the need for safe cycling routes.

It is clear that the status quo on Oxford Street cannot continue. Despite recent public realm improvements, road safety remains a major concern, with alarming casualty rates among pedestrians and cyclists. Levels of air pollution are extremely high, caused by emissions of NOx and PM2.5s as result of heavy and slow-moving traffic, particularly diesel vehicles.

These trends have serious human costs, and also have a negative impact on London’s economy. Oxford Street, Regent Street and Bond Street constitute a global retail destination and a major employment centre. Without significant change to make the area cleaner and safer for Londoners and visitors to the city, its success will be at risk.
We welcome the bold ambition you have set out for the pedestrianisation of Oxford Street. Alongside other changes, pedestrianisation has the potential to transform this area and ensure Oxford Street, Regent Street and Bond Street provide a fantastic environment for people to live in, work and visit. When we met Val Shawcross, the Deputy Mayor for Transport, in July, we were pleased to hear that you are developing specific and timed plans to deliver this objective. It is right that you take a lead on this issue as Mayor, addressing a long-term strategic issue that has proven very difficult to solve over many years.

You will be aware, of course, that many challenges lie ahead. It is clear that key stakeholders have concerns about your plans and their implications. It is vital that, as far as possible, you develop a shared vision among businesses, residents, Westminster City Council and others about the future of Oxford Street. We would urge you to address the concerns of local stakeholders in order to do this.

The overriding sentiment of the committee’s discussions with stakeholders is that Oxford Street cannot be considered in isolation from the rest of London’s West End. For instance, there are a number of major transport schemes affecting traffic patterns in the West End, including the Baker Street Two Way project, Crossrail, and potentially Crossrail 2. Each will have significant benefits, but without coordinated planning there could be unintended consequences that could make congestion worse, not better.

The most important strategic priority for the immediate future is for Transport for London to deliver a sizeable reduction in the number of buses on Oxford Street. It is impossible to conceive of a pedestrianised Oxford Street until this happens. In doing this, large-scale diversion of buses into surrounding streets should be avoided, given the impact this would have on local communities and traffic congestion.

We believe that innovative changes to bus routes and service patterns will be required to achieve this objective, as displacement to surrounding roads would not be acceptable, and welcome the consultation you are planning in the autumn on this topic. It is vital that the space on Oxford Street vacated by buses is not immediately filled by other vehicles. A comprehensive plan to manage all forms of traffic accessing Oxford Street and the surrounding area is required.

We would also urge you and TfL to consider the following suggestions as you develop your plans for Oxford Street:

- Those with mobility problems including older and disabled people are likely to need support to get around on Oxford Street after it is pedestrianised. Some people may currently rely on bus or taxi services to travel to specific points. Taxis in particular provide a valuable door-to-door service for many visitors, so a comprehensive review of taxi access should be completed. Other options for supporting people with mobility issues could be explored.

- New Elizabeth Line stations at Bond Street and Tottenham Court Road are expected to bring many more people to the area. It is vital that these stations have comprehensive and accurate wayfinding within and around them to enable people to find the entries and exits they need. Failure to do this may increase pedestrian congestion, which is likely to
remain a challenge even after pedestrianisation.

- It is currently difficult for pedestrians to get between Oxford Street and Hyde Park, not least because of a lack of safe crossings. This is a lost opportunity for improving the visitor experience, and should be addressed by TfL working with the Royal Parks, New West End Company and Westminster Council.

- London still needs more and safer east-west cycle routes through central London. Oxford Street is used by many cyclists at present, despite it being one of London’s most dangerous roads. TfL should develop plans for improved cycle routes as part of the wider strategy for roads in the area. These should be delivered in a way that avoids adding to congestion, for instance through removing road space without a corresponding plan for reducing or re-routing traffic.¹

I hope you find these views useful as you work with partners to develop plans for Oxford Street. I expect we will hear more about your proposals for pedestrianisation in the coming months, and the Committee looks forward to responding to your consultation in due course. I would welcome any further discussions on this topic.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Chair, Transport Committee

¹ The case for new east-west cycle routes is supported by the majority of the Committee. David Kurten AM of UKIP believes London may benefit from these but that further assessment is required to ensure that there is no concurrent increase in traffic congestion or vehicle journey times from the loss of traffic lanes.
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Let us move, then, to our main item today. We have a lot to get through and we are having two panels this afternoon as our first meeting of our investigation looking at congestion in London, which certainly if you look at my Twitter feed is one of the big issues that seems to be affecting lots of Londoners at the moment.

We have two panels today. Our first panel is before us now. Thank you very much for coming in. We have Grant Davis, who is the Chairman of the London Cab Drivers Club. Thank you very much for coming before us today. We have Edmund King, who is the President of the Automobile Association (AA), and we have Dr Rachel Aldred, who is a Reader in Transport at the University of Westminster and also a trustee of the London Cycling Campaign. You have been a guest before us before and you are welcome before us again. Professor Stephen Glaister is now a Professor of Transport and Infrastructure at Imperial College London but is well known for being [former] Director of the RAC Foundation. It is great to have you before us.

I wanted to kick off our discussion because we know that every part of London is congested and central London is most heavily congested. We have seen the figures for the last few years where journey time reliability has been fallen. I wanted to ask all of you how you think traffic congestion has changed over the last few years, whether it has gone up significantly or is just occurring at different times or in different places, just to get a real scene-setting of what has been happening over the last few years.

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): Thank you very much. I have been studying traffic and congestion in London for probably more than 25 years. I used to head up a group called Movement for London, which sometimes seemed a contradiction in terms as little moved.

However, when you look at London, you do have to differentiate between central, inner and outer London. If you look at central London, over the last 100 years the traffic speed really has not changed that much. It has been around 8 to 10 miles an hour from the horse and cart to the current day. In one sense, it will remain about that. There is a sense of equilibrium. If it gets too slow, some people will not come in. If it gets too fast, other people will not come in. Therefore, there is a sense of equilibrium. The majority of people in central London, sensibly - even before the Congestion Charge was introduced - used public transport to commute. It was something like 84% before the Congestion Charge. The Congestion Charge in terms of the actual congestion probably has not made that much difference. It has raised some money and it has probably changed some of the types of vehicles or people who come in, but it has not made that much difference.

When you look outside of central London, that is where it becomes more complex and where some of the public transport journeys are not radial journeys but peripheral journeys, which are sometimes harder to cater for. That is where traffic has grown more. That is where problems of reliability have become worse. However, it is not an easy issue.

Transport for London (TfL) does an extremely good job at keeping London running. However, there probably still are some small wins on things like traffic light utilisation and I know that TfL is looking at the SCOOT (Split Cycle Offset Optimisation Technique) system and whether it could be improved. A lot has been done on
roadworks with lane rental schemes, but again probably more there. I guess more recently the growth of minicabs in central London is putting lots of pressure on.

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** Chair, the evidence does not support the proposition that congestion is constant over time. One measure of that, which is published in the annual TfL publication, is the number of delayed minutes per vehicle kilometre. I have it in front of me. If you look at it, it has changed quite a lot over the years. In central London in 2010 it was 1.3; it has gone up to 1.9 now. It is a big increase and we see it day in and day out. It just is not true that congestion is constant over time. You can do something about it.

The other thing I would say in relation to your opening comment is that you are right that the delay per vehicle kilometre is high in central London. In terms of where the serious problem is - that is the number of hours lost in traffic congestion - central London was never the big problem. It is outer London and the gluepot ring. It is one of the great ironies that for very good reasons we introduced the Congestion Charge in the centre of London, which is a tiny part of London and which was not where the big problem was, even in 2003 when we introduced it.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair):** Obviously, the bigger problem is outer London.

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** That is where the vast amount of traffic is and where the vast amount of economic loss occurs because of a lot of people stuck in not-free-flowing traffic, yes.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair):** Thank you. Grant, your thoughts on traffic congestion and how it has changed over recent years?

**Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club):** As someone who has driven a London black cab for the last 28 years, I have seen the congestion on an upward scale and I do not know where it is going to take us, to be honest.

I have just a little list here that we have done in our written submission and it is too many vehicles using the road space. I know that we have gone in the last four years from having 52,000 private hire vehicles to - in the last figure last week - 110,000. We are now doubling the size of the private hire fleet coming into London. I know we talked about the outer areas there, but predominantly the private hire who are licensed coming in to central London. That is where they perceive the money is to be made and so we have 110,000 cars driving into central London, looking for business.

On roadworks, I know there is a scheme where they are fined. We think it should be a lot higher and more rigid. Sometimes I am sitting in traffic with people in the back of the cab and they say, “Look, I just have to get out because we are not moving”. That is becoming more and more of a regular work pattern for me.

On the Cycle Superhighways, we all want places for cyclists to use and be safe. The perception that the cab trade does not like cyclists is wrong. We do not all play golf, either. That is another urban myth. We do not live in Essex and my wife is not called Tracy. We want to work alongside cyclists; we do.

However, the trouble is - again, as someone who works as a London cab driver at the front end - I am seeing these road works absolutely bringing London’s traffic to a standstill. They really do. I do not know where we go with that. If you take the Embankment at Big Ben, it used to be two lanes that from 4.30pm were always
solid going down to Canary Wharf. Now it is just one lane and it really just does not move. The left-hand turn from the Embankment to go over Westminster Bridge has been taken away. Whoever thought that one up needs shooting, to be honest. It is just designed to gridlock traffic.

We have a saying at the Club: “a moving city is a thriving city; a gridlocked city is a dying city”. It is my major fear here that the roads now are becoming gridlocked. It is not that they are just a little bit heavy. They are becoming gridlocked and it is taking London as a place to do business down a very small cul-de-sac. We need to address it for everyone’s sake.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): I just wanted to say first of all - and this is something that I am sure we will come back to - that there are quite a few issues related to measuring congestion. Some measures of congestion potentially show different things to other measures. For instance, if you are comparing night-time flows with daytime flows, that is one measure of congestion; another measure is to do with disruption hours on the network. If you are looking at, say, speeds across the network, then potentially enforcing 20 miles an hour might reduce speeds, which under some definitions would increase congestion. Therefore, we need to be clear what we are talking about and what the goals are.

However, really, I wanted to pick up on this movement issue, which is so important. We need to keep in mind the distinction between people and goods movement and vehicle movement. It is really about enabling the necessary people and goods movement, not about maximising vehicle movement. In fact, they conflict if we prioritise inefficient vehicle movement. With millions more Londoners coming into the city, we have to travel more sustainably if we are going to fit everyone’s journeys in. Network-level congestion is fundamentally about inefficient travel and this is why the Department for Transport in its appraisal guidance assigns decongestion benefits to the reduction of car trips. Cycle trips, walking and bus trips are very much more efficient than car trips and this is really necessary for an efficient, functioning network.

I know that we do not have freight representatives here, but I also wanted to say that there is a great need for freight and servicing also to become more efficient. There are some really good case studies. For instance, along Regent Street, there is an 80% reduction in lorry movements associated with a delivery consolidation scheme. There is an awful lot of scope there, too.

However, returning to personal travel, there has been a lot of analysis done around cycling potential lately both by TfL and by a team that I am involved in. There is still so much scope to shift trips from cars to cycles as well as to other sustainable modes. Just to give one example, I have been working on a project called the Propensity to Cycle Tool. Under one of our scenarios, it suggests that a quarter of London car commutes could be shifted to bikes as a whole for all-the-way commutes. That would be 270,000 car commutes and so the scope is still really substantial.

It is not just about how Londoners live but if we live. If we think about the impacts of, say, air and noise pollution, air pollution is killing 10,000 Londoners prematurely every year. The latest academic evidence suggests noise pollution is on a similar scale and premature deaths from physical activity are very many times more than that. We do not have the luxury of avoiding change, but change can bring massive benefits. We need to prioritise solutions to our transport problems that bring benefits in all areas. For instance, a shift to electric cars is very necessary and will bring benefits in terms of air and noise pollution, but it will not bring benefits in terms of congestion and physical activity. Therefore, we need to think about how we prioritise solutions so that we hit all of those co-benefits.
Just finally, best practice was mentioned. Our peer cities are being very ambitious. Paris is pedestrianising the banks of the Seine and big roundabouts. Vancouver is building many segregated bike lanes on main roads in its city centre. Barcelona is substantially reducing motor vehicle access on city centre roads and also building cycle tracks. Oslo is banning private cars from the city centre by 2019. Hamburg is developing a car-free network to cover 40% of the city’s roads. The scope is there and we should learn from our peer cities and be ambitious and hit all of those co-benefits.

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** I just wanted to offer you a statistic that may be helpful. This is from a TfL document for the Roads Task Force. It is just simply that since 1996 until 2010 the various Mayors reduced the road capacity in central London by 30%, in inner London by 15% and in outer London by 5%. That is part of the problem.

**Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster):** That is the capacity for private motorised traffic, I would point out.

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** No, it is network capacity for traffic.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair):** In terms of the overuse, the road space has been reduced. Therefore, what can we do to tackle congestion? That is one of our big issues.

We are now going to move into different sections, trying to focus on impacts of congestion but also some of the solutions. We will start off with cycling.

**Caroline Russell AM:** We have seen a lot of people taking to the new Cycle Superhighways that have just been built. Rachel, I have some questions specifically for you about the main impacts of traffic congestion on people who are cycling in London. Would you like to comment on that to start with?

**Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster):** With the impact of congestion on cyclists, there are a couple of issues here. Firstly, as I alluded to, congestion is often quite poorly defined and we often say “congestion” when we mean delays for private motor vehicles. Really, we need to start looking separately at the performance of the network for different modes, which we already do for buses. We look at bus journey times. We should be doing that for cycles and pedestrians, too.

However, let us just talk about traffic - private motor vehicle - congestion here.

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** And lorries and freight.

**Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster):** And freight, yes. In terms of delays to private motor vehicles and freight and how that impacts cyclists, the evidence is mixed. There is not really good evidence that that kind of congestion - motor vehicles queuing - necessarily is bad for cyclist safety, for instance. Certainly if you have more motor vehicles, you have more risk for cyclists and pedestrians. That is definitional, in a sense, because motor vehicles pose risks to cyclists and pedestrians, who are vulnerable road users. However, there is not good evidence that congestion in itself harms safety for cyclists and pedestrians.
There has been a recent study published that showed that the Congestion Charge improved road safety and so, as a policy it improved road safety but that does not necessarily prove a link with congestion itself under any definition. That proves a link between the policy and road safety. We need more research. In fact, the assumption has traditionally been that queuing motor traffic actually could potentially benefit pedestrian safety, for instance, in terms of ease of crossing the road. Of course, it is true that queuing motor vehicles can lead to more air pollution, although as vehicles become cleaner that should change.

However, I just want to stress that for cyclists what is crucial for safety and comfort is having that separated space on busy roads. The impact on congestion on cyclists in those conditions is really determined by whether that exists or not.

Caroline Russell AM: Thank you. Just to follow on from that, is there any specific evidence on any relationship between congestion and the frequency and severity of collisions. You have touched on that a bit already, but is there anything specific or is that a study that needs to be done?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): One could look in detail at the data to a much greater extent than has been done. It has not, no. When I did a literature review as part of preparing for this to see if there was any recent evidence, no. We know that more motor vehicles mean more injuries for cyclists and pedestrians but, in terms of a link to congestion or queuing traffic, that has not been proved, no.

Caroline Russell AM: Thank you. Then we have also heard in the media a lot of worry about the construction period for the Cycle Superhighways and views that that may have worsened congestion either temporarily or permanently? Do you have any views on that and also on how any impact like that can be minimised?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): Yes, definitely. The first thing I would like to say here is that it is really crucial to separate out the impact of a build period from the impact of a scheme once it is in place because cycles - like buses and walking - are an efficient mode. There is a distinction between the construction phase and the impact of a scheme once it is in place. I will just stress that Cycle Superhighways increase people-carrying capacity and they encourage new cyclists and we will start to realise our potential to transfer journeys from less to more efficient modes. The new tracks have people-carrying capacity of several times the adjacent motor traffic lanes and already at peak we are seeing over 6,000 cyclists using those new tracks in the peak hours. Mode shift generally takes a couple of years or more to start showing up and so this is really encouraging, but we have not seen the full benefits yet.

My research has shown that separating cycles from other traffic can reduce delays because, if you have mixed traffic, it can impede the efficient flow of all of those different modes. For instance, having bus lanes with high volumes of cycles in them can cause problems for both modes and hence separating them can produce benefits for both again. Modelling tools are really poor at recognising this. Traditionally, we have modelled cycling behaviour very badly.

I would also point out that Cycle Superhighway routes are enabling other roads to potentially cater better for other vehicles. With the Embankment Superhighway, you will have seen cyclists move from roads like Cheapside and the initial impact is probably largely due to diversion because we have not yet seen the mode shift. We also need to take that into consideration.
In terms of the building part of the scheme, yes, there will be an impact but, please, we need to remember that this is generic. All construction projects involve such an impact. We have construction schemes all the time in London. We have a building boom. We have high-speed rail. We have Crossrail. All of these things involve pressure on the network.

Just to take one example, the Euston rebuild is apparently going to bring 700 heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) a day into that area, which, frankly, is daunting. Network Rail can do better than that. If that happens, there will be massive risks for cyclists and pedestrians in that area. We need to think about this. It is not just about congestion. There are also other impacts.

Also, it is quite hard to separate out the impacts of all these different schemes that are being built. I have a Master of Science (MSc) student who has recently done a study looking at the impact of Cycle Superhighway 2 on bus journey times. It is really interesting because there was a big impact during the build phase but, as he points out, that is likely to be due to a range of schemes that were going. There were a number of schemes that were impacting traffic at that time. However, when you look at after the build period, the bus journey times went back to what they were before, despite the reduction in capacity. It is really interesting that there is not a longer-term impact from that scheme, apparently, on bus journey times.

There are issues about scheduling works more broadly that we need to look at. It is worth remembering that here short-term pain is leading to medium-term gain and so we need to take a longer perspective. If, for instance - and we maybe will cover this later - we build more roads, we might get short-term relief, but in the longer term there will be congestion and ill health.

David Metz, who is a former Chief Economist at the Department for Transport, pointed out that the M25 very quickly started to encourage short-term car trips by people who live locally, which then meant that the M25 filled up. We should also consider evaluating better the impact of closures and temporary works to see whether some of that space could be permanently used for other purposes and also how we schedule. It does not necessarily mean slowing scheduling down. We might, for instance, decide that putting a number of works together might be better than having a longer-term, drawn-out period of disruption.

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** I was going to suggest that now that most of the big work has been completed on the Cycle Superhighways, it would be perhaps helpful if your Committee was able to stimulate a comprehensive audit of what actually happened.

I have here the board paper that gave approval, dated 4 February 2015, to the Superhighway schemes. That gives very specific forecasts of what the outcome would be of those schemes. It would be interesting - and, presumably, doable - to do an audit to see what did actually happen. The reason that I particularly mention it is that in the case of the East-West Superhighway, the predicted impacts on congestion were quite catastrophic not because of what happened in the centre of town where the work was to be done but because the scheme involved holding traffic out of the area and causing really quite substantial predicted delays to traffic outside the area. It very much increased bus journey times and the figures are here for anybody to see. The costs substantially outweighed the benefits to cyclists for that particular scheme and it would be really interesting to see what actually happened.

**Caroline Russell AM:** Is there any sense of that? Do we know what that evidence might be?
Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): The taxi trade will tell you what is happening at great length, I am sure. What you could easily do is find out quite quickly, I am sure, from the bus operators what has happened to bus journey times outside the area. There were specific predictions on particular specific routes of what would happen to those bus journey times. You can find out what has happened.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We will probably pick that up. We are doing cycling in December and we will, hopefully, have the new Cycling and Walking Commissioner. That would be a helpful area we could look into at that meeting to follow that up.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): If I could just say, the student’s study that I mentioned is along one of those roads that one might think might be affected and the bus journey times look positive, but I would certainly welcome more research such as that. I would also say that TfL is conducting very extensive monitoring as well over the coming period and so we will have that evidence, I hope.

Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club): Again, as a taxi driver myself, who is out there on these roads that we are all discussing, that is not the picture that I see. I see utter gridlock. I see cycle lanes being used quite well in rush-hour but, after rush-hour, it is a barren land. Under TfL, I believe, the cyclists do not even have to use them. They have the choice of the cycle lanes or the road space. They designated all of this money aside and built these specific lanes; yet the cyclists do not have to use the cycle lanes. What was the point of them?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): That is why the evidence on uptake is so crucial. Anecdotal evidence is helpful but to look at the actual numbers of cyclists using those lanes is very instructive. Also, TfL has monitored usage of those Cycle Superhighways and it is over 90%.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Lovely. Let us look at the impact of congestion on taxi and private hire services.

David Kurten AM: Thanks, everyone on the panel, for coming. This is about congestion with taxis and private hire services and I suppose I am particularly interested in, Grant, what you have to say as a representative. Everyone else can answer as well and give your opinions, but generally I am interested in how congestion affects the taxi and private hire trade. You mentioned it a little bit before, but would you say some more about that?

Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club): Yes. I would say, in a word, it is destroying the trade, actually. The whole reason people were jumping into my cab from the City to a meeting in Victoria was because they did not want to use the train or the bus and they wanted to pay that little bit extra to have a premier service that will get them there quicker because they are businessmen. That is what London is - the home of business - or we want it to be in the future.

The trouble is that we are absolutely in gridlock traffic. I could take you all outside and show you that we are not moving. Again, I go back to how a gridlocked city is a dying city and it is. I hear Sadiq [Khan, Mayor of London] talk about how he wants to have London open for business. We all do. I want as many businessmen in the back of my taxi going to meetings as I can possibly fit in. At the same time, I cannot get them from A to B. I am getting, I would say, seriously, between 50% and 60% of my fares now saying to me, “I have to get out of the taxi because I cannot sit in this traffic“.
We are not talking about a bit of heavy traffic at rush-hour. I am talking about gridlocked traffic throughout the day and through the night. We have traffic schemes like Euston Station where they have shut all the roads for us. If someone gets in at the Strand and wants to go to Euston because they want to get to their train at 5.00pm and it is 4.30pm, the fare would come to maybe £6.50 or £6.60 but now the fare is coming to £15 or £18 and it is taking 45 or 50 minutes.

What is happening is people sit in a taxi or a private hire once and they do not do it again. That is the trouble. They cannot afford it. I look at the meter sometimes and I am embarrassed. In my 28 years of driving a cab, I have to say that I have been giving more personal discounts to my passengers than ever before because I am truly embarrassed. We are sitting in gridlock traffic and the clock is going on. I cannot stop that and I am saying to them, “Look, I am really sorry about this, but it is not me. It is these lanes and this road space and these road plans that they are implementing”. They say, “I know it is not your fault, but I cannot afford to sit in the back”. In a short word, I would say “decimation” is the word that I would use.

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** Everything you have said about taxis and hire cars applies to buses and commercial traffic too. It is all stuck in the same jams.

**Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club):** We are. I notice as well that throughout the day, apart from rush-hour, I am sitting behind rows and rows of buses that are not really that full. At rush-hour, they are packed like sardines. If you take them out of rush-hour, the number of passengers really drops but the number of buses is still the same. Maybe something like that could be looked at.

**David Kurten AM:** What could we do differently? Sorry, I am just carrying on the line. London’s population is going up by at least 100,000 every year. You have mentioned congestion from road works. You have mentioned the effect of the Cycle Superhighways. What could we do differently to alleviate the problems for you?

**Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club):** I would love to say that you could cut the number of private hire down from 110,000. That would make a major difference. Maybe look at taking some buses off route at non-peak times or rephrasing traffic lights. TfL could have a more joined-up way of thinking on road works. You see one road works finish on the Monday and you think, “That is great”, but you go back to work the next week and there is another road works just around the corner. You never really get any benefit because there are road works happening all the way.

Again, I go back to this great city. If you look out of the window, you can see it. London is unlike Oslo. It is probably the centre of the universe. It is the centre of the world. London is open for business, but unfortunately we still have these Victorian roads. When you take half of the road space away to accommodate a Cycle Superhighway, where is the traffic going to go? Not everyone wants to jump on a bike. They really do not. I speak to passengers and they do not want to put their briefcases on their backs and strap on their raincoats for later on and cycle. They want a cab or a private hire vehicle and they want to pay you to take them from A to B as quickly as you can. Unfortunately, with everything that is going on, we just cannot do our jobs.

**Edmund King OBE (President, The AA):** If I may just add to that, one additional more recent problem with private hire vehicles has been the escalation in central London and the way they work. Certainly when I leave my office near Covent Garden at 7.00pm at night, there is congestion caused by vehicles waiting, parking...
illegally in the wrong places, causing obstructions and causing extra congestion. Consideration of a cap on the numbers in central London would actually improve congestion.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): When you say “private hire”, just to clarify, Edmund, is that “private hire vehicles” you are saying?

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): Yes, or vehicles on demand that people call up on their apps and then cruise around and park on double yellow lines--

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Yes, it is private hire rather than a black taxi?

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): Yes.

Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club): If I could just say something, Caroline, on Edmund’s point, under the rules of the Congestion Charge, the exemption for taxi and private hire - we being public transport are exempt - was for when you were undergoing a private hire booking or when you were working. Unfortunately, out of these 110,000 minicabs now, like Edmund has just stated, they do not come into London on the booking. They drive into London on the anticipation of a booking. That is a massive difference. You are getting the private hire drivers coming in hoping to get booked; not working but hoping. The exemption that they receive from the Congestion Charge I believe TfL needs to look at again and implement it.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): I would like to say, personally, I would support greater regulation of private hire, but we also need to bear in mind that there is an equity issue. I also have another student who looked at who makes taxi and private hire journeys and just to quote:

“There is a significant difference in the household income of people travelling by taxi and private hire vehicle [this is in London]. Private hire vehicle journeys are spread fairly evenly over the income bands with a noticeable peak at the lower end. Taxi journeys are strongly skewed towards the higher income bands, with the most trips being made by people with a household income of £100,000.”

This is premier services for businessmen often, although I would point out that to get from the City to a meeting in Victoria, many of these people do have multiple options.

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): Many use the Tube, as I do.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): I just wanted to reiterate a point Edmund made earlier on. This is very much a central London discussion. It is a tiny proportion of the London problem. If you look at central London, it is black cabs. Outside central London, there are not many black cabs. It is private hire. Private hire is providing a very important service to an awful lot of people, many low-income people, who do not have access to cars. The volume of use of private hire vehicles outside central London is very substantial and one should not forget that. It is providing a service to ordinary people.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Let us look at commercial traffic now.

Joanne McCartney AM: I am aware that our guest from the Road Haulage Association could not attend today and so I hope you can help me nevertheless. We did a report in 2015/16 - last year - where we noted that for delivery van traffic in particular there had been an increase of 30%.
My question to you is whether we need to reduce the number of delivery vans on the road. How can we do that?

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** You have to recognise there is competition for that space and we all want to use the space more effectively. To put the question back to you, I suppose we have to think about which of those journeys are not effective use of that space or whether they could be made to use the spaces at a different time of day when it is causing less congestion. I know TfL has done a lot of good work since the Olympics, trying to think about how it can discuss with freight shippers alternative times of day working.

There is a good discussion to be had - and this is a longstanding issue - with the boroughs about the extent to which commercial vehicles these days could be allowed to use night-time deliveries. As you know, night-time restrictions were imposed a long time ago when the vehicles were very different and much noisier. This of course is very controversial, but almost everywhere else in the world you are only allowed to deliver at night. Here, you are not allowed to deliver at night at all. All of that can be thought about and changed. As I say, TfL has done some very good work and is just beginning to address that at the edges.

In the Olympics, they did make a very big difference to the amount of congestion caused by commercial vehicles, without necessarily destroying the businesses. By the way, I do not know if Edmund knows off the cuff what proportion of the traffic on the roads is commercial, but it is a high proportion.

**Edmund King OBE (President, The AA):** Stephen, what you have to do is to differentiate between white van growth, which has been much greater than the bigger commercial vehicles, and this is down to society and the way we work: people ordering stuff online. One of the major problems in London is people having stuff delivered to their offices in London, which is very inefficient and causes immense congestion. I know some companies have actually banned it because it is causing congestion at their reception areas, let alone on the roads. That is something we have to look at. There are better hubs. There is a system where you can pick up your deliveries at a Tube station rather than going out to individual offices. It is whether you can make that delivery system more efficient because that is where the major growth has been.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** TfL did this pilot about having your grocery shopping delivered at Tube stations, which was not exactly successful, but do you think that would be a sensible solution with click-and-collect at your local Tube station?

**Edmund King OBE (President, The AA):** Yes. Certainly during the Olympics TfL did advise all companies to restrict the number of deliveries that they had. A number of companies did that and stopped their staff from receiving any deliveries at all and that made a difference. Yes, we do have to start looking at hubs where things can be delivered and people go and pick them up. Whether it is at railway stations or Tube stations on the way home, it would be much more efficient than having a fleet of vans just with one small book being delivered to an office in central London.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Rachel, earlier you talked about the success of the Regent Street and Bond Street area. Do you want to just talk a little bit about that and whether that could be replicated?

**Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster):** Yes. It was in terms of combining deliveries to businesses and there were a number of other examples of that as well. There was a recent article via my colleagues at Westminster looking at delivery and servicing plans that were again based at the retailer and the retailer in terms of thinking about not having things delivered every day but trying to combine and so
on with other local retailers. They found that potentially there were reductions in costs and externalities of 50% and so there is a lot of scope.

One of the barriers was that retailers often did not think there was any scope for change, and we find this generally with individuals and with companies. People think there is no way things can change and that things have to be as they are at the moment. Actually, when things need to change, as in the Olympics, suddenly things can be different. There is scope for TfL to take a much more active role. It has studied, as was alluded to earlier, the potential for having deliveries made not at workplaces - not at homes, either, because potentially at homes people are not in and the vans go away and they come back - but having them delivered to shops in the local area. There is massive scope for that. Really, we are only just starting to wake to this but, as car use and car ownership decline, which is a good thing, there are more white vans on the roads and we need to do something about it.

We also need to remember the potential for the last mile of deliveries being made by non-motorised modes; for example, e-bikes, cargo cycles. There was a European study that found there was potential to replace 25% of freight trips in that way. That has massive benefits if we can do that, but we need to think about encouraging and subsidising e-bikes and cargo cycles to allow that last mile. TfL did a study in 2009 and found a lot of potential, but again not much has happened since and so I would like to see TfL take more of a lead on this.

**Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club):** The first point really is important with the big deliveries to the big businesses in central London and the big stores. If I drive up Regent Street behind some big articulated lorry and he pulls over, hazard lights on, he is going to be there unloading for 45 minutes. All of a sudden, that restricts the volume there by 50% and so it goes from two lanes to one and filters back. Unfortunately, in London we have these lovely old Victorian roads and, apart from driving on the kerb, we are a bit stuffed. If it is down by 50%, it is easy to see the trail back of traffic start permeating all the way back to Piccadilly Circus and beyond. That is what happens in London. It is like a chain reaction. If something sits here, you start seeing the build-up of traffic all the way along the line, unfortunately.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Is there a case for banning HGVs in London to get the really big vehicles off the road?

**Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club):** That would be quite hard.

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** They are doing a job. HGVs are there for a reason. I make a broader point along those lines. Delivery vans are a particular issue, but go into outer London in the middle of the day and see what is out there. It is a lot of commercial vehicles doing their jobs: moving building materials around, plumbers, all the life stuff of London. If you impede that, you do risk damaging the London economy.

**Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster):** I would point out that often jobs could potentially be done differently.

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** Of course.

**Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster):** We have become very used to having relatively subsidised motor vehicle transport and parking. For instance, are people doing jobs in homes
taking their tools back and forth? Is this necessary? Could they travel more sustainably? That is why we need incentives - potentially carrots and sticks - to ensure that people and companies think twice before assuming these motor vehicle trips have to happen.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Emeritus Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): Where is the subsidy?

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Sorry, let Rachel finish first.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): Yes. If you would not interrupt me so much, that would be nice.

I would also like to mention something about holding areas. This is something that should be considered. I have a MSc student who looked at the potential for more efficient use of construction vehicles, and he found that if we had holding areas, there would be fewer construction vehicles driving around. They drive around waiting for a site to open, which also is an issue about hours of work. There are plenty of things that can be done, but they are happening in isolated pockets. There needs to be much more of a push on that. There is plenty of research on the externalities associated with driving and car parking that just demonstrate how much resources are being put into this.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): Could you enlarge on the subsidy point? Why are they subsidised?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): Because of the externalities that car-driving causes and because of the externalities associated with car parking. Car parking in an expensive city like London is, frankly, an inefficient use of resources, and my own employer has realised that.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): It is in the sense that people are not paying a proper rental for the use of the land that they occupy?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): In terms of car parking, that is largely it. In terms of driving, it is the externalities that are imposed upon others.

Joanne McCartney AM: We have had discussions before, but with a lot of commercial traffic in particular or transportation of goods, what is the capacity of the rail or river network to take some of that capacity to free up road space?

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): It is very difficult for the type of deliveries that have increased more because they are smaller scale and it always is the last mile and how you do that. It would be quite complex for those to use the river or rail.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Emeritus Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): Just thinking about the trip patterns, it is stuff going here, there and everywhere all over London and the river goes nowhere. It is just a few specialist flows and that is it.

Joanne McCartney AM: Is there any evidence that commercial traffic will drive into London to avoid going around London?
Edmund King OBE (President, The Automobile Association): No. When you speak to Scottish hauliers, the best road in Britain, believe it or not, is the M25 because before the M25 many of them drove through London. That was the route. Actually, the M25, with all its ills, helps them a lot. No, there is little evidence of that.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): Could I just make a point while I remember? We have to also be alert to the fact that if congestion reduces, freight may potentially retime and cause further problems. A student of mine who was studying delivery timing found demolition contractors were mainly using the inter-peak period and his conclusion from that was that they were avoiding congestion during the peaks. If congestion reduces, there is the potential for those journeys to change time and so we need to be alert to those issues.

Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club): What I would like to say is that we all love seeing London boom and we are all talking about reducing the congestion and freight, but at the same time we want London to be the hub for business. We are encouraging companies to come to London. You only have to look out your window and see how many blocks of flats are being built. I do not see how you can have a growing economy with massive housebuilding going on, big shopping centres growing and being built and everything that goes with them, and then say, “How are we going to cut the lifeblood of them actually happening?”

Joanne McCartney AM: We are not saying that. I am just asking whether there is going to be a better use of the capacity.

Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club): No, but what I am saying is it is booming, is it not? London is booming and with that boom comes the problems that we are talking about: added congestion, builders, contractors, everything.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): Things can be done differently; for example, mixing concrete on site. That was a change that my student looked at and it could potentially impact vehicle movements. There are things that can be done differently. London booming does not need to mean so many HGVs on the road and so many cyclists and pedestrians injured.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): The use of the river we have looked at before in terms of developments along the river or things like Blackfriars Bridge. Everything was brought in by the river. The Thames Tideway Tunnel is now - which originally we found was not going to - going to take lots of vehicles. That is really great. Thank you for that.

We are going to move on to a more controversial topic, possibly, now: tackling congestion through potential road charging.

Tom Copley AM: Yes, in the opening remarks Edmund [King] and Stephen [Glaister] have set out some thoughts already on the effectiveness of the Congestion Charge and so perhaps I could come to Rachel and then Grant [Davis] first of all and then I have another series of questions. Rachel, could you tell us how effective you think congestion charging has been?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): Congestion charging in the early years was very effective in enabling capacity previously allocated to private motor vehicles to be reallocated largely to bus lanes and pedestrian space because it reduced demand and because it allowed us to use our
public space more efficiently, more pleasantly and so on. Also, the research suggested that there was a road safety benefit as well both through fewer car trips and through car trips causing fewer injuries, which is great.

What we are now seeing is that that effect has started to wear off and we need to think very hard about whether what we currently have is the most effective means of reducing all of these problems that are associated with excessive motor vehicle use. For example, the research that I referred to also looked at the impact of increasing the [Congestion] Charge, and every pound increase in the Charge, they found, would reduce five injury incidents per month, which would be a good thing in itself but also has the co-benefit of reducing unplanned disruption to the traffic network. Potentially doubling the Charge could have a really substantial impact on injuries.

However, is that the way you want to go? Do we want to think of other ways of disincentivising motor vehicle use? Workplace parking levies (WPLs) have been very effective in Nottingham, for instance, and other forms of emissions-based charging. Yes, it has really helped, and it has helped start a cultural shift away from excessive motor vehicle use, but we need to think about increasing it, enhancing the scope and using other forms of charge as well. Potentially, as vehicles become cleaner, the revenues will decrease and so on.

**Tom Copley AM:** I am going to come on to WPLs in a bit, but the Mayor has announced various new charges related to air quality, the toxicity charge (T-charge) and expanding the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ). Do you think that will have an impact on congestion as well? Do you see it as effectively an increase in the Congestion Charge?

**Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster):** The actual numbers of vehicles impacted by the T-charge are going to be relatively low. It is a positive step in the right direction, but we should be thinking more radically, as I said earlier, particularly in terms of what our peer cities are doing. Paris is planning to phase out diesel vehicles totally by 2019. That is the kind of thing we should be thinking about: the way in which these vehicles are harming our children’s lungs. Is that acceptable? Do we just want to put a slightly higher charge on these vehicles?

**Tom Copley AM:** Grant, could you tell us your thoughts on the effectiveness of congestion charging?

**Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club):** Yes. Tom, we have a few that I have just put down here. What we say in the cab trade is that a simple scheme like the Congestion Charge is easy to understand and, if the price was set at a level that deterred unnecessary journeys, if public transport was improved and the Congestion Charge exemption for the private hire was removed, this would have a massive effect on reducing the traffic levels around London. People are used to the Congestion Charge.

**Edmund King OBE (President, The AA):** It would be interesting, though: what are the unnecessary journeys in central London? I do not drive in central London. I paid the Congestion Charge once and I could park for free but it is not efficient to drive in. When I look around central London, you do not see many people just driving there for the heck of it. They are doing things. They are delivering things. They are going to work. They are on shift. There were very few in central London even before the Congestion Charge. As I said, 86% use public transport because it is a more efficient way of getting around. Hiking the price I am not sure would have that much difference. As Steve Norris [former Minister for Transport in London and former mayoral candidate] said, if you put the price up, more of his rich friends from the City might be able to use it.
Tom Copley AM: Of course, there is also a sense that the Mayor of London does not have many revenue-raising powers. This is one of them as well. Is there tension as well between wanting to make sure you set it at a point where the Mayor can maximise the revenue for TfL?

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): Yes. You have to be clear what it is about. Is it about raising revenue? In terms of raising revenue, it has raised money that has gone into the transport system, without a doubt. Stephen would be the expert on this, but if you get it too high, it would put off some drivers.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): Rachel [Aldred] put it very well. It did work spectacularly well. There has been no other traffic management measure in history that did what that did. It continues to serve a function. If you removed it, you would be in big trouble. To repeat what I said, it is on a tiny, tiny area of London.

Tom Copley AM: Do you think it needs to be expanded geographically?

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): Let us not say what I think. The problem for London is this: what are we going to do? We have a growing population. We have growing traffic, and traffic is growing. For the first time for years, traffic is growing. If we accept what I believe to be the demographic forecasts, the demand on the road networks is going to go on and on. We could do things in outer London to increase the capacity - we will probably come to that - but we are not going to be able to deal with this in any other way than mitigating the growth in demand on the network through some kind of price incentive. It would not necessarily be Congestion Charge with a capital C as we know and understand it, but some way of giving incentive to use the road space more effectively and generate lots of revenue. London desperately needs revenue for its infrastructure, and it does both.

Tom Copley AM: This is now quite an old piece of technology and perhaps a blunt instrument. Do you have any examples internationally of where there are perhaps more sophisticated models that could be transplanted to London?

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): Road pricing of one form or another is used all over the world: Singapore, Stockholm, Oregon. Technically, there are many different ways to do it, and it is not a problem. It has a cost, but the cost is coming down very fast.

The thing that could attract me if it could be done - and I am not sure whether it can be done yet - is to find a way of integrating paying for using the road with paying for everything else, as in your other modes of transport. You have a car ...

Tom Copley AM: When you register your car.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): Yes. Why not? TfL officials have written about the possibilities of doing that. It would not be technically easy, but in terms of presenting it to the public, it has an attraction. We do not care how you travel, whether you cycle, whether you use a lorry or whatever, as long as you pay what it costs. This is your point about people paying the true cost.
Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): Yes. If we are going to have true costs, we should pay people to walk and cycle so they can get an e-bike.

Tom Copley AM: There is an idea.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): I am just concerned that people do not run away with the idea that anybody is suggesting that in outer London people are going to be paying £10 a day. That is not the point. It varies by time of day and by space, to get a more intelligent use of the road space and to generate some revenue.

Tom Copley AM: That sounds very sensible and the idea of that is something we can put to our second panel this afternoon when we have TfL, do we not?

Next, perhaps, Rachel, could you talk about the political, practical and financial barriers a Mayor may face in terms of changing the road pricing system and expanding it. The political ones are obvious, but the practical issues as well.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): I would like to agree with Stephen [Glaister] that these things are technically possible. It is not actually that difficult to institute different systems of road pricing. The political issue is really the big issue and we have to be clear that we cannot carry on travelling in the old way. We need to change. We need to make that change possible. It is really important that the revenue is used, as it was before, for sustainable transport because road pricing has the potential to be very regressive if it is done badly. In London it was not and that was because it was ploughed back into largely walking and bus schemes, and the revenue needs to go into walking, cycling and public transport so that people have real alternatives. For many people, they do not necessarily have alternatives. If we are going to ask people to cycle to the Tube and there is massive potential for cycling to the Tube and train stations in outer London - we need to provide for that and that needs to be invested in.

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): The other point politically and what makes central London in the current system different is that it did not affect many voters as such in central London. You go to outer London and politically there would be a different outcry. Many people, whether right or wrong, would see it as a poll tax on wheels. Politically, getting that acceptance, there would have to be some pretty good carrots.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): May I suggest you look at the evidence on what people’s attitudes are? There was work done at the time of the Congestion Charge across the whole of London and there was work done after it. Of course, a referendum would have been lost, as they always are, before the event, but a referendum after the event, London-wide, would have been won in London because people saw the benefits.

Edmund King OBE (President, The Automobile Association): It was only central London, Stephen.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): No, the public attitude work was across the whole of London.

Edmund King OBE (President, The Automobile Association): Yes, but the scheme was only in central London.
Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): I understand. All I want to say is there is a repeated experience all around the world with some of the schemes I have mentioned - and you can look at the evidence - that when people are given the vote before, they have always voted against. When they are given the opportunity to vote to keep it, they do vote to keep it because they see the benefits of it. That is a very difficult political problem to get people to see from here to there, but it does produce a better outcome.

Tom Copley AM: OK, thank you. Perhaps I could start with WPLs with Rachel because you did mention it earlier. You said it had been effective in Nottingham. Sorry, I am slightly ignorant on this point. In London, is it a power that rests with the local authorities or is it with TfL in London to produce this levy?

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): It is with the Mayor.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): It is the Mayor.

Tom Copley AM: It is the Mayor that has the power. Your view is it would be effective both at raising revenue and at reducing congestion?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): There is always a tension between raising revenue and deterring unnecessary motor vehicle trips. In Nottingham, certainly there were reports of doom and gloom and how businesses would all move to Derby. It turned out none of that happened and actually there was a decrease in the number of car trips. There was also an increase in public transport use and they raised revenue in order to fund that public transport and now walking and cycling investment as well. That is very much a good news story, and other places are considering it despite the political difficulties.

Tom Copley AM: Can it be varied? For example, could the Mayor in part of London have one levy and in another part of London have a higher levy?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): That is possible. Obviously there would be complex discussions to be had with the boroughs, but it is possible. There is increasingly good evidence that certainly free car parking really encourages people to drive. Maybe that is not that surprising but certainly, if you put free car parking in, people will drive. If you reduce the amount of car parking, people drive less. There are massive differences across London.

Just to give a personal anecdote, I am at the University of Westminster now on Baker Street. There is virtually no car parking. Virtually no one drives. Previously I was at the University of East London with plenty of staff car parking and no student car parking. Loads of staff drove in, despite the fact that we were on the Docklands Light Railway. All of the students had to get public transport and complained about the fact they saw staff driving in. It really makes a difference to people’s behaviour. In much of London, people do have alternatives. Those alternatives often need to be improved, but it is really very much worth considering because it has such a big impact on behaviour.

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): I am not sure it would have a big impact, though, in central London because there are not that many companies that have massive car parks and so it would not actually have much effect.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): No, but perhaps in inner London.
Tom Copley AM: If you can raise £9 million in Nottingham, you can raise a hell of a lot of money across Greater London. Is it for purely political reasons, do you think, that this has not been implemented and a Mayor would worry he would be unpopular?

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): Originally, the understanding was you either have congestion charging or workplace parking, not both, and that was in the legislation originally. Whether that has changed since ...

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): It is worth remembering that before the Mayor took power in 2000, there was a big study done by the Government Office for London called Road Charging Options for London. How would you go about it? What are the options? That looked at workplace parking, as I recall, and it looked at the scheme that we now all know and love. It came to the conclusion that congestion charging was the best of the alternatives.

It is certainly worth looking as an option, workplace parking, but it does need researching very carefully because you will get all sorts of anomalies. It happened in Nottingham, I believe, but it would happen in London as well where you have large areas that are occupied by vehicles coming to shopping. At Brent Cross, a big shopping area, is that workplace parking? Is it visitor parking or shoppers’ parking? All these definitional issues would need to be sorted out to see if it could be made to work. I have to say - and I am not suggesting it is not a good idea - that it is second-best to charging people for using the road, which is what you want to do directly if you can.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): I would point out that also car parking is an inefficient use of space. The other good thing about it as well is that it is the employer who pays and the employer can choose what to do in relation to it.

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): They did find in Nottingham that there were some problems with shift workers when public transport was not available and essential shift workers ...

Tom Copley AM: Yes, that needs to be taken into account. Excellent. Thank you all very much.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Lovely. Thank you. We are now going to move on to look at road infrastructure.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): I will open with a broad question first. Do we think the construction of more roads would relieve congestion and, if so, where would we look mainly?

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): We could have a tunnel from the A40 to the A12 to take all that traffic out of central London. We could have a tunnel from the A4 to the A13 to do the same: take traffic out. Traffic that does not need to cross London could be in tunnels. There was a lot of work done on this in the past. In fact, a former colleague of Stephen’s at Imperial College probably 20 or 15 years ago looked at it. We were talking about a trans-Pennine tunnel of - what was it - 27 miles or something? We have seen the tunnel, Crossrail, but in this country we have done very little. Paris has put a lot of its traffic in a tunnel and they have in Boston, but it is something we have not really looked seriously at in London.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): It does not need to be enormously big schemes, once you look at those things. Major junction
improvements, flyovers and that kind of thing will relieve particular problems. There is a long list of those which produce big benefits. Judicious - I do not think anybody thinks you can build your way out of the problem in London - but there are real options to improve the situation.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): I would very much caution against new road infrastructure because there is plenty of evidence that building new roads will lead to more use of motor vehicles and will lead to congestion going back up again. We do need to increase capacity, but we need to increase people-carrying capacity, as I said. For example, there is a big issue around river crossings for walking and cycling. We really need more river crossings for walking and cycling. We need more public transport capacity. We do not need more roads, which will funnel traffic. The traffic has to go somewhere from those roads and so we need to be very cautious about it.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): If you are talking about moving people in outer London, it is the car that people use.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): That is what we need to change and we will not change it by building lots more roads.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): That is the choice.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Would that work, Grant?

Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club): Yes, Keith, it is a great idea. The tunnels would work because, if I get a job in the City or Canary Wharf and they want to go to Knightsbridge or Hammersmith, either I have to come along the Embankment - and as we know, with the Cycle Superhighway, that has become a car park - or I have to go up to the Euston Road. With the developments that are looking to go at Euston Station, again, that is going to be gridlocked and so I am really stuck. These big tunnels that could go from east to west and from south to north would be fantastic, another crossing to supplement the Rotherhithe. If you go to Rotherhithe Tunnel, if anything happens, it is major gridlock all through the southeast; Blackwall Tunnel likewise. We could do with a couple of big tunnels and some more river crossings. That would really help London. It would.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): That is helpful. In fact, I was going to ask you about tunnelling but we have got on to that subject already. The question, therefore, is how would we pay for this? There is talk at the moment about an east London crossing. I represent two east London boroughs and one of the ways of financing that of course is through tolling. With the example of the Silvertown Tunnel, they not only want to toll that but they want to keep tolling the QEII Bridge, which has more than paid for itself, and toll Blackwall and Rotherhithe.

First of all, do we think it is sensible to use tolling as a financing method? Secondly, should we continue that tolling after the project has been paid for? Thirdly, is it fair that east London has to pay to cross the river when the rest of London does not?

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): If you are talking about brand new infrastructure, a tunnel across London, the only way conceivably that it could be financed is if there were tolling in place. Things like the Dartford Crossing, there was an agreement that the toll would be dropped when it was paid for and money was put into reserve, and that happened in 2003 and it has not been dropped. The charge has been increased.
Not many people go over the Dartford Crossing for the heck of it. They are going somewhere. You do not get into your car and just drive across the Dartford Crossing. It is somewhat ironic that in Scotland they have dropped all the tolls on all their bridges and tunnels, whereas in London we are looking at increasing them.

**Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club):** On the tunnel aspect, as you said, the agreement was that once the bridge costs were paid, that would be it. The distrust from the public now that it does carry on and it does go up leaves a bad taste in the mouth, but if you were to say to Londoners, “We are in a bit of a pickle, the traffic is rising, we are going to build these tunnels and river crossing and you are going to pay by a toll and when it is paid, that is it”, you would get a much warmer reception.

**Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster):** Just to return to the costs of driving, it is worth remembering that the cost of construction is only a part of the costs in a real sense because the external costs of motor traffic - the air pollution, the injuries and so on - are substantial. Paying for itself in terms of construction is only part of paying for it.

I would also say that east London is very under-served in terms of walking and cycling crossings. People do not have an alternative. Mobility by sustainable modes is restricted there, too.

**Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club):** We have just done the great Crossrail tunnel all the way through because we all recognised that we needed Crossrail to open up London, and the same way with traffic. I believe that the use of tunnels and more crossings is the way forward. It has to be.

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** As a practical matter, if London wants some big, new infrastructure like tunnels, they are not going to get it unless it tolls it to get the capital. It is just a practical point. Your example and your question about whether east London should pay does point out a more general problem of whether it makes sense to talk about charges on specific bits of infrastructure or talk about a portfolio of charges across the piece to fund London’s infrastructure. The users of Crossrail are required to make only a relatively small contribution to the costs of Crossrail. It is part of a network that is funded in all sorts of ways in the way that all London infrastructure is. It is not regarded as a specific thing. Nobody says, “You cannot build Crossrail unless you can make a profit out of it”. It is part of a network.

We should have the same attitude to all our own infrastructure. That is why, to go back to the earlier point, there is a real attraction to saying, “Make charges to the use of the road which are intelligent and moderate and appropriate”, but then use that money partly for cycling and other things, but partly to improve the road network. You will not sell that unless some of the money goes back to improving the road network for the people that are paying the charges. That is the political reality and I would say that that would be the justice in it too. There is enough money here to share it around.

**Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman):** Just as a slight aside, in the east we are not very well served by river crossings but we do have the A406, which has been invested in over time, to three or four lanes in places. In south London you have something that is supposed to be called the A205, the ring road in the south. That is not even more than the village street sometimes. How do we get these inconsistencies in investment and how would you overcome that?

**Edmund King OBE (President, The Automobile Association):** There is no doubt that your analysis is right and it has caused congestion in south London. The North Circular is a bypass for traffic and it is
dedicated. The South Circular was never invested in. There were plans for tunnels actually in the 1980s and 1990s but they never materialised.

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** Part of the problem, of course, is that parts of the South Circular are village streets. They go through town centres. I commend the work of the Roads Task Force, whenever that was. They did discuss these issues at great length and I thought they came to some pretty sensible conclusions about that.

**Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman):** It is a compromise.

**Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London):** It will always be a compromise.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair):** Thank you. A quick look at car clubs now.

**Navin Shah AM:** In January 2015 there were some 135 car club members in London. TfL of course is very keen to increase their membership and that is why it launched its action plan to increase the membership of car clubs.

The question I have to guests is: what evidence is there that car clubs reduce congestion? If I can start with Rachel, because you have talked about doing things differently and the car clubs initiative is one of them, how much do you believe it contributes to reduction in congestion? Is there evidence of that?

**Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster):** Again, it is something that potentially it is quite hard to untangle different impacts and prove links, but one of the things that is quite positive about car clubs is the potential for cultural shift, which is important. Like with the Congestion Charge, the people move away from seeing the car as their own personal property to it being part of shared mobility, it being part of a system. That is positive. The actual numbers are still relatively low, and I know that TfL is concerned that maybe quite a lot of these trips are concentrated in more central areas where potentially the greatest shift away from the car you could get in more outer London areas. I am wondering if there is potential for TfL to take a more active role perhaps in regulating even provision because at the moment the car clubs are not necessarily where they would lead to the greatest benefit.

I have also seen some research from a student of mine who has done some research in the area that suggested that car clubs are not necessarily attracting the kinds of people who are currently driving more as well. The picture is kind of mixed. There is a cultural impact, but the benefits are relatively low at the moment, although that might change.

**Navin Shah AM:** You mentioned TfL’s role. Can the Mayor of London have ideas or what can the Mayor do to increase the impact of car clubs? Is there anything the Mayor can do differently or more?

**Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster):** I do not know exactly what the specific powers are in this area, but maybe there is the case for increasing powers because, if this is going to become a more significant part of the way in which people travel, then we need to manage it more, like we need to manage freight and servicing more and so on, in the same way that we manage public transport systems more. At the moment the market is not providing those services where they are most needed and where they may be most useful.
Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): Yes. Where the Mayor can intervene, it is things like offering preferential parking for car clubs at the end of the road. That makes it easier. They have had this in Glasgow. One car club had the preferential parking and then they lost the tender to have it. They still had car club members but they did not have that parking and so they had to find alternative parking. I have seen an estimate of 150,000 users in London. By 2020 there might be 1 million - I think that is quite optimistic - and it says that that could take up to 200,000 cars off the road.

Often, in the work we have done, people who join the car clubs do not have a car but they want a car to go to Sainsbury’s on the Friday or they want a car for the weekend to go out of town. In terms of that, it is not actually reducing the number of cars. It is giving other people who do not have a car easier access to a car when they need it. In terms of congestion, I am not convinced it is a major player. There may be some other benefits, but in terms of congestion it is fairly minimal.

Navin Shah AM: Stephen, you have been very strongly advocating the issues about congestion in outer London. For outer London, there is major planned growth. Could this be something that can actually help congestion? What can be done?

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): I do not know because I am not very familiar with the evidence. I do agree with what my colleagues have said. First of all, car clubs have been on offer for a long time in London. I was sitting around this table three or four years ago and we were banging on about it. It has not happened in London except a little bit in the centre.

Secondly, if it going to work, you need a high density of vehicles available. If it is going to be useful to you, you have to be able to get one when you need it. That means it is very hard to make it work in the kind of areas you just mentioned in outer London. The cost of doing that, arguably, would be very large.

If you are proposing that a Mayor should put resources into encouraging car clubs, you would have to demonstrate those resources would not be better spent in improving cycling or better bus services or something to achieve the objective. Edmund’s [King] point is a strong one. If you had lots of car club vehicles available, there is a risk that people who do not currently drive will find them easily available and start driving them. There is a balance there. The evidence is very unclear about where the balance lies. It is not a panacea, in my view.

Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club): I would agree with Edmund [King] and Stephen. We are trying to look at ways of taking cars off the road and it would probably be more helpful if the people who would go to a car club would maybe use private hire or a taxi or public transport, to be honest, rather than engage with driving another car on the road.

Navin Shah AM: Another question I have on this is that you have different models of car clubs, parking provision and stuff. Do you reckon car clubs without designated parking spaces encourage people to drive more? Is that the case?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): In a number of boroughs now they are allowed to park in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) area, I have noticed. As Edmund [King] says, the evidence is not necessarily that it is shifting people from owning cars, although potentially it is stopping people from buying cars who might otherwise have bought cars. I generally agree that the impact is currently
relatively limited and the density needed is quite high and so it would need substantial resources put into in order to make that available to people in outer London.

Navin Shah AM: Thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): I have my final question before we bring this panel to a close. If there was one thing you could do to tackle congestion in London, what would it be? If there is one international city that has some good things going on that we should be looking at, which one would it be? Who would like to go first?

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): There is one thing that could make a difference and TfL has started to look at it and it is about efficiency of the road network. It is looking at the automated traffic light system, the SCOOT system, which is state-of-the-art but there is a study being conducted to show that it could be more efficient. There are lots of junctions in London that hold up buses for no particular reason. You then get bus congestion, etc. London is always going to be a problem, but if you can make the most of the scarce resource, that traffic light system would help a lot.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): What do you think about the idea that was mooted a couple of years ago in relation to turning the traffic lights off at around about, say, 9.00 pm or something?

Edmund King OBE (President, The Automobile Association): Yes, there are some areas where it can be done where there are not high pedestrian densities. It was a problem with pedestrians crossing the road. Yes, I believe there are some, particularly in outer London, where that could be done and would be effective.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): In terms of an international city, is there any place you think has good practice we should look at?

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): I mentioned in terms of tunnels there are other cities that are looking at it like Boston and Paris.

Grant Davis (Chairman, London Cab Drivers Club): I am along the lines of more taxi and bus corridors, to be honest, getting people on to public transport, away from the main road, having the roads and designated areas and, like Edmund [King] said, the rephasing of the lights. There is nothing worse than sitting at junctions where they seem to be red for a very, very long time and you think, “If they were to go green, then all these people behind me could get moving”. That would be a real help, actually.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): If I could just say something on rephasing junctions, it would imply disbenefits for others and the others may be pedestrians. It is not benefits for all.

Edmund King OBE (President, The AA): Buses, though, benefit.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Reader in Transport, University of Westminster): Yes, but we need to remember pedestrian movement and pedestrian congestion, too. In terms of what we should do, I would go for reallocating road space because that encourages sustainable modes and encourages more efficient modes. It has so many co-benefits and health is really important and reallocating road space to walking and cycling and
more sustainable modes. My example for this: I have a number but I will use the example of Paris because Paris is very car-choked. It is challenging to do that, but the fact that they are going to take the Right Bank and all these roundabouts and give the space over primarily to walking and cycling is really ambitious and courageous and we should learn from it.

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): I would want to do something that potentially might do something for the whole of London. I would want to get away from this concentration we have all the time on the centre of London. There are miles and miles and miles of people doing their business all over the suburbs and we have outlined between us - I think we are all agreed - the nature of the problem we face and the lack of road space. We have to face up to that.

I do not know what the answer is, but for me the first step would be to go back to the subject of how we might use that road space more effectively and efficiently through charging for it and doing intelligent things with the revenue, not go public with it, but to think carefully about what it might do, what the charges might be and how it might improve the situation, how much money it would raise, have a debate about how we are going to use the money, and see if it offers something new. I do not see any other way out of it.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Any international city you think we should look at?

Professor Stephen Glaister CBE (Professor of Transport and Infrastructure, Imperial College London): It is difficult because London was in the lead with this and the world looked at London and still does look at London. You could look at Stockholm. They have had a system in place for a long time and Singapore. There are many cities that have been these things work.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Lovely. Brilliant. Thank you very much indeed. You have given us lots of food for thought as we start our investigation on this, so thank you, Grant, Edmund, Rachel and Stephen for your contributions. If there is something that you suddenly think, “I wish I had said that and I did not”, please do write to us because we are taking lots of evidence and this is our big investigation over the next few months. Thank you very much.
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): I know some of our guests, if not all of them, having been listening in to the previous session.

My first question to you all as an opener is: how do you think traffic congestion has changed in London over the last few years? Has it gone up significantly? Is it occurring at different times and places, and what do you think the main causes are?

Actually, I should have introduced you all. That was very rude of me. We have the panel here today. Some have been before us and some have not and so I ought to start off. We have Dr Aruna Sivakumar, who is a Lecturer in Transport Studies at Imperial College. Welcome, Aruna. Thank you for coming along today. Stephen Joseph is Chief Executive for Campaign for Better Transport. Paul Gerrard, who is the Operations Director for the National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG), deals with all the roadworks in London. David Leam is the Infrastructure Director for London First. Welcome along.

You have heard my first question giving the overall picture on congestion in London. Would you like to start, Aruna?

Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London): In the first place, the question that was put to me when I received the email invitation was: what are we trying to address, really? As Rachel [Aldred] mentioned earlier, how do we measure congestion if it is about average travel speeds? That could be affected by a lot of different things. It is not just about how many people are able to use the system effectively but it is about the fact that more of the road network is being reclaimed for other purposes and so on. Even if the Congestion Charge had a very strong and good impact in terms of letting only people who really need to be in London come in, travel times and congestion have presumably increased because we have taken some of that space away from these people now to better use it for more sustainable modes, improve public transport and so on. That leads to congestion.

The question really should be: what are we addressing? Is it really about making sure that people can get from A to B faster by road or is it that they can get from A to B period? That is more my perspective. If you are going to specifically answer that question of congestion in terms of travel times or average speeds, it is really an incomplete picture. To answer the complete picture, I would have to do a lot more analysis. I do not have an answer offhand for you on that.

Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive, Campaign for Better Transport): We have said in our evidence to the Committee that private car use in London has been falling for a number of years. The issue is about the growth in commercial traffic, where delivery vans now make up 13% of all motorised urban traffic, and INRIX, which has been quoted by a lot of people, talks about the impact of planned roadworks. They say a 362% increase since 2012, and that is reflected in the latest TfL monitoring report on the TfL Lane Rental Scheme (TLRS). I am sure my neighbour will have views on this. Those seem to us to be among the reasons.
Actually, more generally, if you look around the city, particularly in the centre, it is a growing city, there is lots of construction work and that does involve the closure of roads and offices of City Road. That road keeps being closed because there are large blocks of flats and other things being built all over it. There is a limit to how far you can keep open the existing road network while the scale of development that is happening in London continues: freight, roadworks and general development.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair):** There has been a perfect storm of all these things coming together perhaps in recent years.

**Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive, Campaign for Better Transport):** Yes. We can talk about it in more detail later, but that is a summary.

**Paul Gerrard (Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group):** From my perspective and from the perspective of the NJUG members, we have seen an increase. We are emergency services at the end of the day. We have to attend to gas escapes; we have to attend to water leaks. We have standard levels of agreement and we are challenged in reaching those within the timespans. It is not just that we excavate and dig roads. We are an emergency service. We supply a service. We have to get there within timeframes. Yes, we have seen - and it is probably reminiscent of the extra building work that is going on - vehicles. We have talked about vehicles. We use HGVs. We use large goods vehicles (LGVs). We have to transport pipes. We have to transport all of the materials. We are part of it. If London is growing, we are growing. Yes, we have seen an increase.

**David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First):** There is no doubt that congestion is steadily worsening, and if you look at the forward forecast from TfL over the next 10, 20 and 30 years, it is only going to get worse.

There is a really important contextual point here. Just looking back over the past couple of years, your perfect storm reference is a good one because, if you think about it, we did have the Roads Task Force with which I was involved at the time, but that did trigger a greater interest in roads on the part of TfL and it stimulated quite a big investment programme. If you think about all the big junction works that have been taking place, tackling those old horrible 1960s gyratories and making them a bit more friendly for a modern city and the massive programme of cycling investment in the Superhighways, a lot of this of course was quite condensed because the Mayor was conscious he was coming towards the end of his time. The perfectly understandable desire to do as much as quickly as possible meant there was a very considerable programme of TfL activity that has made the congestion problem a bit starker and a bit worse in the past couple of years. Some of that will ease off as we get to a more TfL steady state, but there is certainly something about planning the programme of interventions on the road network a bit better in the round.

**Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London):** I would like to add to that. Just talking about this triggers a parallel analysis that has been undertaken both in academia and elsewhere. Lots of people have been looking at the whole peak car phenomenon that was just alluded to, which is the idea that the driving peak has already arrived, in a sense, and now we are plateauing out and perhaps even reducing in terms of overall demand for driving. That is something that has been analysed for over more than a decade.

Just as I was alluding to in terms of congestion being not the core issue but what we are really addressing, in the same sense when it comes to the peak car issue, looking at the details - unpeeling the onion, if you will, whatever you want to call it - when you start looking at the data in greater detail, you see that a big part of
the initial reduction that has been considered in driving has been the introduction of company cars, for
instance, which happened heavily because of a change in taxation. For private cars, in that sense, there has
been a reduction again. If you break it down, there has been a reduction in the number of young males who
are driving but there has been an increase in the number of young females who are driving for other purposes.
If you start looking at those kinds of details, the picture is very different and it is the same issue with
congestion.

If you start looking at whether travel times that have gone up, then why is it? I do not disagree with the idea
that there has been a significant increase in the number of commercial vehicles, service vehicles, minicabs and
so on. I do not disagree with that because the data is very obvious on that but we really need to get what is
the question we are answering. Do we need to just be able to help people go from A to B most efficiently? Or
is it about reducing travel times? If you reduce travel times people will get on those routes. It will induce
demand and it will go right back up until it gets to the level where people can just about survive without
complaining too much.

Florence Eshalomi AM: I want to pick up on the point you mentioned about the drop in the number of
young males driving but the increase in young women. I have been driving since I was able to get my
provisional licence and, looking back to all those years at college, all the girls were able to get insurance and
some who did not get insurance were able to join their parents’, whereas for the boys it was still quite hard.
Do you that this is still the continuing trend and that is why?

Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London): We do not have the
data to draw obvious causal relationships unless we actually ask people and try to compare that with the
acquisition of driving licences itself, but one of our theories is that it could be the increased cost of owning
cars, insurance and so on that is leading to this. There have been a number of reports that have come out of a
collaboration between the Imperial College Centre for Transport Studies (CTS) and the University College
London (UCL) CTS on this peak car issue funded by the RAC amongst others and that goes
into a lot of these
details. Yes, you are right; that could be one of those.

Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive, Campaign for Better Transport): Briefly on that, there are
larger societal changes going here, particularly among young people in relation to, for example, the
introduction of student loans and increased housing costs, which tend to reduce, particularly in London, the
desirability and indeed ability to afford to own and run cars. That is not just a London phenomenon but you
see it here and that certainly comes of the work that Aruna referred to.

There is some new national data that came out today from the Government’s National Travel Survey (NTS),
which shows that what used to be the case, which that there were a standard number of trips that people
usually made - people nationally used to make 1,000 trips a year when you took in work, shopping and so on -
and that was stable for years, but now it has been dropping because of changes particularly in shopping as well
as commuting patterns and now it is about 900 a year or thereabouts. The authors of this commentary on
travel, which is a detailed household-based travel survey that goes back to the 1960s, say that it looks as if
some of the structural changes - internet shopping, for example - are starting to feed through to travel
patterns. Hence, behind the comments I made about declining private car use and rising vans, that may be one
of the things that is going on there, declining trips to the shops, certainly car trips to the shops, but rising van
use.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Shall we move on to look at buses?
Florence Eshalomi AM: I confess I am a driver but I am still very much reliant on buses and the Tube in terms of doing the nursery run in the morning, which would be a nightmare driving. Then again, competing for space on the bus sometimes can be quite challenging in the morning.

The reality is that a lot of people are using the buses, a really quick, efficient mode if we are looking at congestion and getting people out of cars - up to 80 people on a packed double-decker bus - but because of congestion on the road we are seeing drops in bus usage. There have been massive improvements where dedicated bus lanes have cut the journey times and that is really good. When I used to commute on the 133 from Brixton to London Bridge, it was under 25 minutes straight on the bus lane, really good, but I confess that I have followed people when they press the green button and a load of people come off the bus because they are just jam-packed in traffic and the buses are not moving.

To what extent do you think that the buses have an impact on congestion on London’s roads? Why I ask is that one of the things we have been looking at is the big discussion around the pedestrianisation of Oxford Street and the reality that there are a number of different bus routes there. Some of them going from one end to the other are empty. Do you think our buses are contributing to congestion on the roads? I come to you first, Stephen, and then Aruna.

Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive, Campaign for Better Transport): Buses, even in London, I would say, are almost a forgotten form of transport. The last Mayor had strategies for everything except buses. You had a spending strategy on everything. The national Government has a rail strategy, a roads strategy and now a cycling and walking strategy. There is no bus strategy. Yet they are critical. They get people to work; in particular they get shift workers to work at night; the discussion we have just had about people without cars; they are vital and does not get recognised enough, I would say. It is worth saying that in the business cases for transport planning bus users have a lower value of time than car users because they are generally thought to be paid less and that tends to have its own impact on the kind of justification for bus needs.

We think there is a need to revalue buses and give them much more priority. We want to see a rollout of dedicated bus lanes and bus priority. The last panel talked about the need to give buses priority at secondary junctions. Where you get buses coming out of side roads, they tend to get held up. Buses are victims of traffic congestion as much as causes. There are well-known graphics going back to a London Transport poster from the 1960s that went, “These 69 people in cars”. It showed the 69 cars and how 69 people just on a road could all fit on one bus. Buses are potentially an answer to congestion rather than a cause of it but they need to be planned for and given the appropriate priority.

Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London): Something that Stephen just said makes perfect sense: they are victims rather than instigators, in a sense. There is a bit of a cyclical problem here in the sense that because congestion is bad buses are less reliable. They do get from A to B in 25 minutes but depending on the level of congestion that could be 50 minutes or it could be a few minutes less and that reliability is a big issue. People with higher values of time also have values attached to reliability and they choose modes according to the reliability of the travel times. Buses get used less because they are less reliable. If they get used less, then there is more congestion; the congestion leads to the buses becoming even less reliable. There is a very difficult cyclical problem there that needs to be broken up.

Buses could be a part of the solution to congestion because clearly part of that solution must be about getting more people on public transport and so in that sense they could be. However, perhaps it is about breaking that cyclical problem somewhere - I am not an expert on determining the best routes for buses - and starting
with looking at the routes the buses take and maybe avoiding or reducing the overlap of bus routes that use regular lanes of traffic as much as possible. This may perhaps sound dramatic but it comes back to the fact that I am not an expert in bus routes, maybe even breaking up long bus routes so that you do not have them turning off arterials too much and you have feeder buses coming up to arterials or something. They are part of the problem but they also suffer because of the problem and that needs to be broken up.

Florence Eshalomi AM: There is one thing that I want to flag up with you, Paul, if you could help. The Transport Committee went out to visit the Go Ahead Bus headquarters in Stockwell in July. This will stick with me because we were quoted the figures for bus route 11, where the drivers said that in some instances on a journey that should have taken just under 45 minutes on average, they were being delayed by over 45 minutes just on one particular stretch. They mentioned that it was a combination of roadworks and utility works on the roads. Do you think there is any more that could be done to liaise with some of the different bus networks in terms of the range of works going on across London’s roads?

Paul Gerrard (Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group): The answer to your question is yes, I do. We need to be more co-ordinated throughout the whole industry with all the stakeholders. We are moving in that direction. Now we have to contact every bus authority where we are working to make sure we liaise with them. We are now using more variable message signs messaging boards that we have ever used before but they should be a counteract to the co-ordination; the co-ordination should be saying, “We are going to work in this place. What do you need to do with buses? How do we need to manage between us with the best co-operation so that the buses can flow?”

The odd exception would be emergency works that happen then and there and that becomes a little bit harder to co-ordinate. We do co-ordinate after the event. We do make sure the bus stops are there. We do our utmost. We believe that we are now in a place on all planned works, where we contact the bus authority to say, “We are going to work here.” maybe one day, maybe two days, maybe four weeks, “What do you want us to do? How can we work with you?” In some instances we have contributed to diversions; some of our members have contributed to help the bus companies. That is the best we are offering at the moment. Yes, we can still better co-ordinate and there is an opportunity there to keep going up the ladder, saying better co-ordination, better collaboration and better co-operation.

David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First): Buses are a good topic for the Committee. They shift huge numbers of people; they shift many more people than some other forms of transport. Stephen [Glaister] is right that they often do not get as much profile as some of the other modes and it is very clear that particularly in recent years there has been a big impact on delay and reliability. Professor David Begg has done some work on this with the sector. I would encourage you to get that - they have put some numbers on it - and to test that with TfL because it is quite worrying and it is affecting people’s lives. There is a real cost to it as well in terms of the cost of running of the service, having to put on more buses. There are some real problems there, looking at how bus reliability can be improved, at some of the priority measures or other measures, to better enforcement - whatever it is - to keep the buses operating on a timetable that is meaningful to people.

There is also a separate issue with central London; your own study into Oxford Street, for example. Central London is changing; that is the reality. We are going to have to deal with this. Increasingly central London will not be a place for vehicles. That is the reality. It is going to take time. It is going to be very challenging for us to deal with this but it is going to have a big impact on how buses operate in the centre. The only way Oxford Street can become pedestrianised, which probably is a desirable outcome, is to take a chunk of buses out. That means those routes will have to change and that will be politically challenging because these are things
that people use. We get used to our favourite buses. We know where they are going. People do not like those sorts of changes but it is the direction of travel.

**Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive, Campaign for Better Transport):** I have a couple of quick points. First, the Hopper fare that comes in next week does make it at least a bit easier to split routes so that you can shorten them without the cost penalty. Secondly, the outer London point is really important. There are lots of places in outer London where you could have better bus services. We, I am sure, will come to the WPL but the WPL is paying for the better bus services in outer London to help businesses get people to work differently. It looks like a package that might be worth thinking about.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair):** Let us look at roadworks.

**David Kurten AM:** Thank you for coming in, everyone. I want to ask you a bit about roadworks. There are a couple of specific things that have been brought in over the last six years or so. One is the London Permit Scheme (LoPS), which you might know about, to try to mitigate the effect of lots of roadworks happening at the same time; and the TLRS, by which there was a charge of up £2,500 per day for some companies to do roadworks. Do any of you have any comments on those two schemes and how effective they have been or any other ideas you might have to minimise the impact of roadworks on congestion?

**Paul Gerrard (Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group):** If I start off just to let you know that in the utilities industry we are covered by 50 pieces of legislation and so excavating on the highway, really, is a minefield for us to do it.

Bringing in more and more legislation does restrict us and we do not want restrictions; what we want to do is work with people, to work with the highways and with the people of London at the end of the day. We are providing a service and we only excavate the roads to lay new services, to divert services, to replace under policy, so we are driven by those things, for example, recently the European Union Broadband Directive. Everybody wants broadband and there is no quick fix to putting broadband in there.

Going back to the legislation, we have adopted the permit schemes, we have worked with highway authorities and within the footprint of National Grid we are now 80% permit schemes. We are well used to the permit schemes and we are working with the highway authorities to refine them. The problem we do have, even in central London, is there are 34 interpretations of the LoPS because there are 34 boroughs and so it is just depending on the framework that you work in.

On top of that you have lane rental. Now, the LoPS does what TLRS does; TLRS just puts the charge on top. The LoPS does what you need it to do. If you work TfL you work through the LoPS, lane rental is just the charge on top. What is the difference? We are doing it anyway. We do not see magnanimous benefits in it. If I look at the TLRS, all the fees that are paid to that, they are going into the Innovation Fund. If you evaluate the Innovation Fund, most of it is supplied by TfL. It is not just the utility side. We have to work together with the highways side and with the roadworks side because they cause as much congestion as we do.

**David Kurten AM:** Do you think the TLRS does not reduce congestion?

**Paul Gerrard (Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group):** We do not see what the benefits are. I reviewed the Ecorys report commissioned by the Department for Transport (DfT) and it rather sits on the fence. It says neither one thing nor another. We want to work now with the DfT to see what the next steps are and what the proposals are. We have to be very careful. If you do roll it out or the DfT does want to roll it
out, we estimate it would cost every household in Britain £12 per annum on their bills. That is the impact. What we do not want to be hiking the bills up; we want to do the work more efficiently. We want to work in a co-ordinated, better manner and it is not always the stick that is going to work. Sometimes is it the carrot? Give us the permit; we will pay for the permit and if we do it in one day less, kill the permit fee because the amount of congestion we have saved by doing it in one day less against the £400 permit fee is negligible. There is a bit of the carrot there instead of the stick all the time.

**David Kurten AM:** Are there any other ideas anyone else might jump in with, about how we could reduce congestion from roadworks?

**Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive, Campaign for Better Transport):** In our evidence we referred to a Dutch scheme called *Minder Hinder* - reduce nuisance - which is essentially about better liaison, doing a holistic approach in liaising with people. You might for example get employers to stagger arrival times or, say, offer a discount for customers using public transport during roadworks. We thought that would be worth a look. The Dutch have had some experience of doing this and they think it reduces congestion and also makes people feel a bit better and better able to adjust to roadworks. We thought that might be helpful. It is worth saying that there are three things going on here. There are roadworks, which repairing a highway. There are utility works, which are utilities under the highway. There are construction schemes, which as I have said earlier, because of the level of construction going on in London, do take over parts of the public highway and the Mayor and the boroughs do have the Considerate Constructors Scheme and that could be enforced as part of planning consents so that you make sure that construction works do not take over more of the highway that they are supposed to and that some thought is given to impact on highways and roads generally.

**David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First):** It is definitely worth having on your list, but it is not a new issue and it is not a major cause [of congestion]. However, I would absolutely get from TfL a breakdown of the data of those causes because the reality is if we are to have any impact on congestion, we are going to need to have that bit of performance management on all these different things that are causing the problem. I remember on the Tube a few years ago, when we were having a period of relatively poor performance there, TfL absolutely did look at all the different causes of those problems and really targeted some resource, management time, leadership effort, at tackling them. If there were a few things that we can make a 10% or 20% difference on, that is worth having.

**Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London):** I do not have much of a professional perspective on how much roadworks affect congestion and so I cannot quite speak on that but personally it occurs to me that if some of the routing tools - Just City Maps or Google Maps - had more accurate information about some of these roadworks, which it seems to me they do not, that might help people naturally reroute themselves more efficiently and maybe that would help a bit.

**Paul Gerrard (Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group):** Picking up on that point, David, it has been noted that if you get it out on Twitter and any media you can use, it is amazing how many people start to avoid routes. In our industry we are now putting more and more out and using different ways of communication. It is slow on the take-up but it is getting there. We have noticed. We did it on one road and there was less traffic than there normally was and it helps matters because you think, “Where has all the traffic gone”, and it had disappeared.

Going back to your original question against permits, the utility industry does 98% of all works within the specified period we have agreed with the highway authority so we are talking about 2% where we have delays. I do not disagree that for the 98% we are still working on the highway, but there are other key factors that will...
help us move forward. We talk about the London Infrastructure Delivery Board (LIDB). They know five years, eight years, ahead what is going to happen in London. It helps us to get our reinforcement policies right. Industry is very wary about committing funds, as you all would be, to an eight-year project and then when it comes you think, “We have to do this” and there is an opportunity to better plan. You know where the houses are going up; you know where the buildings are going up. We know if there is enough gas, electricity, telecommunications in the system to supply it at the end of the day, and that is what we have to co-ordinate the more long-term. We are now working through the whole of London to supply Battersea Power Station because there is not enough gas in the system. We have a two-year project with TfL that is working really well. I have no doubt it is causing disruption but it is the best we can offer at the moment. Once that is in, the whole of Battersea can have gas.

David Kurten AM: Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM: It has always seemed to me there is obviously an issue with utilities because they are always put down the middle of the road. I remember when they were doing the expansion to the North Circular Road around Bounds Green a lot of the preparatory work they did to widen that road was to relocate some of the utilities to the side. It did not impinge on the pedestrian footways but it was taken out of the middle. Is there scope for doing that, particularly in new developments, ensuring that utilities do not --

Paul Gerrard (Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group): There is a project going on in Ebbsfleet where all utilities are going together in one corridor off the highway. So for future reference, it is all in one place, there is no congestion, and it is all there. The challenge we have at the moment is we are trying to deal with this congestion and disruption and those mains, water mains, gas mains, have been in place since Victorian times but we are using them because we can use smaller pipes and greater pressures so it is less disruption.

Coming back to your question on anything that we can do, we were approached in outer London to instead of going down the A406 to put 400 metres of main through a golf course. We sought the wayleaves and it was all agreed. Yes, it can be done.

Joanne McCartney AM: It has always struck me that whenever you see Thames Water in particular it says that a lot of its holes are investigative holes because there has never been any duty to plot where utilities are. The deregulation of the television and telephone utilities led to a lot more uncertainty as to what was actually under the road. Is there something that can be done about that?

Paul Gerrard (Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group): Yes. Under NRSWA (New Roads and Street Works Act 1991) is the records code of practice which stipulates where we can put and where we should bury utilities and to what levels. Also now I am part of the steering committee on PAS (Publicly Available Specification) 256, which is looking at a British standard of recording apparatus below the ground. There are movements afoot to correct and enhance; you are right that dry holes are not good holes.

Tom Copley AM: We have seen since the creation of the GLA and TfL a big shift away from private vehicles towards public transport, which is a testament to the effectiveness of the devolution of transport to the Mayor. If I could start with Stephen, perhaps you could tell us to what extent you think convincing road users to change transport modes will help relieve congestion. Is there the capacity within the public transport network to realise that?
Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive, Campaign for Better Transport): First, yes, there is more potential, and second, there is capacity depending on where you are taking people. Aruna talked about getting people from A to B. Where A and B are can change so that if you, for example, have more development around railway stations, it is easier to get people to those by public transport. If they are out in the wilds of industrial estates in the Lee Valley where there is lots of car parking and it is quite difficult to get public transport in there, you are going to get less public transport use.

That is why in our evidence we talk about the importance of land-use planning and getting that right. We know both TfL and Government nationally are more interested in having development around public transport hubs and along public transport corridors. That way you get the virtuous circle of both having better public transport but having the funding from development to pay for the better public transport and for improving things. We think that there are opportunities there around land-use planning.

Boroughs in London pioneered what is known as Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs), which is a way of measuring how accessible developments are by public transport and that gives you a way of targeting places that do not have good public transport, particularly in outer London. There is always a tendency, as somebody said in the previous session, to talk about central London when you are talking about congestion, but actually a lot of the congestion is in outer London and needs to be addressed. Using the PTAL system tied to land use planning looks like a good way of doing this.

Will people switch? They have switched in London. There has been a huge change in London over the last 20 years in terms of what percentage of people are driving versus what percentage of people are using public transport, and indeed walking and cycling, so there is clearly potential there, the combination of using the land-use planning system, so the Mayor’s transport strategy and London planning to work together on this. We will probably come to this but it is worth saying that not building big roads that will encourage car use and channel lots of traffic into places that should not have it is probably quite a good way of making sure you do get modal shift rather than not getting modal shift.

Tom Copley AM: What influences someone’s decision to drive rather than to use public transport? There is an obvious one, which is whether public transport is available but what other influences are there?

Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive, Campaign for Better Transport): There are lots. Walking and waiting time; relative speed and attractiveness, coming back to the bus priority issue you talked about earlier, and so on. Then there are things that will tend to militate against public transport, like are you trying to carry things back from Ikea or something; in other words, large goods and things like that. Accessibility: for many people, particularly if you are trying to carry more than one child around the place, the public transport system is not always brilliant at that. There are a number of determinants.

This is more Aruna’s territory than mine but there is quite a lot of good evidence about decision trees and things like that that dictate those sorts of things, but these are researchable and you can address them.

Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London): The whole issue of modal shift is something I have been spending within a decade now working and developing models on; a couple of decades or nearly. The kind of statistical models we develop clearly show us that it is not a simple problem, and that is something that is obvious to us. It is not just about providing disincentives. It is about providing a combination of disincentives and incentives and changing attitudes, and all of these come into play within that complex combination and circumstances in which people make these trips. All of those have to be addressed, which is why in an academic context – and increasingly as we are moving it into practice by people
like TfL and the DfT - we develop, from a layman’s perspective, some pretty complex statistical models to capture all of these within one framework, so that we can predict modal shifts as accurately as possible in response to policy changes. If you have very simplistic models, then you would assume modal shifts when actually there are a lot of these effects in place, for example, as Stephen [Glaister] was saying, the purpose of travel.

If you are travelling because you are carting kids from place A to place B, then the constraints of accessibility come into the picture. Constraints of safety come into the picture because presumably a lot of kids cannot make it from A to B on their own. I am reminded in this context of an article that my husband shared with me, which is that in Japan, for instance, kids of a very young age ride the Tube on their own. They do not have to be driven to school. Why is this? Is it because there is naturally a sense of safety? Yes, but there is also a communal sense of trust in the system in some senses. Not to say that is going to easily happen in any other context or any other place, but I am saying the kind of things that go into what drives the choice of mode are very complex, considerations of safety, for instance, for young children being a big one.

Attitudes come back to one of Richard’s favourite topics, cycling. We have been doing a lot of statistical modelling. Traditionally, a lot of the mode shift models that we developed tend to look at pretty good shifts of mode between private vehicle and public transport in response to things like pricing, in response to things like improved public transport accessibility and improved reliability of public transport. These models do pretty well in those contexts in terms of predicting what will happen to mode shifts, but they do very poorly in predicting what will happen if you had infrastructure investment in cycling, for instance, simply because what drives those shifts are very attitudinal. It is about what people think of cycling as. Is it the sort of elitist, middle-aged, white male commuting to work kind of mode? It is not something I would not consider unless I was just doing an off-the-road recreational biking thing. I would not consider going to work on it kind of thing. All of these are attitudes that are not necessarily correct, but an attitude is an attitude and you have to work against those changes.

**Tom Copley AM:** When you are talking about a creative sense of safety, yes, the shift we have seen there has been no change in walking and cycling has doubled but only for 1% to 2%. If you create a sense of safety by, for example, having segregated cycle lanes, is this the sort of thing that is going to encourage --

**Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London):** Some of the models that we are developing are exactly trying to get at that. Can we get at what is really going to drive these mode shifts, especially towards walking and cycling? Yes, as far as cycling is concerned, a big part of it is a sense of perceived safety. In addition to a sense of belonging to the cycling community, which is something that people do not easily feel, and that is something that is harder to push and a lot of that has to be pushed through the right marketing and advertising campaigns and getting people on board. Santander Bikes have done a great deal in terms of getting people used to the idea of, “I can cycle too. It is not just an elitist thing”.

Segregated bike lanes could be one of those where you would have truly cycle highways where they are not concerned about people who are not regular commuters on cycle. Even if you had a segregated lane, which is a lane but they have a car next to them or a bus next to them they are still uncomfortable with that concept. This partly depends on where they grew up cycling perhaps. Perhaps they grew up cycling in a neighbourhood or a town where big buses and big cars were less of an issue.

**Tom Copley AM:** David, can I bring you in on the issue of modal shift and how we can get more of a modal shift, either to public transport or into cycling and walking?
David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First): In particular it is zeroing in on the problem that we most care about. If our starting point here is that we have a congestion problem, I guess it is drilling into the data. What are the areas where we have the biggest problems? What are the times of day? I find myself having to keep reminding myself of that and stepping back, because you do quickly blur London all together at the same time and there are very different problems in different areas at different times of day.

In central London, for example, car travel has fallen in the last four years. I was slightly surprised by that. That is including minicabs and private hire. It is not surprising when you think that the space has shrunk and we have had lots of other things, so there is less scope there in a way. Then, if we are talking about people driving in one bit of outer London to another bit of outer London, it is a different sort of solution in a way. What is it that we are doing? Is it better orbital links? Is it information? It is a harder challenge.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you.

Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London): I was just thinking that the interesting thing is congestion itself is a good disincentive to driving in some sense. If we were to support it with the right kind of improvements and accessibility to the rail network or the cycle network, that is the one way we would be able to shift more.

Tom Copley AM: Could you tell us about electric cars and whether or not they can relieve some of the problems such as noise and pollution?

Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London): Noise and pollution absolutely, yes, especially - and probably crucially - if electricity generation were also cleaner because, otherwise, we do not really get the same benefits. You would have to have clean electricity generation for electric vehicles to truly have that air quality effect. Local air quality will be affected hugely but in the wells-to-wheels scheme of things not necessarily.

Tom Copley AM: Yes, it is no good if you take pollution off the road and it comes up somewhere else.

Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London): Yes, exactly.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you very much.

David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First): There is a massive policy challenge on things like electric vehicles and autonomous vehicles. I absolutely do have sympathy with policymakers at TfL because, if I am looking at the Tube and rail, I can feel reasonably confident in championing Crossrail 2 as, by the time that gets around, it still feels like it will be the sort of thing that we need. The pace of change on the roads with different sorts of technologies that are emerging and the like, it is very hard to plan for the future - to know precisely how these things are going to interact with each other - and so that future proofing challenge is an enormous one.

Tom Copley AM: That is an interesting point about planning.

Paul Gerrard (Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group): Tom, electric cars, cycle way is great but each one needs a point. Each one needs another explanation.
Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive Campaign for Better Transport): I would say that there are some non-excavation things. TfL did in the past do the Smarter Travel Sutton and certain behaviour change programmes, which involved talking to the people who generate travel: schools, businesses and hospitals. There are the opportunities that we saw at the Olympics for getting more leisure travel on to public transport through German-style combo tickets that have combined match day and public transport tickets for people coming from outside London to matches in London. Those kinds of things do not involve utilities digging up roads but they are very useful, flexible fares and that kind of thing.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Let us move on to road charging.

Caroline Russell AM: We have heard a lot about how we use our road space today. We also heard some surprise expressed by Stephen Glaister in the earlier session that road pricing was not adopted when Ken Livingstone [former Mayor of London] brought in the Congestion Charge. The Review of Charging Options for London (ROCOL) report was produced before the Assembly began a non-political assessment of how to tackle congestion and how to use our roads more efficiently. One of the options in there was road pricing. Another one was the Congestion Charge in the smaller area in the middle.

To start off with, to what extent do you think the current Congestion Charge has been effective at limiting congestion in central London? I have lots of other things to ask about and so just be quick on this one.

David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First): It was a success. It succeeded at reducing vehicle movements and we reallocated that space to bus services and a bit of pedestrianisation. That was a good thing. Of course, having reallocated that space, the gains then disappeared after that and so we have stagnated a bit since then and the question has to be: what next?

Caroline Russell AM: Indeed, I am coming to that. Does anyone else want to say anything on the current Congestion Zone?

David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First): The striking thing is that no one at the last election was talking about getting rid of it, were they? That is how embedded it is in London now.

Caroline Russell AM: Yes. In fact, I think everyone - Caroline, you would be able to say - was talking about road pricing as another way of doing things, but, while we currently have the Congestion Charge, do you think that the cost of the Congestion Charge needs to be increased and perhaps current exemptions reviewed, particularly in comparison to the rises that we have seen in public transport fares? Should people who are driving be paying a bit more while we still have a Congestion Zone?

Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive Campaign for Better Transport): When you look at where you go next with congestion charging, there is a very wide range of things that need to be thought about. Just increasing the costs within the exemptions of the current scheme is one thing that needs to be thought about but there are a number of others.

If, as I said and other people have said in previous sessions, one of the issues is outer London and congestion around there, then one needs to look at extending the Charge and having other zones. There has been a lot of talk about, for example, a zone around Heathrow Airport. Perhaps we will talk about this separately, but looking at the WPLs.
Also, if you are going to have the rather broader road user charging scheme that you were talking about with Stephen Glaister and others in the previous session, that can only happen if it is linked to another thing that you asked about, which is devolving Vehicle Excise Duty (VED). You need to be able to play with different packages of road charging. The decisions the Government makes about what happens with VED ought to be linked to this. There is an argument if £0.5 billion is raised from Londoners in VED maybe you could raise that differently, spend it differently and run it more locally. That is clearly a matter for the national Government but if you did that you might open the way to a more general road user charging scheme.

The short answer to your question: you need to look at the options for future congestion and road charging in the round, not necessarily just going for increasing the costs of the current scheme.

**David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First):** I would agree with Stephen on that. It is looking at the geography of it. The occurrence of congestion at the moment is wider than the current scheme, but also trying to have a bit more variance in it. The fact that we have a flat charge to cross a cordon and that there is not then at least some variability of price taking into account the fact that congestion varies over the course of the day. Other schemes have that. The Stockholm scheme that was mentioned in the session earlier has three levels of price, for example. Just some element of variance will help sharpen the incentives for people. That would probably have a bigger impact than the actual level, I suspect.

**Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London):** That is something I completely agree with. The important thing perhaps in the next stage is really a variance. For instance, trying to spread the peak because, at the end of the day, it is about whether we have capacity in the off peak or on the shoulders of the peak that in many cases we do. Admittedly, there are some routes that will struggle to find that capacity but many routes can afford to have a spreading of peaks.

Peak pricing or pricing that helps spread the peak would be a big part of that picture, except that will also have to be combined with some other incentives, potentially starting from the workplace. This is something that was mooted in the United States many decades ago: encouraging workplaces - big employers - to shift their start times, stagger their start times so that people can comfortably come in staggered during the morning and the peak naturally spreads itself, for example.

**Caroline Russell AM:** Bringing us back to the congestion/road charging things, one of the other things that the Mayor is thinking about at the moment obviously is pollution. We are hearing ideas for a T-charge. We are hearing ideas for a ULEZ with different kinds of geographical boundaries. Do you think that London should be looking at one scheme or do you think that this patchwork of schemes is something that can be made to work?

**David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First):** That is a very good question. It is perfectly possible to have a patchwork of schemes so long as there are some interactions between them and it is comprehensible from the consumer point of view. One of the things that I am concerned about is exactly that we are having a bit of a flowering of lots of different sorts of schemes with slightly different objectives. How coherent that would be in the round there has to be a question about and so looking at how some of these things can interact because they inevitably will interact. The ULEZ is very interesting and I absolutely applaud the Mayor’s ambition to tackle air quality in London. That is a very positive thing, but the T-charge is probably more straightforward.
The bigger and earlier ULEZ is quite ambitious and it will be quite challenging making that work. There will be lots of groups that will be keen to work with TfL and the Greater London Authority (GLA) to make sure that something is developed that is deliverable there. That will take some time and I am glad they have given themselves a period to work that through.

**Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive Campaign for Better Transport):** All I want to say is that this is one area where there are some things that could be learned from other cities and other countries. We referred in our evidence to Milan, which has a combined congestion charge and Low Emissions Zone (LEZ) that they call the Ecopass, and that is an attempt to tackle both at once. Some of the things that Paris has been doing head in that direction as well. We have also referred to Rotterdam and LEZs and this is one area where it would be worth seeing what the experience from other cities and other countries is and what the effect is both on congestion and on pollution.

**David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First):** Of course, tackling congestion will itself have some air quality benefits. That might not be quite as strong as the other way around, I suspect.

**Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive Campaign for Better Transport):** Yes, exactly. You need to look at both and the fact that Milan has already effectively amalgamated those seems like an interesting model to go and look at.

**Caroline Russell AM:** For politicians people have expressed views that it is very difficult to get people to think about paying for the roads differently and thinking about the external costs of using cars. We heard quite a lot about the external costs of using cars in terms of health and congestion and in terms of traffic collisions in the last session. If you were going to explain to politicians so that they can explain it to the communities that they represent, how would you explain the benefits of a road pricing scheme?

**Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London):** Fundamentally it is about ensuring you get closer to a state where people are paying the real price of travelling - which is getting closer to what Stephen was saying - and that we are spreading the utilisation of road capacity.

**Caroline Russell AM:** Thank you.

**Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive Campaign for Better Transport):** It is about whether it can only be placed in a wider “what kind of city do you want to live in” context, clean air and safe streets. It is about those kinds of public goods that people want: do you want your kids breathing in horrible air? Those are the kinds of things that will sell this.

I have noticed that this is happening not just in London but even the new proto-mayor in Manchester, Tony Lloyd, has started to say that that is the justification for doing radical things about traffic in a city that has previously rejected congestion charging. It is about a wider conversation than simply traffic.

**David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First):** I agree with Stephen and with what Stephen Glaister was saying earlier as well, not to try to rush to a particular scheme and say, “This has to happen now”, but to start that conversation about how London is going to evolve. The fact is, of course, this is not a new thing. We pay for road use in London now in different ways: if we use a river crossing, if we travel into the central zone, by virtue of emissions. We are going to have new emissions charges and so it is about how these things are going to evolve. The fact is that looking forward congestion is going to get worse. There are doubtless more things that TfL can do to try to bring that down, but it will still get worse unless there are other things
that we can do. We will have a choice: that we either ration space through people queuing for it, and all the negative impacts that has, or we find other things like managing demand through price in some way.

**Caroline Russell AM:** Thank you. Finally, the WPL idea: what would be the next steps for bringing a WPL into London? We have heard Heathrow and I believe Hounslow are possibly interested in doing a WPL.

**Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive Campaign for Better Transport):** Very briefly, we have done quite a lot of work on this and in fact we have published a briefing that Nottingham City Council did for us, which is on our new thought leadership website, which says what has happened as a result of the levy there. Their view is that it has worked. We have given the detail in our evidence about how it has worked. There was a huge battle particularly with Boots, which is a major Nottingham employer and which manages to be half in and half out of the city council area, so it was a kind of wicket issue for them. This has made a difference to congestion and traffic, while Nottingham has been one of the places outside London with some of the strongest job growth in the last few years and so it has not harmed the economy.

What should happen next? There should be a pilot with TfL and one or more boroughs to look at this. Hounslow is a borough that has expressed interest in this. They have a scrutiny committee inquiry going on looking at exactly that. Hounslow looks like a very interesting place to do it because it has a large number of business parks with a lot of car parking spaces and some quite low PTAL scores. It works politically because you have the potential to have a conversation with the business community that says, “Look, you have a serious congestion problem around your sites. We can help you. If you pay this much as a levy, what would you like on the other side of the ledger? Would it be about, for example, reopening the freight line from Southall to Brentford, which means that Sky [Television] and the other places at Brentford get a decent public transport link? Is it about orbital bus services?” There are a range of things and you could have a proper conversation with the business community, which is what is going on in Cambridge and Oxford, two other cities that are actively investigating this. We say, pilot it with a borough. Try an outer London borough particularly. That looks like a sensible place to try it because of commuting being still a principal cause of congestion there.

**Caroline Russell AM:** Thank you.

**David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First):** We need to see some data, but with that caveat it is worth a look. I do not think anyone has looked at this for quite some time. We need to look at where is the workplace parking in London? You talk about it and people will immediately think this is about targeting bankers driving into central London or something like that, and the reality is that there are not many of those people doing that. There is a car park in the bottom of my building. It used to be a car park. It is now a trendy architects’ office. They have converted it. That is what is happening in Central London because it is valuable real estate and firms do not want car parks there. They want to be able to use that space and to sell it and are looking at that. There might be a bit in central London that might raise some money or it might change some people[‘s behaviour’]. Elsewhere you need to be clear about what alternatives and choices people have. The examples that Stephen said are interesting but I can immediately feel the political heat dial dialling up a little bit on that one, but let us have a look.

**Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London):** I would just add to that. I do not know if this is the plan but I would actually combine WPLs with some sort of an incentive, perhaps a benefit in terms of enabling cycling, for instance.

---

1 Clarified by David Leam following the meeting
Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive Campaign for Better Transport): The Nottingham package included a large amount of work with employers to look at how they could change travel behaviour, through to car sharing, cycling and public transport use. Bearing in mind also that the Nottingham scheme was deliberately designed to pay for, among other things, tram extensions so it was part of a package. The result is that their public transport load share is about 40% now, which is one of the highest outside London. It is a really remarkable change.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you very much. Let us move on to looking at road infrastructure now.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): If you were here earlier you will probably recognise these questions and so I will try to roll a couple up together. It is around whether we think that if we were to build more roads that would relieve congestion. Could I add to that: could that be through tunnelling and how would we pay for that?

Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive Campaign for Better Transport): The answer is we do not think that new roads will help congestion. It is terribly tempting. The view from the driver’s windscreen is this big bottleneck there and if we just built a flyover or put in a new river crossing it would absolutely solve the problem, and you just know that it would move the traffic jam just down the road. Particularly, we have done a lot of work on the new river crossings. We think that it will channel more traffic into town centres and communities either side of the river adding to congestion and pollution in those places and potentially promoting more car-based development in those places. We are supportive of river crossings but not more road river crossings.

I heard the comments about tunnelling. They are very expensive. We have been quite involved in the trans-Pennine road tunnel. Nobody has yet been able to answer the question: how do you avoid the problems that the Swiss had with some terrible crashes and fires in some of their tunnels, as a result of which freight vehicles - who are the people who say they really, really want these road tunnels - have had to be banned from them because there are huge safety issues. With the trans-Pennine tunnel there has been a lot of work done. It has not really addressed any of those issues, so we would not see that as a model for London and we think that for London new roads will worsen rather than solve the congestion and other problems.

David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First): I am in a slightly different position to Stephen on this but I certainly do not think they are a panacea. We are not where we were 30 years ago when roads were seen as a solution to everything and the solution would just be to whack in some big highways right into the middle and get those pesky houses out of the way. We are 1 million miles from that now, but the fact is that other cities around the world have selectively put some big roads underground to provide a bit more capacity and make the surface a better place, and not just American cities, cities like Stockholm and Oslo have done this as well. It is not a blanket thing but identifying in a couple of places where there may be options to underground existing roads, to maybe provide a little more capacity, certainly provide better flow and better places on the surface. The Hammersmith one that people have talked about before seems a pretty obvious example. It does terrible things to the area around there. If that was removed you might make flow better. You might make the service better. They are expensive. They are difficult. You would have to toll them for them to ever possibly get them off the ground, but it is worth a look.

On the river crossings to the east I do support those. The Silvertown Crossing that is being put forward at the moment is a good proposition. We are desperately short of connectivity there, but this is new connectivity. It is an area that badly lags behind in road infrastructure and connections and I completely understand – and your
question is a good one - it is not fair that people in East London will have to pay to cross the river when those in the west do not. It is simply not fair. But the only way we are going to get anything happening in that area, which we have been trying to do for decades now, is for that tolling package to be there to both manage demand and pay for it. That is a good option. I would also like to see options east of Silvertown looked at.

**Paul Gerrard (Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group):** From a utilities perspective, I look at it as not the new roads it is all the interconnections to the old roads that causes the problems. I did one on there, 45, 46, at the moment and it has taken three years and I do not see any. I do not perceive to see any benefits for sitting in there for three years, so it is all the interconnections you have to make to the existing infrastructure and do people want things now or do they want it in 15 years’ time?

**Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London):** The demand perspective is two thoughts: that some amount of it will be needed to implement connectivity as David was just saying and from another perspective it is important to keep in mind that any additional road construction is going to lead to induced demand, as long as we keep that in mind.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair):** Lovely. Let us move on to car clubs.

**Navin Shah AM:** I do not know if you heard the responses of the previous panel on this particular topic. What impact do you think can any increase in car club membership have on reduction of congestion?

**Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London):** To add to what was discussed earlier, we have had a lot of research that we have undertaken trying to understand how the demand for car clubs has been developing and will develop. A lot of that research clearly shows that the people who are shifting to car clubs and have shifted so far are people who are not necessarily currently drivers. A good number of those people are people who use public transport and, in that sense, it is not necessarily improving the congestion problem in any sense.

There is something that Rachel [Aldred] said which is very relevant. That is if this then starts shifting the attitude towards less car ownership, then in the long term you might see some benefit. Having said that, there is also a lot of research and statistical analysis that is showing that young people - the younger cohorts that are coming up - are naturally less likely to own cars, so in fact car clubs could be encouraging these people who are less likely to own cars and, therefore, less likely to drive, to start driving after all because it is becoming easier to drive without owning a car. I am not entirely convinced that the argument for car clubs, in terms of reducing congestion, is sound in any sense.

If that were about using car clubs only in a car sharing manner, in other words, you cannot have single drivers using car clubs but you have to share cars going from one place to another, then I can see that there would be some benefit but otherwise I am not convinced about --

**Navin Shah AM:** What can the Mayor and TfL do in both instances? One is a knock-on effect and, yes, let us say car sharing initiatives as well.

**Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London):** If you want to improve car sharing it is pretty obvious what you need to do is provide more space for these cars to be parked somewhere and a larger fleet to be available. That is basically what is needed. The fact that insurance and car ownership is getting more expensive, especially as you have the LEZs coming into place, people will be forced
to own newer cars. That might naturally push things in that direction, but I am questioning whether that is in fact at all a solution to congestion and so far the evidence does not suggest that it is at all.

**Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive Campaign for Better Transport):** I will take a slightly more optimistic view because this refers to the earlier conversation about modal shift and cultural change, and it seems to me that one of the things that car clubs do is that they delay the age and possibly negate people buying cars and owning them.

Again, moving this from a central and inner London conversation to an outer London conversation, this is a potentially interesting area for unhooking outer London from individual car ownership, looking at suburbia and how you can reduce car use and car dependence in suburban outer London. Car clubs could be very interesting in that. It is also worth noting that what car clubs and Carplus have been doing is also going into employers, so that instead of traditional pool cars you have a car club that is available. That has had some effect in London but particularly outside London and other cities, so we would argue that there is definitely something there that needs continued investigation. The current car club offer is not only one that is available and the only place that is available, and moving it into outer London might be useful as a way of providing in some of the more prosperous outer London boroughs an alternative to the second, third and even fourth car that households own out there and, therefore, having an impact on congestion there. That is for proving.

We have talked in our evidence about the tools that the Mayor and TfL have at their disposal, which include planning requirements, requiring provision for car clubs and TfL funded traffic management and parking schemes using the developments that are coming on TfL land and building car clubs into that.

By the way, something that nobody has yet mentioned is that this is not a car club story but, in thinking about new housing, you want to think about what kind of mobility people in new housing will want. You hear a lot from people who are moving into brand new flats and houses in London where there is still no place to put a bike or to plug in an electric car, and there are no car clubs in the area, so they are still built as if universal car ownership is what it is about and there is a need to look at housing and street design in a way that encourages different forms of mobility.

**Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London):** Can I just come back to your question about how to increase car club membership? Some of the data-driven analysis we have done suggests that one of the biggest aspects that will increase that membership is if we had one-way car clubs, car clubs that allow for a car to be picked up at point A and dropped off at point B and not having to bring it back. That in fact is one of the biggest drivers to significantly increasing car club membership. That is more about the car clubs innovating.

**Navin Shah AM:** That is very helpful.

**David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First):** The thing I worry about in all of this is looking into the crystal ball it is all very murky. I do not know how the world is evolving. I do not know how these business models are evolving because if we had been talking about car clubs five years ago we would have missed on-demand taxi apps and ride sharing, which will have captured some of that market. Equally, in the world if suddenly we have autonomous vehicles starting to work and electric vehicles coming along, it is quite difficult for policymakers to put in place a very specific infrastructure if the technology and business models are changing quite quickly and some of these things might get overtaken by events.
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you. Finally, if I could ask you what would be the one thing that you would do to reduce traffic congestion in London. You have all given some good international examples, but do you have any other cities you think we should be looking at?

David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First): I am going to cheat slightly. On the cities, I would encourage you to look at Stockholm because it is not a quasi-police state far away. This is a modern social democratic European country that has managed to do some of these things. It is slightly different to some people’s image of it. Also, they did a referendum there, polling before and after they introduced the [Congestion] Charge. It was 70:30 against having it. They polled people afterwards and it had reversed to 70:30 because, of course, the sky did not fall in. People could see that some benefits had accrued as a result of it. That is interesting.

I would endorse what Rachel [Aldred] said about Paris. The fact is they are grappling with some similar challenges that we are about quality of public place. I am not sure that they have answers that we should immediately rush to implement, but making sure that the two cities are learning from each other as we go along and do not make the same mistakes is pretty critical.

On the one thing, we will need to come back to charging but it is not immediately about to happen and bear fruit.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): About pricing, yes.

David Leam (Infrastructure Director, London First): The one thing would be lots of things. I go back to the Tube example, relentlessly looking at where the problems are happening and targeting with some sustained effort, leadership, vigour and maybe relatively small amounts of money, you probably could make a few percentage points of difference here and there. TfL is generally pretty good but there is always a bit more you can be doing.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you. Lovely. We will go to Paul next.

Paul Gerrard (Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group): Our key goal would be to reduce the red tape reduction of the existing legislation. That could be cut down.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Would that reduce congestion? It might make your life easier but what would reduce traffic congestion?

Paul Gerrard (Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group): It would enable us to work consistently and effectively together, so what we need to do - I touched on an example earlier - the Highway Authorities can only provide us with a one year/two year programme. We can provide eight year programmes and so we cannot get together to work together on a one-year or two-year programme when we want to do eight and 10 years. We mentioned the development side. It all needs to come together.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): That would add to that long term programming. Yes.

Paul Gerrard (Operations Director, National Joint Utilities Group): With a crystal ball, I would put us all round the table together and say, “Now we need to sort out London”.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Great. Thank you.
Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive Campaign for Better Transport): Having had my trial of the WPL in the borough the one I would go for is freight, which we have not talked about in this session. New smart freight policies around last mile delivery, consolidation centres and to try to bear down and make much more efficient the freight and logistics centre in London is the thing and linked to that --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): That includes a night-time lorry ban?

Stephen Joseph OBE (Chief Executive Campaign for Better Transport): You would have to bring that into the frame but you would need to make it part of a much bigger package around this. For example, extending the trial that happened at Euston Station with trains coming in and delivering goods to supermarkets around central London, you might exempt those, particularly zero emissions delivery vehicles from the London lorry ban. Things like that - that kind of last mile stuff - and there is quite a lot of worldwide work on that. Linked to that, my city would be Gothenburg which continues the Swedish thing. We have mentioned this here, but they have adopted a comprehensive smart city approach, electric bypass schemes, low emission delivery vehicles, sharing data with private partners, electric buses, park and ride services, and they also have a smart delivery scheme. We thought that would be a certainly interesting, slightly more off-the-wall place to use as a place to look at.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Lovely. Thank you.

Dr Aruna Sivakumar (Lecturer in Transport Studies, Imperial College London): Before I get to my specific point, I agree with what David was saying. It has to be a basket of initiatives, really. I also want to stress the point that Stephen raised, which is that we have hardly talked about freight in the last hour or so. That is a big aspect of reducing congestion, especially going forward with more and more e-retail related issues.

Personally, if you want to make a significant several percentage points impact on traffic, it will have to be something that improves the efficiency of using road space, and so the solution in my mind has to be somewhat futuristic in the sense that something like an autonomous vehicle scheme where vehicles are able to follow each other much closer, use the space with much less braking and stopping, etc, would be the most efficient use of that space. To me that is the only way you would get a significant traffic congestion efficiency.

In terms of the city, for a city the size and complexity of London, we are actually doing really well. I cannot imagine a city of this size and complexity elsewhere doing anywhere nearly as well.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): That is great. Thank you all so much for your evidence this afternoon. I am sorry we have overrun slightly but thank you, Aruna, Stephen, Paul and David for your contributions.
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1. Summary

1.1 This report sets out the actions arising from previous meetings of the Transport Committee.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the Committee notes the completed and outstanding actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee.

Actions arising from the Committee meeting on 8 September 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>For Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Transport Committee Work Programme</td>
<td>Completed. The consultation response is attached to the report on actions taken under delegated authority, at Agenda Item 5.</td>
<td>Scrutiny Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Transport Committee Work Programme
That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to respond to the Network Rail consultation on the draft West Midlands and Chilterns route study.
### Actions arising from the Committee meeting on 13 July 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>For Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5.** | **Deputy Mayor for Transport**<br>During the course of the discussion, the Committee requested the following further information in writing:  
- Details of the work Transport for London and London Councils were undertaking on integration and joint commissioning of door-to-door transport, including Taxicard;  
- A timetable for the review of bus routes; and  
- The criteria and terms of reference for the review of London Underground ticket office closures. | Completed. A letter from the Deputy Mayor for Transport is attached at Appendix 1. | Deputy Mayor for Transport |
| **9.** | **London TravelWatch Board Member Recruitment**<br>The Committee established a panel, with the Chair and party Group Lead Members as members, to hold interviews for the appointment to three of the London TravelWatch Board Member positions for a period of four years until 31 December 2020 and an additional appointment for a period of two years until 31 December 2018; and delegated authority to the Chair, in consultation with the other panel members, to agree the appointments to the Board of London TravelWatch, following interviews. | Ongoing. Recruitment for the appointments is underway, with interviews scheduled to take place in October. | Principal Committee Manager |
| **10.** | **Transport Committee Work Programme**<br>Authority was delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree a letter to the Secretary of State for Transport to request an update on plans for the devolution of suburban National Rail services to the Mayor and Transport for London. | Completed. Following the appointment of a new Secretary of State for Transport, the Chair agreed an updated letter to Rt Hon Chris Grayling MP. The letter is attached for noting at Appendix 2. | Scrutiny Manager |
### Actions arising from the Committee meeting on 15 June 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>For Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Pedestrianisation of Oxford Street</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Committee requested the following further information in writing from Transport for London (TfL):&lt;br&gt;• Detailed data on incidents on Oxford Street and their causes; and&lt;br&gt;• A follow-up to the suggestion that bus drivers’ views be canvassed on the safety of driving on Oxford Street.</td>
<td>Ongoing. The Chair has written to TfL to request the additional information.</td>
<td>Managing Director, Planning, TfL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authority was delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree a response to a forthcoming TfL consultation on Oxford Street pedestrianisation.</td>
<td>Ongoing. Awaiting formal consultation.</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Legal Implications

3.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report

### 4. Financial Implications

4.1 There are no financial implications to the Greater London Authority arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report:

- Appendix 1: Follow-up letter from Deputy Mayor for Transport
- Appendix 2: Letter from the Chair to the Secretary of State for Transport re rail devolution

### Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: Dale Langford, Principal Committee Manager  
Telephone: 020 7983 4415  
E-mail: dale.langford@london.gov.uk
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Dear Caroline,

**London Assembly Transport Committee – 13 July 2016**

Thank you for your letter of 20 July. My responses to the Committee’s requests are below. I look forward to meeting with you again soon to share our progress delivering the Mayor’s transport vision for London.

**Details of the work TfL and London Councils are undertaking on integration and joint commissioning of door-to-door transport, including Taxicard**

I strongly support the integration of these services. This will make the services easier to access and less confusing for users and also deliver savings that can be reinvested in the service. Since producing its Social Needs Transport Roadmap, Transport for London (TfL) has worked with London Councils to make progress on more integrated door-to-door transport services, including Taxicard and Dial-a-Ride.

I enclose the paper I mentioned at the meeting (**Appendix A**). This was endorsed by London Councils’ Transport and Environment Executive Sub-Committee on 21 July. It details the work TfL and London Councils have been doing and sets out how integration will be taken forward.

TfL continues to work closely with London Councils to develop these proposals. A final decision on the way forward for the integration of Dial-a-Ride and Taxicard is expected from London Councils’ Transport and Environment Committee by the end of this year.

**A timetable for the review of bus routes**

As I said at the meeting, I want to make sure that the bus network is responsive to existing and future demand, contributes to our air quality commitments, adequately serves health and other essential public services, and supports regeneration. TfL is reviewing the bus network to ensure:

- it is fit for purpose to meet future demand;
• bus services and reliability are improved;

• it can support regeneration opportunities and help support growth in jobs and housing, working with its borough partners and other stakeholders;

• the bus fleet is as clean and green as possible, and deployed to improve air quality;

• it supports changes in health care, education and other sectors and that health and other essential public services are adequately served;

• it supports the pedestrianisation of Oxford Street; and

• it responds to wider change in demand across inner and central London, including the opening of the Elizabeth Line in 2018, improvements in the capacity and reliability of the Tube and residential/commercial development, particularly just outside the centre.

This is not an exhaustive list of areas and TfL is developing detailed proposals for further comment and consultation in the coming months. Proposals for longer term changes will also be developed. TfL is talking to London boroughs, planning authorities, passenger groups, representatives from the health care sector and other stakeholders to seek their views and to identify requirements and opportunities for more capacity and better connections. I have asked TfL to ensure that the Committee is consulted as part of these discussions and would be happy to seek further information from TfL if we required. I do though anticipate being able to provide a full update to the Committee on this work in early 2017.

The criteria and terms of reference for the review of London Underground ticket office closures, and the timescales of the review

The Mayor’s independent review of Tube ticket office closures will draw conclusions and make recommendations for action to be taken, either across the network or at specific stations, to ensure the best possible customer experience. I have asked TfL to share the terms of reference for the review with you as soon as they are published. Currently, it is anticipated that recommendations will be presented to the TfL Board at the end of the year.

Indicative timescales for refreshing and retrofitting the existing bus fleet

With the introduction of the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ), TfL will bring forward measures and introduce new programmes to make the bus fleet significantly cleaner. This includes bringing forward the Euro VI engine standard that new buses must meet when they enter the proposed ULEZ to 2019 instead of 2020.

From 2018, TfL will also ensure that all new double-deck buses entering the fleet are hybrid or zero emission. Across London, as much of the fleet as possible will be brought up to the Euro VI engine emission standard by 2020. It plans to upgrade 3,000 to 4,000 Euro V vehicles (to Euro VI) at approximately 1,000 vehicles each year between now and 2020, once trials have taken place on a range of common bus types to make sure the upgrade is effective. This will help ensure that the majority of the fleet is at the Euro VI standard by 2020.
At the same time, TfL will introduce at least 10 Low Emission Bus Zones outside central London to make a significant difference to air quality on those roads. From February 2017, the first route along Putney High Street will see the exclusive use of hybrid or diesel buses with anti-pollutant systems that meet or exceed Euro VI emissions standards. The second route, between Brixton and Streatham, will be converted in October 2017. This is in addition to the Mayor’s proposals to extend the ULEZ to a greater area bounded by the North and South Circulars, with which buses would also need to comply, subject to public consultation.

London’s bus fleet is modern and clean compared to those in other parts of Europe, and the combination of these initiatives will make the fleet far cleaner much sooner.

The expected date when the Mayor’s review of the Silvertown Tunnel will be completed and next steps

The Mayor is committed to delivering the major infrastructure that London needs for the long term, including new river crossings for east London. However, he is sensitive to concerns about the Silvertown Tunnel project, and is conducting a review of the project over the summer in advance of the Planning Inspectorate’s six-month public examination of the scheme later this year. The review is placing particular emphasis on the environmental impact of the construction and operation of the proposed tunnel, the benefits the crossing can provide for pedestrians and cyclists, and how the project can be used to provide high-quality public transport links. The Mayor’s review is expected to conclude in early autumn 2016.

An update on the TfL/Network Rail joint capital investment proposals to improve track and network infrastructure

TfL is working closely with Network Rail, both to deliver the current delivery plan (2014-2019) requirements, for example the electrification of Gospel Oak to Barking, and to input into the industry process for the prioritisation of infrastructure projects in the next plan. I will update the Committee in due course.

Expected dates for consultation on the proposals to introduce congestion charging for minicabs

TfL is analysing the issue of traffic congestion and private hire vehicles. It expects this to be completed by the end of the autumn, with consultation on any proposals to take place later this year.

Indicative timescales for announcements on the package of short-term measures to assist black cab drivers, and whether this will be subject to consultation

You will have already seen the Mayor’s commitment to recruit and deploy an extra 250 compliance officers over the next year to patrol London’s streets, crack down on illegal activity and improve safety. This will quadruple the size of a team which provides a highly visible, uniformed presence in the West End, City and other areas across London. I noted and appreciate your support for this announcement. We are looking at even more measures to support the trade which the Mayor will be announcing soon.
MAYOR OF LONDON

An outline of the process and timescales for appointing a walking and cycling champion, including a copy of the job description

As the Mayor stated in his manifesto, his aim is to make London a byword for cycling around the world. The Walking and Cycling Commissioner will be vital to delivering healthy streets and will provide strategic advice to the Mayor and I.

The role has now been advertised. Following a competitive recruitment process, the position will be filled by early winter. I have enclosed the job description for the role (Appendix C), which will report to me and will work closely with the Mayor.

Yours sincerely,

Valerie

Valerie Shawcross CBE
Deputy Mayor for Transport

Enc:
Appendix A – Social Needs Transport Roadmap update
Appendix B – Ticket Office Closures Review terms of reference
Appendix C – Walking and Cycling Commissioner job description

cc: Dale Langford, Principal Transport Committee Manager
Appendix A – Social Needs Transport Roadmap update

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub-Committee

Social Needs Transport – Update

Item No: 06

Report by: Spencer Palmer
Job Title: Director, Transport and Mobility
Date: 21 July 2016
Contact Officer: Spencer Palmer
Telephone: 0207 934 9908
Email: spencer.palmer@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary:
This report provides an update of progress with TfL’s Social Needs Transport Review and implications for the Taxicard scheme in particular.

Recommendations:
The sub-committee is asked to:

- Note the update on the progress with Transport for London (TfL) Social Needs Transport Roadmap to integrate and improve social needs transport for elderly and/or mobility impaired Londoners; and
- To discuss and provide comment on the proposals being developed further before reporting to full TEC meeting for decision later this year.

Background
1. There are a variety of social needs transport services provided in London by boroughs, TfL and other bodies such as charities and the NHS.

2. TEC is responsible for the Taxicard scheme, which provides subsidised kerb to kerb journeys in licensed taxis and private hire vehicles for London residents who have serious mobility or visual impairments. The scheme is jointly funded by Transport for London and the boroughs and managed by London Councils on their behalf.

3. TfL is responsible for Dial-a-Ride, which is a free door to door service for disabled people living or staying in London.
4. On 15 October, TfL presented a report to TEC on TfL's proposals for Social Needs Transport. The Committee noted the paper and supported boroughs and London Councils working with TfL to develop detailed proposals for greater integration of social needs transport services to deliver customer benefits and financial efficiencies. TEC agreed to the principles of change but stressed the need for full consultation with boroughs and that they would need to see more detail about the benefits before agreeing any changes. Key areas for detailed development included financial and governance arrangements together with a programme to take the work forward.

Progress Update

5. Since October, TfL has written to boroughs to share their "SNT Roadmap" and has mentioned its proposals at liaison meetings with borough officers. Only 13 boroughs responded to the questionnaire consultation and where boroughs took the opportunity to comment on the proposals, they were supportive of TfL's plans with comments focused on clarifying points of detail.

6. To help TfL develop a set of proposal that could be recommended to TEC, London Councils officers hosted a workshop with the relevant TfL officers on 3rd May 2016. The meeting involved an open and thorough discussion of the key issues and explored different options for change.

7. TfL has made progress with other proposals outlined in their Roadmap by taking the following steps internally:
   - Separating the Dial-a-Ride (DAR) operation into two distinct parts – Assisted Transport Services and Fleet Services. This provides a clear distinction between the commissioning and delivery of DAR services. The Assisted Transport Service will commission services from both the internal fleet operation but also third-party providers and take the lead on future further integration with Taxicard.
   - Reviewing, expanding and re-procuring its Multi-Occupancy Assisted Transport (MOAT) contract to provide DAR services. The MOAT services are currently provided by a number of Community Transport providers, delivering social value across local communities in addition to the services they provide for DAR. The new MOAT contract will provide operators with greater contractual and financial security and by ensuring social value is a key component of the assessment criteria, thereby help to strengthen the provision of transport services across London;
   - Implementing a review of the five mile trip focus criteria in line with recommendations from the London Assembly and feedback from users – this review will need to balance the desire for longer journeys with the demand for more frequent access to trips.

Integrating Taxicard and DAR

8. A key component of the TfL's Roadmap is further integration of Taxicard and DAR. Greater integration could deliver efficiency savings that could be used to reinvest in service provision and deliver a reduction in operating costs, and therefore, funding requirements for TfL and Boroughs.
9. DAR provision is supplemented by the use of a Taxi consolidator contract which provides flexibility to enable the in-house service to be run efficiently. This consolidator contract is currently delivered by CityFleet; the current contract term ends in October 2017. Taxicard service provision is through a London Councils contract, also with City Fleet, which runs until March 2017 with the possibility to extend until March 2018. Any decision to extend the contract would have to be made by October 2016.

10. There is clearly an opportunity for joint procurement of these services to not only share procurement cost but to hopefully achieve economies of scale in future service costs by procuring these two similar services together. The tender process also provides the opportunity to market test the combined provision of call centre, booking and scheduling services for both Taxicard and DAR. Such services for Taxicard are currently provided by City Fleet as part of the Taxicard contract but for DAR are provided internally by TfL in-house resource.

11. To allow sufficient time to complete the tender process and any consequential transfer of staff, it will be necessary to extend the existing Taxicard contract with City Fleet until March 2018. Such an extension will be subject to TfL continuing funding at at least current levels. London Councils’ officers continue to lobby TfL for this commitment, which is needed by the October 2016 contract notification deadline.

12. TfL’s report to TEC last October also set out some further components of integration for the short, medium and long term. Appendix A describes progress and further development of these proposals.

Recommendations:

The sub-committee is asked to:

- Note the update on the progress with Transport for London (TfL) Social Needs Transport Roadmap to integrate and improve social needs transport for elderly and/or mobility impaired Londoners; and
- To discuss and provide comment on the proposals being developed further before reporting to full TEC meeting for decision later this year.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications to the approach set out in this report, as long as TfL agree to continue funding at the current level up until the potential contract extension date of March 2018.

Legal Implications

There are no legal implications at this stage.

Equalities Implications

There are no equalities implications of the report.

List of Appendices to This Report:

Appendix A – Further Components for Integration
Appendix A – Further Components for Social Needs Transport Integration

Short Term:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TFL’s SNT Review Proposal</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Proposed way forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single customer complaints and feedback process</td>
<td>Customer complaints and feedback are currently directed to and dealt with quickly by either the contractor responsible for the particular service or the relevant TFL/London Councils team. Channelling complaints about different services and service providers through a single route (and then forwarding them on) whilst it may add some delay and cost, it could provide benefits to service governance and management information. A single complaints and feedback service could only work with fuller integration of the booking and scheduling of the services.</td>
<td>Ensure complaints and feedback procedures for both schemes are consistent and transparent to service providers and customers. Consider a single process with fuller integration of the services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single set of eligibility criteria</td>
<td>The principle of this is desirable but Boroughs currently have some discretion on non-automatic qualifying criteria.</td>
<td>Work towards common criteria for all across both schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single membership process.</td>
<td>A single application process for both schemes would be better for customers and could reduce costs, particularly if moved mainly online. Some boroughs already have a shared form and process for multiple benefits such as Blue badge and Taxicard.</td>
<td>Develop a single application process with a single or common form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Dial-a-Ride’s Multi-Occupancy Accessible Transport (MOAT) contracts, in place with six community transport providers and re-let them in a form that would incentivise contractors to invest in the vehicles, drivers and training.</td>
<td>The tender process is already underway by TFL.</td>
<td>Complete implementation during early 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfL's SNT Review Proposal</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>Proposed way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfL will start to diversify the use of the Dial-a-Ride fleet, contracting out to other service commissioners who also have a need for the fleet's specialist vehicles and trained drivers. This would improve the overall efficiency of the fleet and start to integrate the services TfL provides with those in the education and health sectors.</td>
<td>Agreed. Perhaps Dial-a-Ride Vehicles could be subcontracted to be used for Taxicard journeys and more likely for other borough social needs transport services.</td>
<td>TfL to continue to explore and progress options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Medium Term:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TfL's SNT Review Proposal</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Proposed way forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A single booking process for customers. Initially this could mean a single phone number, with calls connected through to the relevant call centre, but the fundamental step will be to move to an integrated booking centre providing an integrated service.</td>
<td>A single number routed through to separate call centres could cause confusion, delay and cost. Taxicard currently handles bookings through a single call centre run by the contractor and also through an online portal and phone app. A single booking process could only work with fuller integration of the booking and scheduling of the services.</td>
<td>Consider whether integration of the booking centres could deliver customer improvements and cost savings. Market test joint procurement of the booking and scheduling services as part of the Taxicard re-tender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial a local decentralised booking process.</td>
<td>There have been trials of this in the past, most notably in Newham which finished in 2015.</td>
<td>The focus at this stage should be to work a more efficient centralised booking service rather than a more fragmented one. This will facilitate a better development of efficiency synergies and recognises that demand for both DaR and Taxicard journeys is not confined to local borough boundaries/activities but reflects the general public usage of mainstream passenger transport services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TfL's SNT Review Proposal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consideration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed way forward</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The taxi and private hire industry already provides significant transport services to both Dial-a-Ride and Taxicard. In partnership with London Councils and boroughs, TfL will develop a new contracting framework, letting a series of contracts either directly to Private Hire Operators or through taxi consolidation firms, which will meet specified training requirements.</td>
<td>There is scope to join up procurement activity and achieve efficiencies in doing so. TfL's taxi consolidator and LC's Taxicard contract could be combined or at least procured jointly as separate lots. The nature of the black taxi and phv industry is changing rapidly. Procurement needs to recognise the challenges and opportunities this may provide and to ensure that new contracts are future proofed.</td>
<td>LC and TfL will work together to jointly tender to meet the requirements of Taxicard and the Taxicard consolidator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Long Term:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TfL's SNT Review Proposal</strong></th>
<th><strong>Consideration</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed way forward</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek to expand the role of the integrated operation to secure more cooperation and coordination with other providers across London, with the aim of commissioning provision from the most appropriate and cost-effective providers. Customers would get the service that best delivers their needs provided in the more cost effective manner.</td>
<td>Demand for social needs transport (statutory and non-statutory) has daily peak and off peak profiles as is widely experienced on mainstream public transport. Further integration of wider services however could deliver benefits and efficiencies for Boroughs.</td>
<td>Continue to consider further integration of services and consider what role TEC and TfL may play in the governance of a more integrated approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B - Ticket Office Closures Review – Terms of reference

1. Overall purpose

1.1 To understand the customer impact of the recent London Underground ticket office closures and to identify any areas where further action is still required.

2. Method of review

2.1 The review will investigate how the ticket office closures have affected passengers, including their ability to:

- Purchase the correct ticket
- Find the right information for their journey
- Feel safe on the network
- Get any required additional support, such as for passengers with disabilities, whether visible or hidden.

2.2 This review is not examining staff rostering arrangements, or operational requirements. A detailed London Underground station staff roster review is currently taking place and will be finalised later this year once initial staff location moves are complete. London Underground have also committed to conducting a separate review on staffing numbers with trade unions.

2.3 Once this review is complete, a report will be produced by London TravelWatch, which can be tabled by the Deputy Mayor for Transport for consideration by the Transport for London (TfL) Board in December 2016.

2.4 The review will draw conclusions and make recommendations for action to be taken, either across the network or at specific locations, to enable the delivery of the best possible customer experience.

3. Format of the review

3.1 This review has been commissioned by the Mayor’s Office. London TravelWatch will undertake the review and report to the Mayor’s Office. London TravelWatch will provide an independent assessment of the changes, drawing on its considerable experience in working on passenger issues, and its record of effective engagement with TfL on previous reviews, consultations and surveys.

3.2 The review will consider how the changes at ticket offices have affected customer service, where customer needs are not being met, and any interventions that could improve the customer service proposition.
3.3 The review will examine how the new systems are working, particularly at the major National Rail terminal stations (including those without a Visitor Information Centre, such as Waterloo, London Bridge and Charing Cross), and whether the level of customer service that staff are providing is as good as it can be.

3.4 TfL will assist London TravelWatch throughout the duration of the review, providing data and information as required. A formal process of regular engagement and co-operation will be established between London TravelWatch and TfL to ensure speedy consideration of data and information for the report.

3.5 This review is not a formal public consultation; however, passenger, stakeholder and staff views will help to inform the review.

3.6 London TravelWatch will provide a draft report on its findings, including any recommendations, to the Mayor’s office. It is envisaged that either the draft or an updated ‘final’ report would then be tabled by the Deputy Mayor for Transport for consideration by the TfL Board.

3.7 London TravelWatch will produce a final report to be signed off at its board meeting on the 29th November. London TravelWatch retains the right to publish the report after 30th May 2017, if it has not been published before.

4 Focus of the review

4.1 The review will consider:

- **Ticket purchasing**
  - Ticketing and payment options, including the ease of purchasing the correct ticket for travel.
  - How quickly passengers can buy a ticket or get information, including queue length at ticket machines and station congestion

- **Access to information**
  - The quality of information available to passengers from staff, including examining the impact of the new handheld devices used by staff
  - The availability of information to infrequent passengers, at stations with a Visitor Information Centre open, with a Visitor Information Centre that is closed, and at other stations.
  - Visitor Information Centre opening hours

- **Journey experience**
  - The quality of customer service provided at stations
  - The impact on passenger perception of safety at stations
- The ease and availability of accessibility and customer service for all passengers, including those with disabilities or hidden disabilities, such as communications problems or learning disabilities

- Any other possible customer detriment
  - Quality of service of other operators such as at National Rail ticket offices
  - Ability of potential passengers who do not currently use the system to gain information and access to the network

4.2 These issues will be considered at different locations and types of station, as well as different times of day.

5 Inputs for the review

5.1 The review will consider evidence from:

- Passengers
  - Focus group research
  - Online survey research designed by London TravelWatch
  - Mystery shops undertaken by London TravelWatch staff

- Stakeholders
  - Focus group research
  - Online survey research designed by London TravelWatch
  - Accompanied mystery shops with accessibility group(s)
  - Consult with other operators (Network Rail, Train operators) about any impact on their network or ticket offices

- Staff
  - Focus group research

- TfL data
  - TfL Customer Satisfaction Surveys
  - TfL Mystery Shopping Surveys
  - London Underground Customer Ticketing Surveys
  - Staff availability data for staffing levels
  - Summary analysis of feedback and complaints received to date from customers and stakeholders including accessibility groups, elected representatives, user groups and tourist groups (i.e. VisitBritain, Golden Keys concierge)

- Other bodies
  - London TravelWatch data of casework received
6 Outcomes from the review

6.1 London TravelWatch will present a draft report on its findings to the Mayor's Office. The report, where relevant, will draw conclusions and make recommendations for action either across the network or at specific locations in support of the best possible customer experience.

6.2 After any amendments of fact, London TravelWatch will prepare a final version of the report to be tabled by the Deputy Mayor for Transport for consideration by the TFL Board.

6.3 When the report has been considered by the TFL Board and any further comments taken into account, it will be published by the Mayor's Office as the work of London TravelWatch.

7 Timeline for review

May - Announcement on intention to undertake customer focussed review following Mayoral commitment

August – Work with Mayor's Office and independent organisation (London TravelWatch) to agree the format of the review

September 12 – Start of 6-week review period

October 24 – Review period closes

November 8 – Initial findings shared with the Mayor’s Office and TFL

November 29 – Final report signed off by London TravelWatch board in confidential session

November 30 - Final report available for publication by the Mayor’s Office
Appendix C – Walking and Cycling Commissioner job description

The Mayor’s Walking and Cycling Commissioner: outline responsibilities and accountabilities

Job Title: The Mayor’s Walking & Cycling Commissioner
Max Salary: Up to £98k (pro rata)
Responsible to: The Deputy Mayor for Transport
Duration: Fixed Term Contract (to May 2020 with possible extension)
Hours: Part time – 3 days per week

Role Scope

The Mayor’s walking and cycling programme will bring together all the activities undertaken by Transport for London and key partners designed to promote and support healthy, active, non-polluting travel in London. This post exists to provide strategic advice to the Mayor and TfL on the overall content and direction of the programme and strategic oversight of delivery of the programme. They would work collaboratively with a wide range of partners in the public, private and voluntary sectors and with London’s diverse communities to support delivery of the programme. The post holder will provide a high-profile "ambassadorial", outreach and stakeholder management role for the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor for Transport and Transport for London on the Mayor's walking and cycling programme. They would represent the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and TfL to stakeholders, the travelling public and the media on the programme.

Key Accountabilities

To act as an advocate for walking and cycling in London, raising the profile of walking and cycling as ways of travelling around the city and promoting their heath, environmental, social and economic benefits to all who live and work in and visit the capital.

Secure the necessary resources to achieve the Mayor’s manifesto commitments related to walking and cycling, monitor progress towards them and report to the Mayoral team as required, including through formal reporting processes.

Have oversight, under the policy direction of the Deputy Mayor for Transport, of the development of TfL walking and cycling policy and programmes (bringing together the key areas of interest across transport, urban planning and public health) and the progress of the delivery of walking and cycling programmes and their benefits across London.

Proactively engage with and build relationships and working partnerships at a high level with London’s local authorities, transport providers, community organisations, Public Health England and other public and private organisations that may already be able or have the opportunity to influence the safety and conditions for walking and cycling in London, or promote walking and cycling within the capital.

Develop and manage relationships and alliances across the GLA Group and with a wide range of external stakeholders with interests in relevant policies and standards, including national, regional and local government, delivery bodies, NGOs, and other key opinion formers to ensure effective representation and delivery of Mayoral priorities.
Represent London's interests on walking and cycling at appropriate events, conferences, launches and openings and to the media to raise the profile of walking and cycling in London.

To identify and lobby for, further sources of funding for the development and delivery of walking and cycling related activity and programmes within London, including helping to secure third party financial support for relevant elements of these programmes through sponsorship, support in kind or provision of staffing or other resources, and securing the provision of adequate resources within TfL.

Provide written and oral briefings, advice and reports for the Mayor and the Mayor’s Office, Chief Executive, Directors and others as required. Respond to information requests from the Assembly.

Promote and enable equality of opportunities, and promote the diverse needs and aspirations of London’s communities.

Key interfaces

The Mayor of London
The Deputy Mayor for Transport
The Mayor’s team of Directors and key staff within the Mayor’s Office
The TfL Commissioner
MD TfL Surface Transport
Director of Strategy and Planning, TfL Surface Transport
GLA Transport team
Public Health England and public health staff within TfL and the GLA
Chief Executives and senior elected members of the London Boroughs
Chief Executives/senior managers of relevant voluntary organisations and trade associations
Chief Executives/senior managers of London

Knowledge

A good understanding of the benefits of walking and cycling and their links to other policy agendas, including public health, the environment, social justice and the wider urban economy.

A good understanding of the key issues and challenges relating to increasing walking and cycling in London and the relationship between the two forms of travel.

A good understanding of the mix of policies and programmes needed to support delivery of an increase in walking and cycling, including infrastructure improvements, financial and other instruments and behaviour change programmes.

A good understanding of the practical, political, financial and commercial realities of delivering projects and programmes that support an increase in walking and cycling on a crowded road network and in a politically complex and highly regulated environment.
A good understanding of and credibility with the key stakeholders involved in the walking and cycling agenda and ability to leverage relationships and interest from across a diverse range of sectors and audiences, including sectors and communities not currently engaged in the walking and cycling debate in London.

**Skills**

Exceptional influencing, communications, outreach and stakeholder management skills, with the ability to coalesce different constituencies around an agenda and to represent the Mayor and TfL's vision compellingly in public. Ability to engender maximum trust and confidence of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor through the highest level of personal and professional integrity.

The ability to network and influence at the highest levels in the public, private and voluntary sectors, including the ability to engage the widest possible range of audiences and interests in the walking and cycling agenda, including from the transport, urban planning, environment, economics and public health sectors.

Strong strategic skills, with an ability to propose and evaluate strategic options and to lead the policy debate in the areas covered. Well-developed analytical and problem-solving skills and ability to devise creative solutions to complex problems and issues.

The ability to work in a politically complex and highly regulated operating environment.

**Experience**

Significant experience of operating in a complex political and regulatory environment together with consultation and negotiation skills in order to seek to change opinion and influence political and other stakeholder

Significant experience of working with a broad range of stakeholders in the public, private and voluntary sectors on development and/or delivery of policies and programmes relevant to the walking and cycling agenda.

Experience of public speaking and representing an organisation or issue to a wide range of audiences, including conferences, senior stakeholders and the print and broadcast media

Experience of generating third party financial or other support for project and programme delivery
Rt Hon Chris Grayling MP
Secretary of State for Transport
Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London SW1P 4DR

Dear Secretary of State,

Devolving rail services in London

I wrote to your predecessor, Patrick McLoughlin MP, in July on behalf of the London Assembly Transport Committee to request an update on plans for the devolution of suburban National Rail services to the Mayor and Transport for London. I would be grateful if you were able to write to the Committee with a response.

The Transport Committee called for devolution in 2015 and in our report, Devolving rail services to London: Towards a South London Metro, set out practical steps towards achieving this aim.

The arguments in favour of devolution are very strong. There is cross-party consensus behind this reform, and it is supported by a large majority of rail passengers in London. The benefits that could be delivered by devolution include:

- Higher capacity: TfL has invested in longer and more frequent trains on the London Overground, reducing crowding significantly.

- Better reliability: TfL has increased the proportion of trains running on time on the London Overground, enabled by strong performance management and incentives for the operator.

- Integrated fares: By integrating rail services with the fares regime for TfL services, passengers can expect simpler and cheaper fares.

- Better accessibility: TfL would improve station design and increase the number of station staff to allow a turn-up-and-go service for disabled passengers.

- Economic development: As part of the GLA Group, TfL can coordinate its investment in the rail network with wider strategies for the development of London’s economy.
- Stronger accountability: Passengers will know they can hold the Mayor of London directly to account for their rail service.

The Committee warmly welcomed the prospectus published by the Department for Transport in January 2016, *A new approach to rail passenger services in London and the South East*, with London’s previous Mayor, as the starting point for further devolution.

The next opportunity for transferring suburban rail services to TfL comes with the end of the South Eastern franchise in 2018. However, at the present moment it is not clear to the Committee or to rail passengers in London what steps have been taken towards devolution of these services. Passengers in south London and areas outside the capital expect to see the Government acting on the plans it set out. Two months on from our first letter expressing this concern, the lack of communication is even more worrying.

Furthermore, we have also seen service performance on Southern Railway decline in recent months. The introduction of an emergency timetable, in an effort to improve reliability, has resulted in cuts to rail services in south London and beyond. The impact on passengers is completely unacceptable and the Government has to take action to resolve this situation without delay. We strongly believe that devolution to TfL, plus major investment in infrastructure, is a vital long-term solution. We therefore urge you to devolve Southern’s suburban services to TfL as soon as practical.

I would like to request a full update from you on plans for rail devolution in London. I would appreciate a response at the earliest opportunity, copying in the Committee’s scrutiny manager on Richard.Berry@london.gov.uk.

I look forward to future discussions on this topic.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM  
Chair, Transport Committee
Subject: Action Taken Under Delegated Authority

Report to: Transport Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 11 October 2016

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report sets out recent action taken by the Chair under delegated authority.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the Committee notes the action taken by the Chair, Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, under delegated authority, namely to agree:

(a) A response to the Network Rail consultation on the draft West Midlands and Chilterns route study; and

(b) A letter to London TravelWatch requesting details of the terms under which it was commissioned to undertake a review into the Tube ticket offices closure programme.

2.2 That the Committee notes the response from London TravelWatch regarding the review into the Tube ticket offices closure programme.

3. Background

3.1 Under Standing Orders and the Assembly’s Scheme of Delegation, certain decisions by Members can be taken under delegated authority. This report details those actions.

4. Issues for Consideration

Network Rail consultation

4.1 The Transport Committee, on 8 September 2016 resolved:

"That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to respond to the Network Rail consultation on the draft West Midlands and Chilterns route study."
4.2 Following consultation with the party Group Lead Members, the Chair agreed a response to the Network Rail consultation on the draft West Midlands and Chilterns route study, as attached at Appendix 1.

London TravelWatch

4.3 Under standing delegations to Chairs, the Chair of a committee may do “anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the exercise of that body’s functions including (without limitation) … entering into correspondence on that body’s behalf in accordance with agreed decisions or in relation to any agreed annual work programme.“

4.4 At the Committee’s meeting on 13 July 2016, the Deputy Mayor for Transport reported that consideration was being given to commissioning London TravelWatch to carry out a review into Transport for London’s Tube ticket office closure programme.

4.5 Following the announcement by the Mayor on 7 September 2016 that London TravelWatch would be carrying out an independent review into the Tube ticket office closures programme, the Chair wrote to the Chair of London TravelWatch to request details of the terms under which they were commissioned to undertake the work and the terms of reference for the review. The letter is attached at Appendix 2 and the response from London TravelWatch is attached for noting at Appendix 3.

5. Legal Implications

5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in the report.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 There are no direct financial implications to the GLA arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report:
Appendix 1: Response to the Network Rail consultation on the draft West Midlands and Chilterns route study
Appendix 2: Letter to the Chair of London TravelWatch re review of ticket office closure programme; and
Appendix 3: Response from the Chair of London TravelWatch.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers:
Member’s Delegated Authority form 731

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Officer:</th>
<th>Dale Langford, Principal Committee Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>020 7983 4415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dale.langford@london.gov.uk">dale.langford@london.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Mark,

West Midlands and Chilterns Route Study consultation

I am writing to respond on behalf of the London Assembly Transport Committee to Network Rail’s current consultation on the draft West Midlands and Chilterns route study.

We welcome this opportunity to respond to Network Rail’s emerging plans for this route. Although a relatively small part of London’s wider rail network, we believe services on the Chiltern franchise are vital part of our transport system, connecting to key growth areas within and outside Greater London.

As you know, the Committee has submitted views on other plans produced recently by Network Rail for routes serving London. As we have previously recommended, London needs a single, coherent plan for upgrading its rail network covering the whole city. The piecemeal approach currently favoured by Network Rail creates a risk that strategic investment needs are overlooked. For instance, the draft route study discusses connectivity with proposed HS2 services at Old Oak Common, but does not address the need for greater capacity of services through London Euston that would be required to accommodate HS2. We understand from previous discussions with Sir Peter Hendy that Network Rail and Transport for London will be producing a joint plan, and therefore we would welcome a timely update on this.

London is set to continue to grow rapidly, with the population estimated to reach 10 million by 2030 and over 11 million by 2050. Jobs are also forecast to increase from 4.9 million in 2011 to 6.3 million in 2050. On the Chiltern route, the number of passengers is set to grow by 76 percent by 2043. These high levels of growth will put severe pressure on the National Rail network serving London. Significant enhancements are necessary on many routes and corridors.

The Committee urges Network Rail to prioritise those interventions which will:
• Deliver sufficient capacity to allow passengers to board trains and prevent them from having to stand on journeys of over 20 minutes in length.
• Improve safety by minimising station overcrowding.
• Improve punctuality and reliability of trains.
• Ensure adequate frequency of trains to meet passenger needs in both the peak and the off-peak, moving towards a ‘turn up and go’ metro-style service.
• Improve journey times and reduce the need to change trains.
• Improve access to rail services for passengers with a disability.

There are specific issues with Chiltern services that we hope Network Rail will seek to address, working with the operator. Stopping frequencies at some outer London suburban stations are low, with significant variation in stopping patterns. For instance, for peak morning direct trains from West Ruislip there are gaps of 15, 38, 45 and 21 and 14 minutes between services from just before 7am to just after 9am. For evening services from Sudbury Hill Harrow to Marylebone there is a gap of 101 minutes from 18.38 to 20.19 between services. This inconsistency is likely to make services unattractive to passengers.

We support proposals for improvements made in the draft route study, which if implemented would help address some of the challenges of this route. Longer trains are required into London Marylebone on the Chiltern route to meet growing demand. We expect this will require an upgrade of Marylebone station to improve capacity and passenger facilities. Delivering electrification and signalling upgrades on the Chiltern route will also improve reliability.

I look forward to seeing further proposals for upgrades to these services.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Chair of the Transport Committee
Appendix 2

Dear Stephen,

Review into Tube ticket office closures

The Mayor of London has today announced that London TravelWatch will carry out an independent review into Transport for London’s Tube ticket office closures programme. The review and that London TravelWatch might be undertaking it was referred to by Val Shawcross when she attended the last meeting of the Transport Committee in her capacity as the Deputy Mayor for Transport.

We also discussed it when Keith Prince and I met with you to have a preliminary discussion about London TravelWatch’s budget and business plan. At that meeting we encouraged you to seek appropriate payments if you agreed to undertake the review to ensure that taking on this work did not divert resources away from London TravelWatch’s core functions. Would you please let me have details of the terms under which you have been commissioned to undertake the work on ticket office closures and the terms of reference for the review.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Chair of the Transport Committee
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
London Assembly
City Hall
The Queen’s Walk
London SE1 2AA

21 September 2016

Dear Caroline

Review into Tube ticket office closures

I am writing in response to your letter dated 7th September 2016.

I can confirm that the basis on which London TravelWatch is carrying out a review of the impact of the closures of the ticket offices on London Underground is that TfL meet all of the costs associated with the review. These include:

- Commissioning focus group research
- All costs associated with the accompanied mystery shopping trips with volunteers from Transport for All
- Seconding a second year graduate trainee to us until Christmas to assist with the work as well as to help take forward some of the work we have had to defer in order to do this study
- Reimbursing the cost of staff time spent on this work

As requested I am attaching a copy of the terms of reference for this review which the Mayor’s office have agreed we can share.

Best wishes
Yours sincerely,

Stephen Locke
Chair, London TravelWatch
This page is intentionally left blank
Ticket Office Closures Review – Terms of reference

1. Overall purpose

1.1 To understand the customer impact of the recent London Underground ticket office closures and to identify any areas where further action is still required.

2. Method of review

2.1 The review will investigate how the ticket office closures have affected passengers, including their ability to:

- Purchase the correct ticket
- Find the right information for their journey
- Feel safe on the network
- Get any required additional support, such as for passengers with disabilities, whether visible or hidden.

2.2 This review is not examining staff rostering arrangements, or operational requirements. A detailed London Underground station staff roster review is currently taking place and will be finalised later this year once initial staff location moves are complete. London Underground have also committed to conducting a separate review on staffing numbers with trade unions.

2.3 Once this review is complete, a report will be produced by London TravelWatch, which can be tabled by the Deputy Mayor for Transport for consideration by the Transport for London (TfL) Board in December 2016.

2.4 The review will draw conclusions and make recommendations for action to be taken, either across the network or at specific locations, to enable the delivery of the best possible customer experience.

3. Format of the review

3.1 This review has been commissioned by the Mayor’s Office. London TravelWatch will undertake the review and report to the Mayor’s Office. London TravelWatch will provide an independent assessment of the changes, drawing on its considerable experience in working on passenger issues, and its record of effective engagement with TfL on previous reviews, consultations and surveys.

3.2 The review will consider how the changes at ticket offices have affected customer service, where customer needs are not being met, and any interventions that could improve the customer service proposition.
3.3 The review will examine how the new systems are working, particularly at the major National Rail terminal stations (including those without a Visitor Information Centre, such as Waterloo, London Bridge and Charing Cross), and whether the level of customer service that staff are providing is as good as it can be.

3.4 TfL will assist London TravelWatch throughout the duration of the review, providing data and information as required. A formal process of regular engagement and co-operation will be established between London TravelWatch and TfL to ensure speedy consideration of data and information for the report.

3.5 This review is not a formal public consultation; however, passenger, stakeholder and staff views will help to inform the review.

3.6 London TravelWatch will provide a draft report on its findings, including any recommendations, to the Mayor’s office. It is envisaged that either the draft or an updated ‘final’ report would then be tabled by the Deputy Mayor for Transport for consideration by the TfL Board.

3.7 London TravelWatch will produce a final report to be signed off at its board meeting on the 29th November. London TravelWatch retains the right to publish the report after 30th May 2017, if it has not been published before.

4 **Focus of the review**

4.1 The review will consider:

- **Ticket purchasing**
  - Ticketing and payment options, including the ease of purchasing the correct ticket for travel.
  - How quickly passengers can buy a ticket or get information, including queue length at ticket machines and station congestion

- **Access to information**
  - The quality of information available to passengers from staff, including examining the impact of the new handheld devices used by staff
  - The availability of information to infrequent passengers, at stations with a Visitor Information Centre open, with a Visitor Information Centre that is closed, and at other stations.
  - Visitor Information Centre opening hours

- **Journey experience**
  - The quality of customer service provided at stations
  - The impact on passenger perception of safety at stations
o The ease and availability of accessibility and customer service for all passengers, including those with disabilities or hidden disabilities, such as communications problems or learning disabilities

- Any other possible customer detriment
  o Quality of service of other operators such as at National Rail ticket offices
  o Ability of potential passengers who do not currently use the system to gain information and access to the network

4.2 These issues will be considered at different locations and types of station, as well as different times of day.

5 Inputs for the review

5.1 The review will consider evidence from:

- Passengers
  o Focus group research
  o Online survey research designed by London TravelWatch
  o Mystery shops undertaken by London TravelWatch staff

- Stakeholders
  o Focus group research
  o Online survey research designed by London TravelWatch
  o Accompanied mystery shops with accessibility group(s)
  o Consult with other operators (Network Rail, Train operators) about any impact on their network or ticket offices

- Staff
  o Focus group research

- TfL data
  o TfL Customer Satisfaction Surveys
  o TfL Mystery Shopping Surveys
  o London Underground Customer Ticketing Surveys
  o Staff availability data for staffing levels
  o Summary analysis of feedback and complaints received to date from customers and stakeholders including accessibility groups, elected representatives, user groups and tourist groups (i.e. VisitBritain, Golden Keys concierge)

- Other bodies
  o London TravelWatch data of casework received
National Rail Passenger Survey results involving journeys starting at stations that have both London Underground and National Rail services

Input from the Metropolitan and British Transport Police on safety and resilience, which might also feed into Lord Harris’ resilience review.

6 Outcomes from the review

6.1 London TravelWatch will present a draft report on its findings to the Mayor’s Office. The report, where relevant, will draw conclusions and make recommendations for action either across the network or at specific locations in support of the best possible customer experience.

6.2 After any amendments of fact, London TravelWatch will prepare a final version of the report to be tabled by the Deputy Mayor for Transport for consideration by the TfL Board.

6.3 When the report has been considered by the TfL Board and any further comments taken into account, it will be published by the Mayor’s Office as the work of London TravelWatch.

7 Timeline for review

May - Announcement on intention to undertake customer focussed review following Mayoral commitment

August – Work with Mayor’s Office and independent organisation (London TravelWatch) to agree the format of the review

September 12 – Start of 6-week review period

October 24 – Review period closes

November 8 – Initial findings shared with the Mayor’s Office and TfL

November 29 – Final report signed off by London TravelWatch board in confidential session

November 30 - Final report available for publication by the Mayor’s Office
Subject: Traffic Congestion

Report to: Transport Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 11 October 2016

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report provides details of an investigation into traffic congestion and provides the background for a discussion of this topic with invited guests.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the Committee notes the report, puts questions on traffic congestion to the invited guests and notes the discussion;

2.2 That the Committee notes the records of its visit to the Transport for London surface transport and London Underground control centres, its visit to the Go-Ahead iBus hub, and its meeting with High Speed Two Limited, attached at Appendices 1 to 3.

3. Background

3.1 Around 26 million journeys commence on London’s roads every day, providing an essential part of the transport network for commuters, visitors and businesses. Roads are managed by multiple organisations:

- The vast majority of London’s roads are managed by London Boroughs;
- Around five per cent of the road network (580km) comprises the Transport for London (TfL) Road Network (TLRN) – these are mainly strategic roads, managed directly by TfL1; and

3.2 London’s roads have been getting steadily busier and more congested for at least the last two years. Traffic speeds are falling and journey times are getting longer, bringing an economic cost to London and increasing pollution. All parts of London’s road network – central, inner and outer London – are considered to be congested. Key measures indicating rising congestion include:


1 TfL is solely responsible for all of London’s 6,200 traffic signals, including those on Borough-managed roads.
Excess waiting times for buses have increased from an average of one minute in 2013/14 to 1.2 minutes in 2015/16.²

Journey time reliability on the TfL Road Network (major roads) has fallen from 89 per cent in 2013/14 to 87 per cent in 2015/16.³

3.3 Congestion is associated with a number of different problems:

- Longer and more unreliable journey times, affecting business productivity and disrupting Londoners’ lives. TfL has estimated that the total annual cost of vehicle delays on the road network is £5.5 billion.⁴
- Air pollution derived from vehicle emissions, which impacts health and quality of life.
- Reduced road safety, particularly for some vulnerable road users – cyclists, pedestrians and motorcyclists.

3.4 In his election manifesto, Sadiq Khan stated that he would take measures to address traffic congestion, noting the continuing impact of this problem on Londoners and businesses. His proposals included working with utility companies to reduce roadworks, working with the freight industry to reduce the number of lorries on the roads, delivering new river crossings in east London, encouraging use of the river for passenger and freight transport, and supporting car clubs.⁵

3.5 On 8 September 2016, the Committee held a meeting with a range of experts and stakeholders to discuss congestion and how it could be addressed. This included representatives of the AA, London Cab Drivers Club, National Joint Utilities Group, London First and the Campaign for Better Transport.

4. Issues for Consideration

4.1 The following guests have been invited to participate in the discussion:

- Alex Williams, Acting Managing Director of Planning, Transport for London;
- Alan Bristow, Director of Road Space Management, Transport for London;
- Councillor Feryal Demirci, Vice-Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils;
- A representative of the City of London Corporation; and
- Dr Steve Melia, Senior Lecturer in Transport and Planning, University of the West of England.

Recent activity

4.2 The Committee has recently undertaken a number of visits and meetings as part of this investigation. Records of the following activities are appended to this paper:

- Committee Members’ visit to the iBus hub run by the bus operator Go-Ahead in Stockwell, from where the operator manages its own bus operations (Appendix 1).

² The number of minutes that a passenger has had to wait in excess of the time that they should expect to wait if buses ran as scheduled.
³ Percentage of journeys completed within an allowable excess of 5 minutes for a standard 30 minute journey in the AM peak.
⁵ Sadiq Khan, A Manifesto for All Londoners, 2016
Committee Members’ visit to Transport for London’s surface transport control centre at Palestra, the central hub from where TfL manages traffic incidents and the bus network. This visit also included a tour of the London Underground control centre (Appendix 2).

A meeting between Committee Members and representatives of High Speed Two (HS2) Limited, the organisation leading the development of the proposed HS2 rail line. This meeting was used to discuss the management of construction traffic in London and other issues regarding the HS2 scheme (Appendix 3).

5. **Legal Implications**

5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

6. **Financial Implications**

6.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

---

**List of appendices to this report:**

Appendix 1 – Record of visit to the Go-Ahead iBus hub in Stockwell.
Appendix 2 – Record of visit to TfL’s surface transport and London Underground control centre.
Appendix 3 – Notes of meeting with High Speed Two Limited.

---

**Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

List of Background Papers: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Richard Berry, Scrutiny Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>020 7983 4199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scrutiny@london.gov.uk">scrutiny@london.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transport Committee site visit - Go Ahead Stockwell iBus Hub

Date: Wednesday 27 July

Attendees: Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Caroline Russell AM
Keith Prince AM
Florence Eshalomi AM
Alison Bell – External Relations Manager
Georgie Wells – Assistant Scrutiny Manager

Meeting with: John Trayner - Managing Director, Go-Ahead London
David Cutts - Operations Director, Go-Ahead London

Overview of visit
As part of the ongoing congestion investigation, the committee was invited by the Go-Ahead bus and rail group on a short visit to a service control centre (called an iBus hub). This was an opportunity to learn how a major bus operator is affected by congestion and consider what action can be taken to address it.

The visit involved a walk around the site to observe technology used to regulate routes, followed by a question and answer session with senior Go-Ahead team members. The visit took in all aspects of the operation, including engineering and service control.

The Go-Ahead Group’s bus and rail operations serve large numbers of commuters and leisure travellers. They have three main franchises (Govia Thameslink Railway, Southeastern and London Midland) which all serve the capital. They also operate around a quarter of London’s buses on behalf of TfL.

Stockwell Control Centre

Key facts about the control centre shared by Go-Ahead:

- Busiest in London, serving the main central routes
- Manages three bus garages
- 220 buses. Each night the garage is at capacity, though 20% of buses remain out on night bus services, so the garage operates with 120% bus capacity (which is only an issue on Christmas Day).
- Some buses will be in operation for 22 hours in a day.
• They mainly recruit staff from the local community – due in part to the early start times. They have around 40 engineering apprentices at a time and 300-400 part-time drivers.

**iBus Control system**

The system is owned by TfL (both hard and software). Although review is underway, it is slow due to the size of the system - with 18 operators in London using it.

Introduced in 2007 and with only minor updates since, the system now operates at three times its intended capacity. This results in slow and fractured communication between the drivers and the control centre, and between the control centre and TfL. This causes strain between drivers and controllers, and controllers and TfL. They report that trust and communication is at times very strained, as people struggle with not only the communication system, but also the frustrations caused by congestion on the roads.

Due to the pressure on the system, it often fails when it is needed most – for instance when there has been an incident it gets overloaded by demand for communication and crashes. There is often a 10-15min waiting time to speak to central control (TfL) about an issue or incident. This can rise to 40 mins at weekends or during special events.

Staff at Stockwell attribute these delays to staff cuts at TfL, the impact of rising congestion (causing there to be more occasions when they need to speak with TfL to resolve an issue on one of the routes) and the sluggishness of the system they are using.

Permanent delays on many of the routes cause stress and frustration for both controllers and drivers (when we visited this morning there were delays of up to an hour on routes 11, 19 and 100). Some of these buses were travelling at around 4mph – slower than walking pace.

Go-Ahead reported that they are losing 70 million passenger journeys year on year and attribute this to customers losing faith in ability of buses to get them from A to B on time. This is due to congestion – loss of road space, lack of prioritisation of buses, rise of private hire usage and road works. The ageing control system is also a factor as it slows communications - frustrating attempts to solve problems and react to situations as they occur.

**Working with TfL**

Go-Ahead shared some concerns about their working relationship with TfL:

• Communication is slow, with staff people not experienced enough. There is not always a good understanding of people’s roles and responsibilities

• The radio system they use is out of date, slow and unable to cope with the demands of today’s network.

• Stockwell staff felt that trust between their controllers and TfL staff has been lost.
Decision-making is a particular issue. At one stage there were several people at a time in TfL’s control centre who were able to make live decisions about changes to specific routes. Stockwell staff felt that this chain of command has been replaced and that there is often only a single decision maker on duty. This means that they will wait for long periods for urgently needed decisions.

There will be long waits for decisions on bus routes affected by issues e.g. road works or very bad congestion. For example, one evening in July it was taking an hour for buses on a route in Central London to travel from Liverpool street station to London Wall. Stockwell asked TfL if they could shorten the route by a couple of stops, which would regulate the services for the rest of the route, but mean that anyone waiting at those stops would find no buses arriving. TfL/central control said no – they do not like these decisions as there is no way to tell passengers at those bus stops what has happened. Stockwell thinks that this is the wrong decision as it creates delays along the whole route.

Empty buses

Concerns about running empty buses were countered by the need for reliability and consistency. People need to know their bus will come and take them from A – B. They need to know this at the beginning, middle and end of the day, regardless of how many others are using that service.

Safety

Safety concerns highlighted by Go-Ahead were:

- Go-Ahead staff felt that staff and passenger safety was not affected by the problems facing their network (e.g. communication delays – technology issues, and also issues relating to congestion such as service delays).

- However they felt that they had to work harder and harder to provide the same level of service. This is attributed to increasing competition for road space and declining system efficiency (meaning there is an increasing need for staff efficiency to offset these problems).

- They highlighted a declining incident rate and progress made with training and vehicle technology.

- The problem of drivers finishing consistently late was mentioned as a potential safety concern. They are persistently late finishing due to delays on their routes, and this causes stress and tiredness alongside making it harder to plan outside-of-work time and engagements.

The night tube

Implications of the introduction of night tube services were discussed:
• Some services are being cut and other new ones introduced, in response to the new coverage of the night tube. This will minimise overlapping services.

• The Go-Ahead team anticipated that the night tube will affect taxis more than buses – feeling that the night bus user would remain loyal and predicting that use of night buses will not be heavily impacted.

• However they conceded that buses are no longer as reliable as they once were, and that some trust in buses has been lost. This was attributed almost entirely to increased levels of congestion.
Transport Committee site visit – TfL control centres, Palestra

Date: Wednesday 27 July 2016

Attendees: Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Keith Prince AM
Florence Eshalomi AM
Navin Shah AM
Alison Bell – External Relations Manager
Richard Berry – Scrutiny Manager
Jonathan Hollis – Conservative group researcher

Overview of visit

As part of the Committee’s ongoing investigation into traffic congestion, Members were invited by Transport for London to view the Surface Transport and Traffic Operations Centre, the central hub where TfL monitors traffic conditions on London’s roads and manages the bus network. Members were also invited to view the London Underground Control Centre, which is also located at Palestra.

Surface Transport and Traffic Operations Centre

Members had an initial introduction Leon Daniels, TfL Managing Director of Surface Transport, before a tour of the Surface Transport and Traffic Operations Centre (STTOC).

The STTOC combines several different activities. It houses the London Buses Command and Control Centre (CentreComm), London Streets Traffic Control Centre (LSTCC) and the Metropolitan Police Service Traffic and Safer Transport Command Control. In addition, the London tunnels control room – for instance, monitoring traffic in the Blackwall Tunnel – is currently being migrated to STTOC.

Traffic data

STTOC can access 5,000 CCTV cameras in order to monitor traffic; 1,300 of these are TfL cameras. TfL also follows social media to learn about incidents, noting that information is transmitted rapidly through social media.

TfL publishes real-time traffic data for anyone to use, for instance in the development of traffic apps for smartphones.
Managing bus movements

TfL manages 650 bus routes from CentreComm. It works with 30 iBus centres, which are localised control centres run by bus operators. CentreComm receives around 1,200 calls from drivers every day about service delivery issues.

Dashboards in CentreComm show staff the status of all bus routes. From the centre, TfL can make interventions to alleviate incidents. Information is also passed on in real-time to passengers. For instance if a bus stop is closed, TfL’s online journey planner will be updated to remove this stop.

Members asked TfL about an instance where the operator Go-Ahead had recently asked for a route curtailment in response to traffic congestion, which was not agreed by TfL. TfL stated that all bus routes have pre-agreed curtailment points, and operators have autonomy to make decisions on whether to use these. In some instances operators may be reluctant to use other curtailment points if they believe they may face a financial penalty from TfL.

The iBus system allows TfL to track bus movements, including which are on time, running late or early. The system was designed specifically for TfL. There are proposals for an upgrade to an ‘iBus 2’ system, but this would be an expensive, bespoke upgrade. Proposals are currently going through TfL’s business planning process.

Congestion

TfL acknowledges that carriageway interventions (roadworks) have become more severe over the past 18 months, and this has increased congestion. TfL has taken away carriageway space to implement its Road Modernisation Plan, for instance new Cycle Superhighways. Other developers have also done this, including Network Rail.

There has also been an increase in traffic from private hire vehicles and delivery vans, with an increasing amount of personal shopping deliveries to central London offices.

TfL has used traffic signals to hold traffic outside central London to prevent build-up of congestion. However, this creates bottlenecks around the centre.

Events

STTOC houses an event liaison facility, in a dedicated room. This allows coordinated responses to major events taking place in London that will affect roads. It was used for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. In the weekend following the Committee’s visit, it was due to be used for the Ride London cycling event.

---

1 Members visited the iBus centre managed by the operator Go-Ahead in Stockwell earlier on 27 July.
Bus emissions

TfL is looking to cut emissions from buses. The oldest TfL bus in London is a Euro 3 standard vehicle. TfL is aiming to have all buses at Euro 6 standard by 2020. Older buses are being replaced, while those at Euro 5 standard are being retrofitted.²

London Underground Control Centre

Members received a presentation from Mark Wild, Managing Director of the London Underground, and Richard Jones, Head of Network Operations, before a tour of the control centre.³

The role of the London Underground Control Centre (LUCC) is to monitor services across the tube network, and take direct control of any major incidents. There are seven control rooms across the network, in addition to the LUCC. Other centres control operations on specific lines. Over time, TfL is looking to introduce greater integration between the centres.

British Transport Police (BTP) officers are also co-located with LUCC – here is a Duty Inspector present 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Network Rail staff are also based there, complementing operations at their main control centre in Milton Keynes. There is close contact between LUCC and the control centres for the London Fire Brigade and the London Ambulance Service.

The ‘contingency and response’ activities of the LUCC including leading the response to major events, severe weather conditions, industrial action and unplanned incidents. The LUCC manages volunteers who help people at stations following major disruptions.

Some events LUCC must respond to are routine, such as spectators travelling to Wembley Stadium. Others are less predictable or present other challenges, for instance:

- New Year’s Eve has become easier to manage since the fireworks display in central London has been ticketed.
- The Notting Hill Carnival is difficult because TfL limited station infrastructure in the area struggles to cope with the number of attendees.
- The poppy display at the Tower of London created a huge amount of unanticipated demand – TfL had to mobilise quickly in response and sustain a higher level of resource while the display was on.

The London Underground network information board is managed from LUCC – this information is put onto the TfL website and is automatically update across the tube

² For more information on emissions standards please see: https://www.theaa.com/motoring_advice/fuels-and-environment/euro-emissions-standards.html
³ Slides delivered by Richard Jones are attached.
network. Similar to the STTOC, the LUCC also monitors social media for updates on service problems.

From the LUCC, TfL directs a number of vehicles that can attend incidents on the network. Although these vehicles are operated by TfL, they are branded as British Transport Police. TfL also controls power networks across the tube from the LUCC.

A large amount of engineering work is carried out on the tube overnight. This is also overseen from the LUCC, with engineering works managers based in the centre overnight while work is taking place.
Transport Committee - Meeting with High Speed Two Ltd

Date: Thursday 1 September 2016, 2.30-4.00pm

Location: City Hall

Attendees: Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Keith Prince AM
Joanne McCartney AM
Caroline Russell AM
Richard Berry, Scrutiny Manager
Georgina Wells, Assistant Scrutiny Manager
Stephen Morgan, Labour group researcher
Stuart Westgate, Programme Development Director, Internal Sponsorship, HS2
Myrddin Edwards, Senior Communications Manager, HS2
Gareth Elliott, Public Affairs Manager, HS2

Purpose of meeting

High Speed Two (HS2) is a new rail line planned to connect London to the North of England. The Transport Committee met with HS2 in order to receive an update on progress with the scheme and discuss challenges it faces. The meeting contributed to the committee’s investigation into traffic congestion, reflecting the large amount of construction traffic HS2 is likely to generate in its construction phase.¹

Scheme progress

In phase one of the HS2 project, a line will be constructed between London and the West Midlands. Legislation is currently being considered in the House of Lords and is expected to receive Royal Assent in late 2016. It is anticipated this phase of the scheme will be completed in 2026.

In phase two, lines will be constructed between the West Midlands and Leeds and Manchester:
- Phase 2a will connect Birmingham to Crewe. Royal Assent is expected in 2019, and completion in 2027.
- Phase 2b will connect Crewe to Manchester, and Birmingham to Leeds. Royal Assent is expected in 2022, and completion in 2033.

HS2 reports that the scheme overall is making good progress and is expected to be delivered on time. There is strong support for the scheme form the Secretary of State. HS2 are currently operating with 95 per cent certainty of meeting targets, which is a standard industry measure.

¹ Unless otherwise stated, the content of this note consists of views and information shared by HS2.
Euston

London Euston is the proposed terminus station for HS2 in London. Some of the main changes to the HS2 Bill as it has gone through Parliament have been about the design and configuration of Euston station. Enabling works begin at Euston in 2017.

In response to concerns about the impact on the community, there has been continual revision of construction plans at and around Euston. HS2 recognises the significant impact the scheme will have.

There will be disruptions to existing services using Euston during the construction of HS2. There will be a series of weekend possessions of the station. A range of options to mitigate the impact are being considered. For instance when the West Coast Main Line was being upgraded, some services were diverted from Euston to Marylebone. HS2 is working with train operators to assess options.

In construction work at Euston, HS2 will be looking to replicate good practice from other schemes, and avoid past mistakes. Experiences at London Bridge and St Pancras will be considered. HS2 will work with TfL. They particularly recognise the need to provide good passenger information.

Construction traffic

The HS2 Bill established environmental constraints on HS2, for example limits on traffic. HS2 will put pressure on its suppliers to minimise traffic. Planning permission will also set out further limits. HS2 is committed to ensuring its vehicles meet all regulations on emissions. They will also meet TfL standards on road safety, such as lorries with high-visibility cabs.

HS2 will be considering transporting spoil from its Euston construction site by rail. There are constraints on this, as it may affect passenger services. The capacity of canals for this purpose is limited.

HS2 will be considering spreading the routes used by construction traffic, and spreading traffic evenly across the day. They will design construction sites to allow for rapid unloading of material and to avoid vehicles queuing.

Old Oak Common

Old Oak Common will be a new intermediate station constructed for HS2. It has also been proposed as a temporary terminus for HS2 as an alternative to Euston. However, HS2 consider this is not feasible as the station would not be able to cope with the demand. TfL has also said Crossrail would not be able to accommodate the number of passengers transferring from HS2 if Old Oak Common is the terminus. Furthermore, there would be opposition from cities in the North of England, which want direct services to central London.

Community engagement

HS2 has focused heavily on community engagement and will continue to do this. There is a drop-in centre at Euston for anyone to come along and talk to staff. HS2 works with Camden
Council’s community liaison team. HS2 also has newsletters and a phone and email helpline. They go out to meet local groups regularly.

This approach will be replicated at Old Oak Common, and at other areas along the route of the line.

**Employment and skills**

HS2 has created two engineering colleges, one in Birmingham and one in Doncaster. They have a hub and spoke model, linking up with other institutions.

In London, HS2 has invested £4.1 million at a college in Camden. They are also linking with Brunel University, which is close to the Old Oak Common site.

HS2 are working with Women in Transport to maximise the number of women employed on the scheme.

**Other issues**

Other issues covered in the meeting were:

- There are no implications of the upcoming decision on airport expansion for HS2. Good links between Heathrow and Old Oak Common are already planned.

- There is no identified risk to HS2 from the decision to leave the European Union. There are some European firms providing specialist services that HS2 may need. It is not yet clear how the decision will alter the procurement process for the scheme.

- HS2 is not dependent on the delivery of Crossrail 2. HS2 agrees that a masterplan is needed for the Euston area that accommodates plans for Crossrail 2 services.

- All HS2 stations will be fully accessible.

**Further information**

HS2 agreed to provide the following additional information to Committee Members after the meeting:

- The number of vehicles per hour that will be coming to/go ing from the Euston construction site.

- HS2’s response to concerns that construction vehicles will be driving along the route of the new Cycle Superhighway 11, which could be heavily congested.

- Whether those working on HS2 construction will be paid the London Living Wage.

- Whether co-located stations for other rail services will be accessible.

- Whether there will be public toilets on board trains, and at new stations.

- Whether there will be new cycle parking facilities at stations.
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Subject: London TravelWatch Business Plan and Budget Bid 2017/18

Report to: Transport Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat  Date: 11 October 2016

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report presents the London TravelWatch\(^1\) draft budget and business plan for 2017/18.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the Committee considers London TravelWatch’s proposed budget and business plan for the next financial year and recommends a budget for London TravelWatch for 2017/18.

3. Background

3.1 London TravelWatch’s budget forms part of the London Assembly’s budget, and as such it will be included in the Assembly’s budget submission to the Mayor. The Transport Committee is asked to consider and approve the proposed budget for London TravelWatch for 2017/18 which will form part of the Assembly’s overall budget submission for consideration by the Assembly’s GLA Oversight Committee in November 2016. Any comments from the Committee will be taken into account during the preparation of the budget submission to the Mayor.

4. Issues for Consideration

4.1 The London TravelWatch draft Business Plan and Budget Bid 2017/18 is attached at Annex A. In 2016/17 London TravelWatch received £1,035,300 from the GLA. London TravelWatch is proposing a budget for 2017/18 that represents a cash freeze, with increased costs mostly for pay, pensions and National Insurance offset by savings on areas such as staff salaries and supplies and services. No contributions are proposed from London TravelWatch’s reserves in 2017/18.

\(^1\) London TravelWatch is the operating name of the London Transport Users Committee.
5. **Legal Implications**

5.1 Under paragraph 6(1) of Schedule 18 to the GLA Act 1999 (as amended), the Assembly must provide London TravelWatch with funds to pay officers’ and members’ remuneration and other allowances as the Committee, with the approval of the Assembly, so determine. The Assembly must also provide such funding as it determines appropriate to London TravelWatch to defray expenses in connection with its functions (para 6(2), Sch 18, GLA Act). All the Assembly’s functions regarding London TravelWatch are delegated to the Transport Committee.

5.2 By 1 February each year (or such other date as the Transport Committee determines) London TravelWatch must provide a formal “statement of expected expenses” relating to the expenses they expect to incur in connection with carrying out of their functions in the following financial year (para 6(3), Sch 18). The Transport Committee must consider that formal statement, and approve it with or without modifications (para 6(4), Sch 18). Once approved (with or without modifications) it then becomes London TravelWatch’s budget for the following year.

6. **Financial Implications**

6.1 London TravelWatch is a separate legal entity which is funded by the London Assembly in accordance with Schedule 19 of the GLA Act 1999 (as amended). London TravelWatch funding, therefore, forms part of the London Assembly and Secretariat budget and London TravelWatch’s 2017/18 proposed budget will need to be contained within the Assembly and Secretariat’s 2017/18 cash limited budget.

**List of appendices to this report:**

Annex A – London TravelWatch Draft Budget and Business Plan 2017/18

**Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

List of Background Papers: none

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Officer:</th>
<th>Mark Roberts, Executive Director of Secretariat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>020 7983 4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.roberts@london.gov.uk">mark.roberts@london.gov.uk</a>,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONDON TRAVELWATCH
Business Plan and Budget Bid 2017-18

London TravelWatch is the independent consumer body responsible under a series of statutes for representing the interests of all who use public transport in London. It is accountable to, and funded by, the London Assembly. It covers all modes of transport, and its work is underpinned by a series of statutory powers and duties. In particular, it must:

- consider and make recommendations relating to matters brought to its notice by users, transport providers, the Assembly, the Government, or which it considers merit investigation
- respond to essential consultations on behalf of transport users
- undertake research and investigation into issues of concern to users, and
- act as an appeals body for users who have been unable to resolve their complaints with service providers.

It delivers these statutory responsibilities through its casework and policy teams and the close synergy between these teams is an important feature of its work. It is, for example, crucially important for caseworkers to have easy access to expert knowledge to help resolve complex appeals.

Dealing with complaints remains a core objective. We will continue to help individual passengers, and use lessons learned from our casework to shape our thinking and to improve services for all passengers. On the policy and investigation side, a wide range of evidence, including both primary and secondary research, is used to inform the organisation’s work, but important policy-related issues emerging from casework also provide a key input to London TravelWatch’s work.

We have been particularly successful in recent years, continuing to make a real difference for people travelling in and around London. We stood up for rail passengers affected by persistent delays and disruption, challenging the industry to improve, and making the case for better compensation arrangements for commuters. We consulted Underground passengers to ensure their needs were properly taken into account when ticket offices were closed, and Thameslink, Southern and Great Northern (TSGN) passengers when Govia Thameslink Railways (GTR) proposed major changes to station staffing. We developed an online community to help give bus passengers a voice and continued to monitor the reliability of bus services, highlighting the worst performing routes and lobbying Transport for London (TfL) to address the underlying causes. Our 2014 report on how to improve public transport access to London’s five major airports was well-received by both politicians and the
industry and some of our recommendations are already being addressed. Our 2015 *Interchange Matters* research report has also led to several improvements at local transport interchanges and will underpin much of our future work.

Over the past five years we have completely restructured and refocused the organisation, streamlining and reducing back office functions. We reduced our senior team from four to two and cut our staffing establishment by a third. This enabled us to cut our budget by more than a third and we continue to seek further efficiencies or ways of making our resources go further. Alongside this we have placed great importance on growing our organisational capacity, especially through developing our staff so that they have the skills to take on new responsibilities.

London TravelWatch remains strongly committed to working collaboratively with the Transport Committee. We will continue to align work plans where practicable and to prioritise requests to provide evidence to the Committee’s scrutinies and investigations. Where resources permit, we will play our part in following up some of the key recommendations arising from its work by monitoring the progress made by operators, particularly TfL, in implementing them.

This business plan sets out the key areas of work the organisation will plan to undertake in 2017-18. These are set out within the framework of our strategic priorities to reflect new transport challenges facing London, especially the major issue of capacity constraints at a time of tight public spending control. Our prioritisation criteria will help focus our resources on areas where we can have the most impact. We will work in accordance with our mission and values - putting the consumer view, challenging the industry where appropriate and championing the interests of the travelling public – but always ensuring that our work remains evidence-based and our decision making is independent.

A series of appendices sets out: our mission and values; our strategic priorities and corporate strategy; our prioritisation criteria; our budget bid for 2017-18; our budget growth and savings summary; and our staffing structure

*Context for and our approach to this Business Plan*

The challenges London TravelWatch now faces are both daunting and exciting. They are daunting because of the scale of London’s transport problems, and the tight limits on public resources available for tackling them – affecting not just our own budget but also those of the Mayor, the London Assembly, TfL and the many other parties involved including local councils. But they are exciting because the importance – and potential impact – of independent and evidence based consumer input has never been greater. Our work on behalf of London’s travelling public is now requested, expected and valued across a very wide range of fronts. We seek to act as a ‘critical friend’ to all responsible for delivering transport services – with equal emphasis on both the ‘critic’ and ‘friend’ roles. Our aim is to achieve real influence by being authoritative and respected. This also requires us to play an active role in consultation exercises and public debates, as well as through careful monitoring of performance data to ensure that adverse trends are picked up.
Our first and most obvious priority is to effectively represent the passenger interest as the new Mayor develops his transport strategy, which will feature a number of areas critically important to our remit. These include fare changes, the promotion of cycling and walking, the pedestrianisation of Oxford Street, alterations to the bus network and the review of London Underground ticket office changes. On this last issue we have already been commissioned by the Mayor to carry out a consumer audit of ticket office closures, which will be completed during 2016. There will also be a need for a strong and balanced user voice in any assessment of measures to reduce traffic congestion by reducing demand for road space.

We hope that the Mayor’s new transport strategy will continue to espouse the benefits of a truly integrated approach to transport services across the capital, building on the benefits of Oyster and contactless cards, journey planners and improvements to information. In this context, we attach particular importance to following through our pioneering work on interchanges, which form a key element of so many cross London journeys. We have identified a number of ways in which modest improvements – for example to wayfinding and physical access – can bring major benefits to the user experience, and help to increase the efficiency of the network as a whole. London TravelWatch’s multi-modal remit is especially helpful here given that many interchanges are the responsibility of more than one operator.

Our second major set of priorities will continue to relate to the National Rail sector. Along with the London Assembly, London TravelWatch has long been a staunch supporter of the devolution of metro rail services to the Mayor and TfL, following and extending the successful model of the London Overground. The Department for Transport (DfT) and TfL launched a landmark partnership agreement in January 2016 and we look forward to providing a passenger perspective as these discussions continue. Rail franchises are ‘set in stone’ for many years at a time, and it is important to ensure that all the passenger-critical elements are effectively addressed at the outset as new franchising arrangements come into effect over the next few years. This requires detailed passenger input at the initial draft Invitation to Tender stage (which is public) and in meetings with prospective bidders. London TravelWatch has also secured an arrangement with the DfT whereby a member of staff is invited to comment, in confidence, on the customer facing elements of each tender from the London passenger perspective once the DfT has received them.

In addition to the franchising process, London TravelWatch will be expected to play a significant role in relation to changes to national rail ticketing, including further ticket office closure proposals and reforms to online retailing and smart cards. Where efficiencies are achieved, it is critically important to ensure that any freed resources are used to enhance passenger benefit. There is also a need to monitor National Rail performance data, so that problems can be identified and addressed as early as possible – for example we identified a downturn in TSGN performance as early as autumn 2014, even before the London Bridge works had a major impact. Rail issues such as these have particular resonance for passengers beyond Greater London but within the wider London Railway Area for which London TravelWatch has formal responsibility. This area extends to Gatwick, Luton and Stansted airports and includes most of the London commuter belt.

The third priority is to ensure that consumers get a fair deal – through appropriate compensation when services are poor, and through effective mechanisms for
handling complaints. Complaint handling by staff of the transport operators continues to be a challenge, and change is not always in the right direction. One important development has been the publication by the Office of Rail and Road (ORR) of formal guidance on complaint handling by train operating companies, which is backed up by the licensing system. The ORR has also given the opportunity for London TravelWatch and our related organisation Transport Focus to agree a Protocol governing ‘appeal complaints’ – i.e. those where the complainant has not got what they wanted from the operator and seeks the help of a third party. This Protocol helpfully sets out a series of requirements placed on train operators, for example to explain how to appeal to London TravelWatch and to handle our requests for information expeditiously. We plan to review progress with the Protocol towards the end of 2017. Meanwhile the incentive to maximise our own efficiency in handling appeal complaints remains very strong, especially at a time when the public’s propensity to complain seems to be rising – though it is important also to bear in mind the value of complaints data in the improvement of services to all passengers.

Last but by no means least, there is a vital need in the current environment to ensure that all user voices are given a fair hearing. London TravelWatch has been prioritising the interests of bus users especially, through its work to facilitate local user groups. We are also committed to working closely with organisations such as Transport for All, the RNIB and others to ensure our work reflects their particular needs.

Taken together, the challenges we have outlined could easily consume the resources of a much larger organisation than London TravelWatch. To ensure that our work is kept within bounds, the Board has set clear prioritisation criteria. These require that all proposals are tested to ensure that they meet genuine identified consumer needs, and that any London TravelWatch intervention genuinely adds value and does not unnecessarily duplicate the work of others. All the proposals in this draft Plan have been subjected to these tests. But it needs to be borne in mind that the range and scale of the issues identified above will limit our ability to take on new work.

Additional work

There is more that we would like to do if we were able to take on another member of staff. In particular, implementation of the Thameslink and Crossrail timetables and service patterns at the end of 2018 will improve journey opportunities and the connectivity of over 80 interchange stations throughout Greater London to almost all other stations in Greater London and beyond. This has the potential to attract significant traffic from the private car and improve access to jobs and services, but only if these interchanges are of sufficient quality to attract and retain these additional passengers.

If extra resources of £50,000 are available beyond those envisaged in this Plan, London TravelWatch would like to focus on identifying and promoting improvements at a range of interchanges across London where there are the most promising opportunities to influence modal shift.
Objectives for 2017-18

Our response to the challenges described above and other key work areas, is set out below within the context of our five strategic objectives.

1. Support and advocate initiatives which make best use of scarce capacity on all London’s transport networks and promote infrastructure changes that will help to do this

   • Promote suggestions we have made previously about how to increase overall capacity on the existing transport network by relatively small improvements which make best use of current assets.

   • Take all opportunities to use our influence to promote further devolution of local National Rail services to TfL.

   • Assess the effectiveness of the Road Modernisation Programme and its impact on all road users, paying particular regard to bus priority measures and the needs of cyclists and pedestrians.

   • Evaluate the impact on passengers of timetable changes, especially those associated with the Thameslink upgrade and the Crossrail Elizabeth line.

   • Provide a passenger input to plans to improve Bank station in 2020 and to other upgrades and extensions to the Underground network.

   • Promote the development of new rail, Underground and bus interchange stations where these would make better use of existing capacity and encourage improvements to strategic interchanges such as Brixton and West Hampstead that could deliver passenger benefits over a much wider area.

   • Promote the improvement of surface access to London’s airports, both in terms of infrastructure (rail, road, bus) and the terms and conditions to which passengers are subject (rail and bus ticketing, taxi and private hire fares and availability).

   • Promote the development of initiatives that encourage more people to walk or cycle for journeys of less than two miles, particularly in outer London.

   • Review the effectiveness of station travel plans in improving the quality of access to the rail network.

2. London has a transport system that is well-integrated and accessible to all, with convenient interchanges, easy-to-use ticketing and good customer service

   • Promote good practice at transport interchanges as set out in our well-received Interchange Matters report – using a variety of methods to influence both operators and decision makers, as well as to try to engage local
stakeholders. Continually challenge the industry to make improvements particularly during major station upgrades.

- Work to improve accessibility by encouraging transport decision makers, providers and operators to take further action - on the railway by doing more to mitigate the impact of excessive gaps between trains and platforms; on buses by pushing local authorities to adopt the more challenging target of making 95% of all bus stops accessible; and on pavements by highlighting the problems posed to blind and partially-sighted pedestrians by pavement obstructions.

- Building on the Mayor’s ticket office closure review, our response to GTR’s ticket office proposals and the Assembly’s scrutiny of TfL’s customer service, assess the impact of changes to the way that London Underground, London Overground and National Rail stations are staffed and intervene where there is evidence that passengers’ needs are not being adequately met, particularly those of disabled or vulnerable travellers.

- Evaluate the impact on passengers of major station rebuilding programmes, particularly at London Bridge, Waterloo and Euston, and continue to speak up on their behalf to ensure that the changes best meet the needs of passengers and to help minimise the effect of disruption during construction.

- Take all opportunities to encourage transport operators to continuously improve the service they give to passengers; particularly through commenting on passenger charters and penalty fare policies, as well as through monitoring how well they adhere to their ORR approved complaints handling policies.

- Follow up work done in 2016-17 regarding the needs of the 96 million passengers who use small (fewer than 1 million users a year) stations in the London Railway Area, and suggest how these could be better met.

- In partnership with Trust for London and London Councils, review the impact of the TfL fares freeze and the new bus hopper ticket for people in low income jobs living in outer London who have to travel long distances to work.

- Produce a good practice guide for the service standards passengers should be able to expect at bus stations and major bus interchanges.

3. All decisions about transport in London take account of transport users’ needs and priorities

- Give bus passengers a voice by further developing our online bus community and by supporting groups in locations particularly affected by major service changes (for example in the Thamesmead and Belvedere areas when the Crossrail Elizabeth line comes to Abbey Wood).
Monitor closely the new rail franchises on Greater Anglia, West Midlands and South West routes to ensure the services they provide meet the needs of passengers as promised in the franchise bid, and provide input from the London passenger perspective to the Southeastern and East Midlands franchises before they are tendered.

Monitor progress on direct award rail franchises to ensure services meet the needs of passengers as promised in the terms of the franchise award (Southeastern and First Great Western).

Provide input to new rail concession competitions by TfL for London Overground (and potentially the metro parts of South West Trains and Southeastern, as appropriate).

Track the legislative and decision-making process for HS2, speaking up at appropriate points to ensure that London passengers’ interests are properly taken into account in relation to Euston and Old Oak Common stations.

Work to ensure that the investment in Crossrail brings maximum benefit to passengers – that stations are accessible and well-connected with local bus services, and that there is a direct link to Terminal 5 at Heathrow Airport.

Input to TfL’s work on access by public transport to hospitals and take opportunities that arise to promote improved access to healthcare and education services, particularly when new or reconfigured services or facilities are being planned, as well as to major new housing, enterprise or retail developments.

Use our influence to ensure that Crossrail 2 is developed with passenger needs considered as a key element of the planning process.

Use our Key Transport users priorities, initially developed for discussion with the candidates for the 2016-2020 mayoralty, to guide our response to the new Mayor’s Transport Strategy to ensure that it delivers on what we consider to be key user needs.

4. The travelling public are well-informed by service providers, they get high quality and timely information about services available, fares and ticketing and any disruption to their journeys

Provide a strong consumer voice on the multi-agency London-wide Travel Demand Management Board set up to coordinate passenger communications during planned disruption, and to learn the lessons from incidents of unplanned widespread disruption.

Use our influence to try and accelerate the extension of the Oyster pay as you go and contactless smartcards to Luton and Stansted Airports and other stations within the London Railway Area.
• Pending the outcome of the government’s Penalty Fares Review, encourage transport operators to be more transparent with passengers about the circumstances in which penalty fares are levied and to raise awareness of the importance of having a valid ticket or touching in with Oyster pay as you go, contactless smartcards or other electronic payment means before travelling.

• Use our quarterly service monitoring reports to provide early warning of deteriorating performance, paying particular attention to bus and cycle safety statistics as we develop our scrutiny of these.

• Negotiate to ensure that new ticket machines are designed to be user-friendly and encourage operators across the industry to adopt consistent design principles so that passengers develop greater confidence in using these.

• Promote the simplification of ticketing arrangements in London to enable easy understanding and a fair deal for all passengers, wherever they are travelling to or from.

• Evaluate the impact on passengers of new ways of paying for travel such as contactless cards, other forms of electronic ticketing and part-time season tickets. Identify and work to resolve any issues arising from the extension of different National Rail ITSO or other smartcards to the London transport network.

• Lobby hard to encourage the industry to adopt the 15 minute threshold for delay-repay compensation already promised by the Government and continue campaigning to secure improvements in the way that passenger compensation generally is paid.

5. An efficient and responsive organisation

Further efficiencies

As explained earlier, London TravelWatch has progressively reduced its costs in recent years and we now operate on a budget that is in real terms, after allowing for inflation, little more than half of what it was nine years ago.

Our bid this year is for a grant the same in cash terms as for 2016-17. It has been particularly challenging to produce this standstill budget because we have had to accommodate unavoidable growth of £64k. Most of this is due to increases in employee pension and National Insurance costs resulting from changed DWP policies, though we have made an allowance for a 1% cost of living increase to salaries in line with the GLA. We also have to meet the cost of our 3-yearly Investors in People assessment and allow for a small increase in our IT support, audit and other fees.

We have managed to partly offset these added costs by making a range of small but cumulative savings to our supplies and services budget, and by not budgeting for any external research next year. However staff are our biggest cost. We have made savings this year after several people voluntarily agreed to reduce their
hours. In the year ahead we will make corresponding savings in our member salaries, mainly through reducing the amount paid to the Board member who represents London on the Transport Focus Board. We have also made savings by continuing to freeze recruitment to a vacant policy officer post, and we will delete this post. But these savings mean that the organisation is now fully stretched. We will continue to be flexible in the way that we work, but will not be able to operate effectively if we make any further staff cuts.

Appendix 4b gives further details.

Communications

We will focus our communications work on influencing key debates and targeting our resources on the most significant audiences. We will prioritise continuing our regular dialogue with key stakeholders and decision-makers to ensure that the transport user voice in London is heard when decisions are made. We will continue to highlight the impact that our work achieves.

We will continue to use our website and social media presence to help promote our work more widely but at minimal cost. We will further develop our Interchange Matters blog where we share good practice and find out about people’s experiences at interchanges. We will also give transport users the opportunity to engage with us during our ‘Ask London TravelWatch’ Twitter sessions.

Board

We will maintain and underpin the strategic role of the Board through our streamlined committee structures and high quality briefing papers. There will be new appointments to our Board in January 2017 and a new Chair from October 2017. We will plan a comprehensive induction programme for them all at the beginning of their terms of appointment and will work to ensure a smooth handover of responsibilities between incoming and outgoing Chairs.

Staffing

Staff remain our key resource and we aim to be an excellent employer. The award of the Investors in People accreditation at silver status provided external confirmation that our investment in staff development is well-aligned with our business objectives and we are working to retain this in 2017.

We will continue to pay the London Living Wage and participate in the Cycle to Work Scheme. We will help to support people into employment by taking on at least one apprentice and providing work experience for one or two year 11 students from a local school.

We will continue to ensure we get best value in all that we do by maintaining our shared services agreement with the London Pensions Fund Authority for our senior finance work. We will continue to be alert to any other such opportunities where we are sure that there are real cost savings to be made.
Our permanent staffing establishment is now 14.2 full time equivalent posts. The current staff structure is attached as Appendix 5.

**Casework**

Our casework team will continue to provide a first class appeals service to users dissatisfied with the response they received from the transport operator to their original complaint. The firm but fair approach we take to this work, critically evaluating each request but only taking forward those where we think the appellant has a case, continues to win us plaudits from both consumers and the industry. Most crucially we continue to achieve results through effective negotiation and persuasion.

Dealing with an increasing workload at a time when staff resources are being squeezed presents an ongoing challenge but one that our team meet through continuous improvement, a flexible approach and a real desire to get things done for passengers.

**Information technology**

As we have reduced the size of our staffing establishment over recent years, making best use of technology has become even more important in ensuring we are as productive as possible. In the past three years we have upgraded our website and our CRM casework management system, and replaced our desktop computers. This investment means we can now update much more of our website without the need to pay for extra time from our IT support company. Similarly, our Casework Manager can now more easily tailor the CRM to meet our needs without extra external help.

**Partnerships and additional resources**

Partnership working last year led to match funding from Trust for London and London Councils being made towards the cost of our transport affordability work. We will continue to collaborate with Transport Focus where appropriate and in the year ahead we will seek ways of making our overall resources go further by working in partnership with other stakeholders.

**Premises**

Our move in late 2014 to share premises with the London Fire Brigade at their Union Street headquarters has provided us with efficient and good value offices which are closer to almost all of the stakeholders with whom we regularly meet. It is also helpful to our work that other London bodies have moved in (London Pensions Fund Authority, London Waste and Recycling Board, London Ambulance Service and the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation).

**Risks**

London TravelWatch has a comprehensive risk policy and business continuity plan and regularly updates its procedures according to changing circumstances. Risks are reviewed regularly by the staff team and the Governance Committee.
We will continue to refer to the organisation’s published prioritisation criteria before committing time and resources to new projects to avoid the risk of spreading resources too thinly in response to the many and rising calls on time.

Reserves

For a small organisation entirely dependent on an annual grant, maintaining an adequate level of reserves is essential to ensure that core operating activities can continue during periods of activity involving exceptional levels of unplanned expenditure. Last year we had to use some of our resources to offset an unavoidable overspend on staff costs of about £20,000. We have frozen all non essential expenditure so far this year to rebuild these to the intended level of £50,000. London TravelWatch reviews its reserves policy annually.

JC/30.9.16

NB: Since preparing this budget bid and business plan we have been notified of a proposed rent increase of more than 30% (more than £42k) by our landlords the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority. We are in negotiation with them about this.
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London TravelWatch Mission and Values

Mission

London TravelWatch is the body established by Parliament to be the official voice of transport users in greater London. It has a statutory role in the appeals and consultations process, and in putting the transport user view on transport issues, to improve the experience of travelling in and around the capital.

Values

London TravelWatch aims to be:

- **Independent** – we are firmly on the side of the consumer and will not bow to outside pressure.
- **Authoritative** – our work will be evidence-based, rigorous and respected.
- Open – we will share information, and accept new ideas.
- Collaborative – we will work with stakeholders.
- Inclusive – we will represent all transport users in our area.

The first two values of being independent and authoritative are business critical for us.

Vision

That London TravelWatch is the champion of the travelling public in London, successfully influencing decision-making about travel in our area.
Appendix 2

Strategic priorities

Our work in 2017-18 will continue to be driven by the need to improve outcomes for transport users. On behalf of transport users we will work to ensure that:

- We support and advocate initiatives which make best use of scarce capacity on all London’s transport networks, promoting infrastructure changes that will help do this.
- London has a transport system that is well-integrated and accessible to all, with convenient interchanges, easy-to-use ticketing and good customer service.
- All decisions about transport in London take account of transport users’ needs and priorities.
- The travelling public are well-informed by service providers, they get high quality and timely information about services available, fares and ticketing and any disruption to their journeys.
- Our work is delivered by an efficient and responsive organisation.

Underpinning our work will be our belief that passengers should get the best value for money possible for the price they pay for their ticket; that services should keep pace with demand, running frequently and reliably at all reasonable times of the day and week; and that journeys should not just be safe but also feel safe. All transport users should have easy access to an effective complaints service from transport operators and providers, backed up by a robust appeals system when they are not satisfied with the response they receive.

Corporate strategy

The strategic priorities that underpin our work are:

- Maintaining an efficient system for handling appeals casework and for responding to consultations.
- Developing an independent evidence base of the views and needs of current and future transport users in London, especially those facing barriers to travel.
- Maintaining awareness of current transport service and future policy issues in our area.
- Becoming increasingly influential advocates on behalf of the travelling public to policy makers, regulators and operators.
- Building effective partnerships with stakeholders where it is in the interests of travellers to do so.
- Ensuring transport users feel their concerns are represented.
- Further developing as an efficient and responsive organisation.
Appendix 3

How we prioritise our work

London TravelWatch will keep its work priorities under review by means of a simple set of criteria. These criteria are similar to those used by other consumer protection and enforcement bodies and will allow London TravelWatch to plan and co-ordinate its activity with other consumer bodies and the London Assembly.

The criteria set out below will be used to assess the strength of the case to undertake the work. These will help to demonstrate the extent to which the issue is relevant for London TravelWatch and the extent to which it impacts on transport users (either generally or on a particular group which London TravelWatch wishes to target, for example due to vulnerability or linked to a specific geographical area).

If there is a strong case according to these two sets of criteria, then consideration can be given to the resource implications and timing of the work.

Relevance of the issue for London TravelWatch

We will define the relevance of the issue to London TravelWatch according to the following criteria:-

- Confirm that it is in the scope of London TravelWatch’s remit and the extent to which we have discretion over becoming involved.
- Does London TravelWatch have a distinct contribution to make?
- Why is it important?
- Is this a problem now or is it likely to be one in future?
- What is the cost of inaction?
- How strong is the evidence?
- What opportunities will there be for London TravelWatch to influence the situation?

Impact on transport users in the London TravelWatch area

To identify the impact of the issue on transport users in the London TravelWatch area we will look at what the evidence shows about the impact of the problem.

We will consider whether there is a detriment or benefit to transport users. To do this we will define the impact taking into account the following criteria:-

- Numbers of transport users affected
- Whether it has implications for more than one mode of transport
- Distribution of impact on transport users in Greater London and the wider London Railway area
- Impact on transport users in vulnerable situations, especially the elderly and those with mobility impairments or those that London TravelWatch has judged should be given greater priority
- Impact on future transport users
- Impact on or links to of other London TravelWatch policies or previous research
- Whether there is a strong, very strong or escalating effect on users.

The tests above will be applied to establish whether or not London TravelWatch should become involved in new activities as well as the extent and timescales of involvement.

We apply these broad principles to our day to day work but also to new projects and research that we may undertake form time to time as part of our agreed Business Plan.

**June 2013**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18 £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Plan 17/18</td>
<td>1,035.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Budget</td>
<td>1,035.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget requirement pre growth and savings (below)</td>
<td>1,035.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unavoidable growth:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation costs</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Members' &amp; Staff costs-pay:</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members’ costs- non-pay</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff related costs-non-pay</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp; Asset Replacement</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total unavoidable growth</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Savings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation costs</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Members' &amp; Staff costs-pay</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members’ costs- non-pay</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff related costs-non-pay</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp; Asset Replacement</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total savings</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application of reserves</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Requirement-after growth and savings</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,035.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guideline target</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,035.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess over guideline</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NB Growth and savings in the same headings have been offset above.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2016/17 £000</th>
<th>2017/18 £000</th>
<th>Movement £000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>1,035.3</td>
<td>1,035.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation costs:</td>
<td>134.9</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Members’ &amp; Staff costs-pay:</td>
<td>770.7</td>
<td>785.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members’ costs- non-pay</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff related costs-non-pay</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>-15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation &amp; Asset Replacement</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of reserves</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1035.3</td>
<td>1035.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4b

**London TravelWatch**  
**Budget Submission 2017/18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£k</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Plan 17/18</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016/17 Budget</th>
<th>1,035.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget requirement pre growth and savings (below)</td>
<td>1,035.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unavoidable growth:

- **Accommodation costs:** 0.0
- **Chair, Members’ & Staff costs-pay:** 55.9  
  Cost of living 14.6, employer pension cost 29, NI inc 12.3
- **Members’ costs - non-pay:** 0.1  
  Travel
- **Other Staff related costs - non-pay:** 6.0  
  IIP one off every three years
- **Supplies & Services:** 2.1  
  IT support, audit and other fees
- **Depreciation & Asset Replacement:** 0.0
- **Total unavoidable growth:** 64.1

#### Projected Savings:

- **Accommodation costs:** 2.8  
  Previous over estimate due to low inflation
- **Chair, Members’ & Staff costs-pay:** 40.9  
  Staff salaries 33, Member salaries 5.6, Finance adviser 2.1
- **Members’ costs - non-pay:** 0.0
- **Other Staff related costs - non-pay:** 2.4  
  Training 1.9, recruitment and payroll 0.5
- **Supplies & Services:** 17.4  
  Research 7.5, comms and meetings 3.9, periodicals 1.2, office costs and phone 2.4, insurance 1.6, IT consumables 0.7
- **Depreciation & Asset Replacement:** 0.6
- **Total savings:** 64.1

#### Application of reserves

- 0.0

#### Budget Requirement - after growth and savings

- 1,035.3

**Guideline target**  
1,035.3

**Excess over guideline**  
0.0

*NB Growth and savings in the same headings have been offset above.*
Structure of London TravelWatch
31 August 2016

Chair and 5 Board members

Chief Executive*

Safety Advisor *

Director Policy & Investigation

Headcount: 18
Fte: 14.2

Chart code:
* Part-time employee
** Job share

2.4 Caseworkers

Casework Support Officer

Corporate Support Assistant * Business Support Apprentice *

Finance Officer*

Executive Assistant **

Corporate Support Manager

Communications Officer

HR Advisor*

2.6 Policy Officers
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Subject: Transport Committee Work Programme

Report to: Transport Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 11 October 2016

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report provides details of planned or ongoing scrutiny work by the Transport Committee and the schedule of Committee meetings for the 2016/17 Assembly year.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the Committee agrees its work programme for 2016/17 Assembly year, including the schedule of topics for forthcoming meetings set out at paragraph 4.8.

3. Background

3.1 The Committee receives a report monitoring the progress of its work programme at each meeting.

4. Issues for Consideration

4.1 The Committee has discussed a number of priorities for the Committee’s work programme in 2016/17. The following is a list of topics that the Committee will aim to explore:

- Pedestrianisation of Oxford Street;
- Traffic congestion;
- Buses;
- Mayor’s Transport Strategy;
- Night tube;
- Tube stations – staffing and ticket office closures;
- Cycling; and
- Surface transport access to airports.

4.2 In addition to the above topics, the Committee will also seek to hold a meeting with the Commissioner of Transport for London (TfL).
4.3 The exact scope and timings for work on any of these other possible topics will be determined in due course and more detailed reports submitted to future meetings. The Committee seeks to maintain flexibility in its work programme to take account of any relevant developments when scheduling its work and has a rolling work programme so work on any topics may continue beyond each Assembly year.

**Pedestrianisation of Oxford Street**

4.4 Following a pledge made by the Mayor’s in his election manifesto, the Committee considered a proposal for pedestrianising Oxford Street at its meeting on 15 June 2016. The Committee submitted its views to the Mayor on plans for pedestrianisation in early September 2016.

**Traffic congestion**

4.5 The Committee is currently investigating traffic congestion. Recent evidence suggests congestion has risen in London, with various causes cited including an increase in internet shopping, roadworks and the provision of private hire services. The Committee’s meeting on 8 September 2016 was used to discuss this topic, and guests have also been invited to today’s meeting to contribute to the investigation. Further information is provided under another item on this agenda.

**London Underground services**

4.6 The Committee has identified two ongoing changes to London Underground services as topics for its meeting in November. Mark Wild, TfL’s Managing Director on London Underground, will be invited to the meeting, with additional guests being considered. The meeting may cover a range of issues regarding tube services, but in particular focus on:

- The rollout of night tube services on a number of lines; and
- The closure of ticket offices and associated station staffing changes.

**Cycling and walking**

4.7 The Committee has identified TfL’s cycling and walking programmes as the topic for its meeting in December. Valerie Shawcross CBE, Deputy Mayor for Transport, will be invited to the meeting, with additional guests being considered. The meeting would be used to scrutinise schemes such as the Cycle Superhighways and Quietways, and the future priorities of the Mayor’s Cycling and Walking Commissioner.

**2016/17 schedule of meetings**

4.8 The date of the next meeting of the Transport Committee is set out below with details of the main topic identified:

- Tuesday 11 October 2016 – Road congestion
- Wednesday 9 November 2016 – London Underground
- Thursday 8 December 2016 – Cycling and walking

5. **Legal Implications**

5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.
6. **Financial Implications**

6.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

---

**List of appendices to this report:**

None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of Background Papers: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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