

---

**Minutes**

Agenda item: 4  
Drafted 27.02.18

---

**Minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 27 February 2018 at 169 Union Street, London SE1 0LL**

**Contents**

- 1. Chair's introduction and pre-meeting announcements**
- 2. Apologies for absence**
- 3. Declarations of interest**
- 4. Chair's activities and Transport Focus update**
- 5. Minutes of the Board meetings held on 28 November 2017 and 16 January 2018 and minutes of the Governance Committee**
- 6. Matters arising (LTW574)**
- 7. Key activities (LTW575)**
- 8. Station travel plans (LTW576)**
- 9. London Plan consultation (LTW577)**
- 10. Croxley link update**
- 11. Surface access to Heathrow Airport consultation (LTW578)**
- 12. Social needs transport (LTW579)**
- 13. Any other business**
- 14. Resolution to move into confidential session**

**Present**

Members

Jackie Ballard (Items 8-14), Alan Benson, Richard Dilks, Glyn Kyle, Arthur Leathley (Chair), Abdi Osman, John Stewart (not Item 11)

Guests

Nick Mitchell                      Senior Integrated Transport Officer, Rail Delivery Group (Item 8)

Secretariat

Tim Bellenger	Director, Policy and Investigation
Janet Cooke	Chief Executive (Items 1-9)
Richard Freeston-Clough	Communications Officer
Sharon Malley	Executive Assistant
Vincent Stops	Policy Officer

**1 Chair's introduction and pre-meeting announcements**

The Chair welcomed those present to the meeting and made the standard safety announcements.

## **2 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for lateness were received from Jackie Ballard.

## **3 Declarations of interest**

Alan Benson reminded members that he was Chair of Transport for All, which meant he had a particular interest in the item on social needs transport. He did not believe this interest prevented him from participating in the meeting.

John Stewart said that his role at HACAN presented a conflict with the item on surface transport access to Heathrow Airport and he would leave the room during discussion of this item.

Glyn Kyle declared that he had made an individual submission to the London Plan consultation from an inclusive design perspective, but this would not prevent him from participating in this item.

There were no other declarations of interest in addition to the standing declarations recorded on the London TravelWatch website.

## **4 Chair's activities and Transport Focus update**

The Chair said that he had attended a productive meeting with Gareth Powell, Managing Director of Surface Transport at Transport for London, which had included a discussion of the challenging financial position. Mr Powell had said that that there would be a moratorium on roads improvements by TfL for the next two years.

The Chair said he had attended London TravelWatch's Interchange Matters seminar which had focused on access to Heathrow and Gatwick airports. He had also taken part in London TravelWatch's seminar on fares and ticketing with rail industry members, the Department for Transport, TfL and the Rail Delivery Group. This had been a useful occasion to discuss opportunities and challenges in the fares and ticketing area.

He had attended a useful Transport Focus meeting in January that focused on franchises, which was an issue Transport Focus would be watching closely.

## **5 Minutes of the Board meetings held on 28 November 2017 and 16 January 2018 and Governance Committee**

The minutes of the Board meeting held on 28 November 2017 were agreed and signed as a correct record, subject to the amending of South West Rail to South Western Railway on page 3. The minutes of the Board meeting held on 16 January 2018 were agreed and signed as a correct record, subject to the amending of South West Rail to South Western Railway on page 2 and amending "Officer" to "Office" in the title of Item 11 on page 9. The minutes of the Governance Committee of 14 November 2017 were noted.

Members noted that the issue of London Underground ticket office closures remained live and that progress against London TravelWatch's recommendations would be monitored. It was hoped that Mark Wild, the Managing Director of London Underground, would attend the Policy committee meeting in June.

The Director, Policy and Investigation, noted that the proposals relating to London Overground's ticket offices, mentioned in the January minutes, were now deferred and the consultation would not now happen until after the London borough elections in May.

## **6 Matters arising (LTW574)**

Members welcomed the response from Transport for London on various Underground issues. The response would be attached to the papers for the meeting and uploaded to the website.

**Action: Executive Assistant**

Members agreed that it would be important to continue to monitor the position in relation to step-free access to the Central line platforms at Bank station.

## **7 Key activities (LTW575)**

The Chief Executive said she and not the Casework Manager had attended the London Underground stakeholder event. The meeting happened approximately once a quarter and was a useful opportunity to exchange views on issues such as safety and transport planning. There was a focus on business issues and attendees included business representatives and members of the entertainment industry.

The Chief Executive said the meeting with Network Rail on Victoria and London Bridge station management had been extremely positive. The Network Rail team were reviewing how the stations operated as a whole, with a focus on the passenger perspective and this was to be welcomed. As an example, the invitation to tender for new advertising boards at the stations had been changed to enable more messages for passengers to be included at times of disruption. The Chief Executive recommended that this be an issue to consider for the next London TravelWatch interchange seminar.

The Chief Executive said the meeting with Nick Brown, Chief Operating Officer at Govia Thameslink Railway, had been positive and open.

The Director, Policy and Investigation, said that the recruitment of panellists for the Independent Appeals Panel was progressing well and he would be interviewing applicants in the following week.

The Chief Executive said that she had attended the launch of C2C's 15-minute delay repay compensation scheme, which would be welcomed by passengers.

## 8 Station travel plans (LTW576)

The Chair welcomed Nick Mitchell, Senior Integrated Transport Officer at the Rail Delivery Group, to the meeting. The Director, Policy and Investigation, presented a report on station travel plans (STPs) and how effective they were in encouraging modal shift.

The Director, Policy and Investigation, said that London TravelWatch had produced a report in 2004 called "Getting to the station" which looked at the best ways of managing access to stations and introduced the idea of STPs. These would be a development of travel plans already prepared by workplaces and facilities such as schools and hospitals.

The Department for Transport began to incorporate STPs into franchises to manage and accommodate growth in passenger numbers by improving access to stations. However, it had proved difficult to obtain information about the STP commitments in franchises so it had not been possible to monitor their use or effectiveness.

The report stated that information about STPs was not available on the Rail Delivery Group website. The RDG had subsequently sent some links to London TravelWatch but it was clearly not straightforward to find the relevant information.

Mr Mitchell said London TravelWatch's report was useful and that STPs were closely linked to accessibility. He sat on the Greater Anglia Integrated Transport forum where recent STP work had focused on improving access to stations by cyclists.

Mr Mitchell said he had discussed STPs with colleagues and it was important to manage expectations. It would not benefit passengers if STPs were produced at the start of each franchise but never implemented or reviewed. STPs often relied on external funding for implementation such as from local authorities or developers and this was not always forthcoming.

He said that there had previously been an effort to make STPs part of franchise commitments but that this was less common now. This was driven by the content of bids rather than the DfT. It was important that the content of STPs was deliverable, bearing in mind the physical constraints at many stations.

Mr Mitchell said that Govia Thameslink Railway had prepared 43 STPs at the start of its franchise but some of these were now in need of review. He said that STPs would be more deliverable if they could make use of existing community capacity and recognised that more than one group could be involved in the delivery of each STP.

Members said that STPs presented a good opportunity to improve transport accessibility for passengers but questioned how much monitoring or evaluation of them took place. Mr Mitchell said this was limited. Generally, the STP was written as a stand-alone report and then funding was sought to implement it. If no funding was identified then no funding body would be chasing delivery. Members said that without monitoring there was no way of capturing good practice or addressing poor practice.

The Director, Policy and Investigation, said that the key to a successful STP was engagement with the local authority. It was important that local authorities engaged with the franchise process at an early stage in order to influence behaviour of bidders. Mr Mitchell said bidders did often speak to local authorities when preparing bids and this was the best opportunity for local stakeholders to influence bid responses.

Members noted that local authorities often focused on issues such as timetables and stopping patterns when consulted on rail franchises, rather than softer issues such as STPs. Mr Mitchell said he would take this on board.

Members noted that currently passengers and community groups would not generally be aware of the opportunity to work with train operators to create STPs for their stations.

Members asked whether there were criteria to identify which stations received STPs. Mr Mitchell said that the choice of station depended on the operator and the franchise. Members noted that a list of stations with STPs should be available publicly and that it would be useful to see GTR's 43 STPs.

Members said they would like the RDG to respond on the points raised in the discussion, particularly around which stations already had STPs and how these STPs were working. It may also be useful to establish links with the DfT on this issue to push for progress.

**Action: Director, Policy and Investigation**

## **9 London Plan consultation (LTW577)**

The Policy Officer (VS) presented a report on the draft London Plan and London TravelWatch's proposed consultation response. He said that the London Plan sought to guide development in London and showed how the Mayor of London expected boroughs to deliver the 65,000 new homes per year that would be needed.

The consultation process was formal in nature. The Mayor would consider responses and then amend the draft London Plan. This would then be considered at an Examination in Public by independent Planning Inspectors, who would report their views to government before the plan could be formally adopted.

The Policy Officer (VS) outlined the policies in the plan that were relevant to London TravelWatch's remit. He said there was an emphasis on intensifying development of existing town centres rather than opening up new development areas, which meant that some outer London boroughs would be expected to provide an increased number of new homes.

The Policy Officer (VS) said that the draft plan alluded to the introduction of roads pricing as a means of managing road space and reducing congestion. However, no timetable had been given for its introduction. He thought that it would be very difficult to achieve the targets relating to increased public transport mode share and healthy streets without roads pricing.

It was noted that the draft plan did not refer to the Croyley rail link proposals, which should be included.

On Victoria Coach Station, the Policy Officer (VS) said that there were currently no better proposals for coach services in central London and so the coach station should be defended on behalf of passengers.

The Policy Officer (VS) said that car parking was a controversial issue and that many outer London boroughs felt constrained in their ability to compete with retail parks on their borders that did not have such restrictive parking policies. He said that the draft plan included provision for car-free developments near transport hubs but thought the plan should acknowledge the need for controlled parking in these areas in order to ensure car-free developments could be properly implemented.

The Chief Executive noted that one of London TravelWatch's priorities for transport users was to ensure that London had a planned response to reducing car traffic and that it also had a requirement to promote the use of public transport. London TravelWatch's comments in relation to parking would focus on the implications of uncontrolled parking on transport users.

Members noted that there was nothing in the London Plan about river services and suggested London TravelWatch's response should address this. It was also important to ensure that London TravelWatch's data on usage of Victoria Coach Station was up to date, given the growth of coach services at Heathrow coach station.

Members suggested it may be worthwhile to comment on the need for freight and servicing to be carried out in the off-peak period in central London, to reduce congestion in the central area.

Members noted that London TravelWatch should support cycling aspirations in the draft plan and should emphasise the importance of bus services.

It was agreed that the Policy Officer (VS) would circulate to members London TravelWatch's proposed response to the London Plan consultation prior to submission.

**Action: Policy Officer (VS)**

## **10 Croxley link update**

The Chief Executive said that this issue had been progressed with members outside the meeting and the way forward had been agreed.

## **11 Surface access to Heathrow Airport consultation (LTW578)**

John Stewart left the meeting for this item.

The Director, Policy and Investigation, said that Heathrow Airport was conducting a consultation on surface transport access as part of its preparation for a planning

application related to its expansion. He was hoping to secure firm commitments from Heathrow Airport in relation to rail access and also recommended that works be carried out in phases so that rail connectivity was improved before roads were disrupted as part of the expansion process.

The Director, Policy and Investigation, said that London TravelWatch's report in 2014 found that rail access needed improvement in order for Heathrow Airport to function properly with its existing capacity. Members noted that improving rail access was not within Heathrow Airport's gift and was likely to take a lot longer than road improvements. London TravelWatch should be clear that rail improvements were needed but it may not be appropriate to say that road enhancements should be deferred until rail projects were delivered.

Members welcomed the good working relationship London TravelWatch had developed with Heathrow Airport. It was important that London TravelWatch's response to the consultation should be realistic and capable of delivering benefits for passengers.

The Director, Policy and Investigation, said that London TravelWatch's response to the consultation would have a wider audience than just Heathrow Airport. He said that Heathrow would probably be expected to make financial contributions to the rail schemes given their substantial cost.

Members said London TravelWatch's response to the consultation should be positive and include realistic aspirations. In addition, it should refer to London TravelWatch's support for Piccadilly line modernisation.

It was agreed that the response should include support for Heathrow Airport's progress on signage. It should also include the work London TravelWatch had carried out on taxis and private hire vehicles at airports. The Director, Policy and Investigation, would circulate a draft response for comment prior to submission.

**Action: Director, Policy and Investigation**

## **12 Social needs transport (LTW579)**

The Policy Officer (VS) said that social needs transport included Dial a Ride, taxicard, capital call, community transport, hospital transport and social services transport. Change to social needs transport provision always took place incrementally because of the sensitive nature of the clientele.

London TravelWatch's long-term aspiration was that all social needs transport be provided by a single operator but this would require significant structural changes to the way services were currently organised. TfL had considered diversifying Dial a Ride to involve more community providers but this had been difficult to deliver. TfL also produced a roadmap for social needs transport which did not appear to have been taken forward.

The London Assembly had done work on door to door transport and had been critical of how services were provided. It asked for six-monthly updates on delivery of the roadmap but little information has been given. TfL's position was to prioritise

delivery of the Mayor's Transport Strategy so progress on social needs transport would be slow. The position was somewhat unsatisfactory.

The Policy Officer said that the best current outcome would be for the service to offer a single customer-facing co-ordinator who would then arrange the transport with whichever provider was most appropriate.

Members noted that anecdotally Dial a Ride had been more efficient before the introduction of a computerised routing system which, had not delivered what was promised. It should be possible to improve efficiency again.

Members agreed that the focus should be on how passengers experienced the service rather than on how it was structured at an operational level. There was concern that TfL did not appear to have any urgency about this issue.

Members noted that a joint service approach had first been proposed around 15 years ago but progress since had been minimal. Dial a Ride was used by many members who each made many journeys, but services could be something of a postcode lottery. Taxicard was managed by London Councils but they only provided 20% of the funding. TfL provided the remaining 80% but had no control over the service.

It may be possible for London TravelWatch to work with the Transport Committee on the issue of social needs transport, in order to avoid duplication and ensure that value was added. However, it should be noted that the Transport Committee's report had not been unanimous and did not always reflect the responses of passengers to the consultation.

Members noted that Newham council had operated an integrated service for a short period and that it may be useful to hear from them about their experiences.

This was an issue that would be kept under review and further reports would be made to members in future.

**Action: Executive Assistant**

### **13 Any other business**

There was no other business.

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

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

During the confidential session, members reviewed the meeting.