
Secretariat memorandum

Author : Sharon Malley

Agenda item: 6

CAC043

Drafted: 05.02.13

Actions taken

1 Purpose of report

- 1.1. To advise members of actions undertaken since last meeting by the secretariat or members in relation to any matter pertaining to this committee.

2 Recommendation

- 2.1. That members consider the actions listed here in the context of case-specific workload of the Casework team.

3 Information

- 3.1. Please note that regular discussions take place with key partners in respect of matters related to the remit of the Consumer Affairs committee. In addition, in the period since the previous committee, officers attended the meetings reported below.
- 3.2. On 26 October 2012 the Director, Policy and Investigation, met with the Department for Transport to discuss the South East Flexible Ticketing project.
- 3.3. On 6 December 2012 the Chief Executive and the Director, Policy and Investigation, met Transport for London (TfL) to discuss the TfL's Future Ticketing Project.
- 3.4. On 31 January 2013 the Policy Officer responded to TfL's consultation on river crossings. The response is included as an appendix to this report.
- 3.5. On 4 February 2013 the Policy Officer responded to TfL's consultation on changes to the operation of the central area congestion charge. London TravelWatch supported the proposal to tighten up the green car concessions, accepted the loss of retail outlets for buying congestion charging zone permits and supported the increase in penalty charge to bring it in line with the penalty charge for parking violations.

4 Equalities and inclusion implications

- 4.1. This report poses no specific equalities and inclusion implications for London TravelWatch.

5 Financial implications

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

6 Legal powers and financial implications

- 6.1. Section 248 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 requires London TravelWatch (as the London Transport Users Committee) to consider, and where it appears to it to be desirable, to make recommendations with respect to any service or facility provided by or for (or in the case of hackney carriages and private hire vehicles, licensed by) Transport for London, other than a matter relating to the transportation of freight, if it has been the subject of representations made by or on behalf of users of that service or facility. Section 252B of the same Act places a similar duty on the Committee in respect of users or potential users of railway services provided wholly or partly within the “London railway area” as defined under the provisions of the Railways Act 1993. The Consumer Affairs Committee is not required to consider matters which appear to it to be frivolous or (in the case of railway services) vexatious.

Appendix

Our Ref: TfL

Your Ref:

31 January 2013

River Crossings Consultation
RSAK-YAYS-ACKX
Transport for London Consultation Delivery
11th Floor Palestra
197 Blackfriars Road
London, SE1 8NJPalestra

Dear Sirs

Second consultation on TfL's proposals for new East London River Crossings

London TravelWatch is the statutory watchdog representing transport users in London. London TravelWatch considered this issue at its 27 November 2012 Board meeting.

London TravelWatch supports the proposals for a Silvertown Link and a new ferry at Gallions Reach. This will provide additional capacity and, in the case of the Silvertown Link has the potential to provide a more reliable service to travellers as the incidence of unplanned closures would be reduced.

The Board also make the following additional comments for consideration:

Silvertown Tunnel

- i) A new larger tunnel would not, on its own, eliminate the issue of closures of the Blackwall tunnel due to over-height vehicles. Could consideration be given to the Blackwall tunnel being operated with access for only cars and light vans. All HGV's being directed to use the new, larger tunnel?
- ii) A minimum frequency and capacity of public transport links should be operated through the tunnel (e.g. not less than 20 crossings per hour in each direction during weekday peak periods, and not less than 10 at other times). The frequency suggested is illustrative of that needed to encourage maximum use of public transport by offering a "turn up and go" service which minimises waiting times and therefore maximises its attractiveness to users.
- iii) Bus passengers tell us that they see the improvement in journey times and the reliability and consistency of these as their priorities for improvement. See <http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/4152> Free passage of buses through the tunnel will be of limited value if they are prevented from reaching it unhindered by other classes of vehicular traffic. An area-wide traffic management scheme (with bus priority) is therefore required, both on Transport for London's and the boroughs' roads, to ensure that the bus network operates with maximum efficiency, free from conflicts with other road users

- iv) There would need to be a tolling regime to ensure, as far as is practicable, that congestion levels in the tunnel and its approaches are managed and that the benefits of the additional capacity results in more reliable journey times for both public and private transport. The capacity of the road network beyond the tunnel would need to be such that additional traffic is accommodated and the wider area not congested. Appropriate measures may also be needed on any adjacent crossings, including at Rotherhithe, as traffic may well be displaced there. The surrounding road network capacity would have to be compatible with the levels of traffic it is planned to allow to use the tunnels.
- v) There needs to be a full evaluation of the effect of the scheme on cyclists and pedestrians in the area of the tunnel portal and the roads that will see an increase in vehicular traffic to ensure that current safety measures are not compromised and hopefully improved.

Gallions Reach Ferry

- i) The issues of traffic generation and wider impacts will be similar, but of a lesser scale given the much lower capacity of a ferry crossing. However, the same issues described with respect to a Silvertown tunnel are pertinent.
- ii) We would want to see public transport service utilising any new crossing and for this service to be given priority access to and onto a ferry. Alternatively good bus interchange facilities should be provided at the ferry terminals.

Woolwich Free Ferry

We would have concerns about the potential loss of the Woolwich Free Ferry. Although the pedestrian tunnel and the Docklands Light Railway are alternative routes for foot passengers. Any change to the Woolwich Free Ferry needs to be clearly thought through before being progressed. London TravelWatch would want any decision on closure be taken after the opening of a ferry at Gallions Reach.

If you have any questions please contact me.

Yours sincerely

Vincent Stops
Policy Officer