
Confidential Minutes

Agenda item: 13
Drafted: 19.12.16

Confidential minutes of the Board meeting held on 29 November 2016 at City Hall

These minutes are in addition to the public minutes of a meeting of the Board on the same date. The Board 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 this part of the meeting.

Contents

1. Minutes and matters arising
2. Ticket office review (LTW539)
3. Cycling in London (LTW540)
4. Meeting review

Present

Members

Chris Brown, Richard Dilks, Glyn Kyle, Stephen Locke (Chair), Abdikafi Rage, John Stewart

Secretariat

Tim Bellenger	Director, Policy and Investigation
Janet Cooke	Chief Executive
Sharon Malley	Executive Assistant
Robert Nichols	Policy Officer
Vincent Stops	Policy Officer

1 Confidential minutes of the meeting on 27 September 2016

The confidential minutes of the Board meeting held on 27 September 2016 were agreed and signed as a correct record. There were no matters arising.

2 Ticket office review (LTW539)

The Policy Officer (RN) introduced London TravelWatch's review of the closure of ticket offices at London Underground stations. He thanked Rebecca Adkins, on secondment from Transport for London, for her assistance with compiling the review.

The Policy Officer (RN) said that the review report would need to be submitted to the Mayor's office the day following the meeting but there would be opportunity to incorporate members' comments.

Members noted that the content of the report was good but the presentation could be improved by the inclusion of graphs and charts within the main narrative section. It may also be worthwhile to pull some of the qualitative quotes from the research and put them in text boxes alongside the narrative.

It was suggested that the summary of recommendations should be moved to the beginning of the report.

It was suggested that the report should specify that its terms of reference did not include levels of staffing as otherwise it might seem odd that recommendations did not include increased staff numbers. The terms of reference should be included as an appendix.

It was agreed that the wording of the conclusions and the executive summary should be consistent, particularly in relation to the need for the recommendations to be implemented if the offices were to remain closed. It was also agreed to remove the sentence about TfL being able to continue to offer excellent customer service.

It was agreed that the report should be clearer about the disbenefits of leaving gatelines open, which happened more frequently under the new arrangements. It was noted that this was a sensitive area since levels of staffing were outside the terms of reference of the report.

It was agreed that the summary on page 34 should be moved to the end of the executive summary. In addition, the report should clarify the position in respect of data about lift availability and staffing.

It was agreed that the appendices would need to be explained more clearly, including information about who provided each appendix and the role it played in the review.

The Policy Officer (RN) said that the findings had been shared with Mark Wild, the Managing Director of London Underground, and that officers had also informed the RMT of the main recommendations. TfL had been invited to comment on the accuracy of the report but were not able to influence the recommendations.

It was agreed that the Policy Officer (RN) would update the report in line with the discussions before sending it to the Mayor's office.

Action: Policy Officer (RN)

3 Cycling in London (LTW540)

The Policy Officer (VS) presented a report on cycling in London. He said that cycling rates in London had increased following the introduction of the congestion charge and outlined fatality levels for different modes of transport. Motorcyclists were far more at risk per mile travelled than any other transport user, including cyclists and pedestrians.

The Policy Officer (VS) said that cycling stakeholders had several ambitions for cycling, such as slower vehicle speeds and junction redesigns, while other users had concerns about cycling infrastructure, for example over bus-stop bypasses or the use of rubber delineators in the carriageway.

Research carried out in the Netherlands showed that levels of cycling in cities was affected by many factors, such as the date of the onset of automation, the urban form of the city and the policies towards car users. The Policy Officer (VS) said that cycle infrastructure improvements did not guarantee safety and that impacts on other users such as pedestrians and bus users could be problematic.

The next step would be to review the material on cycling that had been compiled by the Policy Officer (VS) and pull it together into a coherent document. Key learnings from the recent Cycling Cities event would be included. The final piece of work would be dedicated to the memory of Ruth Thompson.

Members noted that it would be important to frame the work properly and to consider issues such as the volume of motorised traffic on the road, provision of cycle parking facilities, extension of the bike hire scheme and growth of electric cycles. It was agreed that the report would be considered at board level before being finalised.

The Chair said it would be important to nail down the remit of the work, such as the need for efficient use of road space and the trade-off between more cycling and safer cycling. It may include the creation of criteria to assess the quality of cycling initiatives. The Policy Officer (VS) hoped to produce the report in the new year.

Action: Executive Assistant/Policy Officer (VS)

4 Meeting review

Members agreed that it would have been useful to hear from a bus expert on the item about changes to the bus network. The bus issue would need to be handled with great care.

The discussion on the ticket offices report had mitigated the reputational risk arising from this issue. No other reputational risks or media issues were identified.