



The voice of transport users

Crossing the Border 2008

May 2009

A reprise of our 2000 study of cross-boundary bus services



Contents

Foreword	4
Executive summary	5
Introduction	6
Methodology	10
Objective of report	10
Comparison of bus kilometres operated	11
Cross boundary levels of service	12
Commentary	18
TfL’s response to our original report (received 2004)	20
Conclusion	21
Appendix 1	23
Appendix 2	25

Foreword

In 2000 we looked at the volume of local bus services crossing the Greater London Authority (GLA) boundary in comparison to 1985.

The report, *Crossing the Border*, demonstrated that services linking London with adjacent areas had grown less than one fifth of that of services running entirely within the capital.

This seemed to us unfair. Transport for London (TfL) has a duty to meet the needs of passengers travelling to and from the capital. Passengers living close to the GLA boundary should not have an inferior service to those travelling entirely within its boundary.

There has been no stated policy change that we know of since the publication of our report, but we are aware that the issues it raised were considered by TfL and prompted both consultation and joint working with the transport authorities bordering London.

This report looks again at this issue and replicates the work of *Crossing the Border*. It is timely as the Mayor has indicated in his first planning document *Planning for a better London* that "London is not an island" and "Outward commuting from London is increasing and it is impossible to address the issues of outer London without considering what is happening in adjoining places outside the city's boundaries". It is also significant that the new Local Transport Act gives significant additional powers to local authorities outside of Greater London to improve their bus services which could be used to improve the provision of cross boundary services and co-operation with TfL.

Our conclusion is that there has been real improvement to service levels. However, this general improvement is not uniform, with a worsening of the situation on some corridors. There has also been better joint working between TfL and the transport authorities bordering London resulting in improvement to bus infrastructure and information.

We hope that this survey will encourage continuing dialogue between ourselves and TfL and between TfL, the transport authorities bordering London and the bus operators.

Executive summary

TfL has a duty to meet the needs of passengers travelling to and from the capital, as well as within it.

We have previously investigated bus services across the Greater London boundary. We looked at changes to service levels between 1985 and 2000. This study updates that work looking at changes between 2000 and October 2008.

In 2000 we found that the rate of growth of services across the boundary had not kept pace with those inside the boundary. Cross-boundary growth in service levels was about a fifth of those within the boundary. Between then and 2008 there has been a marked improvement. Cross-boundary bus services have grown by 22% overall, whereas services within London have grown by 28%. However, this average hides great variability between counties and individual routes.

There has also been better joint working between TfL and the transport authorities bordering London resulting in improvements to infrastructure and the availability and quality of passenger information. However, we would urge further dialogue and closer working to ensure that cross-boundary services continue to be maintained and enhanced.

London TravelWatch and Passenger Focus already have a good working relationship in relation to rail services and have agreed protocols for dealing with cross-boundary bus services under the Local Transport Act. London TravelWatch will continue to be responsible for all TfL services throughout the length of their routes and for all services within the Greater London boundary. Passenger Focus will be responsible for all non-TfL bus services outside of Greater London. It is recommended that Passenger Focus and London TravelWatch should establish regular reviews of cross-boundary issues to agree joint approaches to the relevant authorities and operators.

Introduction

For much of the last century, London Transport (LT) provided bus services not only within London but for large parts of the adjacent 'home' counties as well.

Indeed, the boundary of London TravelWatch's own jurisdiction is derived from that of the former Metropolitan Traffic Area, which reached from Hitchin to Crawley and Windsor to Dartford, within which LT reigned supreme. But when the Greater London Council (GLC) was created in 1963, its area was restricted to the continuously built-up area of the capital, almost entirely well within the alignment of the future M25. And when LT was placed under GLC control in 1968, its country bus division was hived off to become London Country Buses, a subsidiary of the National Bus Company. This in turn was dismembered and privatised in the mid 1980s.

The result is that the regimes under which bus services are planned and operated inside and outside Greater London are now completely different. Within London, LT's successor TfL plans the routes, frequencies and fares and contracts out the actual operation of the services by means of competitive tendering. Beyond, bus services were deregulated on 26 October 1986. Since then a free-for-all has effectively reigned there, in which any licensed operator may register and run services at its own commercial risk, and modify or withdraw it at will, subject only to a duty to give eight weeks' notice to the Traffic Commissioner. Local authorities have powers to buy in additional journeys where these meet a social need not covered on a commercial footing (again, this must be done by means of competitive tendering, except in very limited circumstances). Typically only 15% of bus journeys outside London are supported in this way. There are no common service planning standards applying to London and to its neighbours or, indeed, between the neighbouring authorities themselves. It should be noted that since our previous report the legislation has changed (and is changing again) to allow Quality Partnerships and Quality Contracts although this has made little or no impact so far on the deregulated nature of the bus industry outside London.

The consequence of this difference in regulatory regimes either side of the Greater London boundary is a situation of some administrative complexity. Cross-boundary routes may have any of four different legal

and funding identities. Some which extend only a short distance beyond London are contracted by TfL, but the relevant adjacent authority (either a county or a unitary council) may also be a party to this arrangement, if some element of subsidy to the operator is required. Others are not contracted but run under 'Section 156(2)' agreements with TfL, and are included within the Travelcard and Freedom Pass schemes. Yet others are run on a purely commercial footing, although they must have licenses issued by TfL to permit them to do this. The last two categories are generally excluded from Travelcard, although the introduction of the English national concessionary fare scheme in 2008 means that they are now within the scope of Freedom Pass.

The recent introduction of over 60's bus passes for non-Londoners that are valid across the London boundary may lead to more travel and enhanced services, though this is uncertain at present.

The Greater London Authority Act 1999 imposes a duty on the Mayor (and thus on TfL) to:

*"develop and implement policies for the promotion and encouragement of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport facilities and services **to, from** and within Greater London" (our emphasis).*

Thus the Act clearly places cross-boundary travel within TfL's ambit of responsibility. A similar duty applied to its predecessor, but LT never sought specifically to develop such routes. When pressed by London TravelWatch's own predecessor body, LT took the view that this power was purely ancillary to its role within Greater London, and that actively facilitating access by public transport between points within Greater London and points beyond was not primarily its function. Unfortunately, because the neighbouring authorities tended to the opposite view, there was – and is – no clearly defined locus of responsibility for preserving and promoting such links, with the danger of their users becoming the victims of an administrative and financial stand-off.

The legislation which authorised LT to run cross-boundary bus routes also enabled it to operate Underground services on lines penetrating the areas of neighbouring authorities and similarly allows TfL to do the same. Interestingly, although the level of fares on the relevant sections of the Central and Metropolitan lines was the subject of debates with

the three county councils affected (Bucks, Essex and Herts) in the GLC era, LT seems never to have singled them out for less favourable treatment with respect to the service levels provided – except in the case of the Ongar branch – which was the subject of statutory closure procedures. Bus users seem to have been less fortunate.

The legal position of the adjacent authorities differs from that of the Mayor/TfL. Their responsibilities towards buses are set out in the Transport Act 1985. This act places on them a duty to:

“secure the provision of such public passenger transport services as the council considers it appropriate to secure to meet any public transport requirements within [their area] which would not in their view be met apart from any action taken by them for that purpose.”

The effect of this act is to limit the council’s responsibilities to meeting the needs *within* their areas. They are, however, able to enter into agreements with each other (and with TfL) regarding the sharing of costs, which enables them to co-sponsor cross-boundary routes. Where TfL is party to such an agreement, it is similarly restricted to funding non-commercial services, i.e. those which would not otherwise be met. This restriction does not apply in the case of services sponsored by TfL alone, and unlike the councils it is subject to a specific statutory duty to promote services to and from its area. Clearly these councils could (and arguably should) be more active than they are in supporting public transport links between their respective areas and Greater London, and such activity might foster, in turn a more positive attitude on the part of TfL towards this facet of its responsibilities. But whatever the criticisms that may be directed towards the neighbouring authorities, TfL’s statutory duty is explicit – and not contingent upon the willingness of others to co-operate in underwriting it.

Prior to recent changes, over 60s concessionary fare travel schemes sponsored by non-London authorities had to be open to any public transport operator wishing to participate. The same did not apply in London. This was one of a number of difficulties which arose at the interface between Greater London and adjacent areas, with adverse results for passengers. This was highlighted in our 2000 report and will have affected service planning. The Freedom Pass

provided by the London borough councils was limited to services run for (or by agreement with) TfL plus the Underground and main line railways operated under franchises. The boroughs had discretion to include other services within the scheme, but chose not to do so. The result was that operators who provided services into Greater London from beyond lost their entitlement to share in this source of revenue once they crossed the boundary. This may well change in the future as the changes to over 60’s concessionary fares leads to increased demand which will influence bus service planning and bus companies’ ability to claim from the public purse for carrying pass holders on services run within London.

Both TfL and the neighbouring councils are involved in publicising public transport services and providing the necessary infrastructure. But whereas the councils do this in a non-discriminatory way, TfL is free to limit such support to the services it sponsors. Previously we commented upon the paucity of information on TfL maps etc of cross-boundary services run independently of TfL. Independent operators’ timetables can be excluded from bus stop displays and they have no automatic right of access to bus stations. These bureaucratic issues are of no interest to passengers, just as the border of London is irrelevant and so it is to be welcomed that some of these issues are being resolved by the relevant authorities as reported below.

All of this is also an issue of more than local importance. Traffic volumes continue to rise, particularly in the outer London boroughs and beyond. National policy seeks to reduce this growth by improving alternatives to the private car. If cross-boundary bus services are inadequate, some local trips which could be made by bus may have been displaced to cars, and some of these may be adding to the pressure on outer London’s road network.

Objective of report

The report repeats the approach used in our 2000 study looking at whether the level of cross-boundary bus services may have been affected by the fact that they straddle the interface between the regulated and deregulated territory, i.e. across the Greater London boundary.

We additionally report TfL's response to our 2000 report.

Methodology

The study briefly looks at the wider picture, using bus kilometre figures from the Department for Transport (DfT) and TfL for trends in the volume of bus services.

This is necessarily a more limited aspect of this report than the 2000 report because the DfT have not allowed us access to the individual shire statistics as they say this would breach their commitments to the bus operators supplying them.

It then analyses the levels of service across the Greater London boundary in 2000 and 2008. The details of the methodology used for this exercise are contained in Appendix 1. The number of cross border journeys entering London, by corridor, is presented in Appendix 2.

Comparison of bus kilometres operated

Details of bus kilometres operated are collected by the DfT, but unfortunately are not available at either county or route level, so data for cross-boundary services cannot be isolated (as previously), nor can we, with any confidence use the English shire statistics as a measure of the change in volume of bus services in the 'home' counties around London as we did in our previous study. Though we do report this statistic for interest. As in our previous study we have taken the view that broadly the change in bus kilometres run is a good approximation to the number of bus journeys.

In the period between 1985 and 2000, two unitary authorities were established to administer what had previously been part of counties adjoining Greater London. For the sake of simplicity, in this report Thurrock is still included with Essex, while Slough is still treated as Berkshire. The former county of Berkshire did not have a common frontier with Greater London, being separated from it by part of Buckinghamshire (Colnbrook) and part of Surrey (Poyle). When the Slough unitary authority was created, it absorbed these localities. The bus routes between Greater London and Slough cross this former stretch of Buckinghamshire, so for the purposes of analysis at route level Berkshire and Buckinghamshire have been treated as one.

The English shires

Taking the 'English shires' – i.e the non-metropolitan counties as a whole, 30% more bus kilometres were operated in 1999 (the year we reported in our 2000 report) than in 1985.

Since then there has been a 4% decline comparing 1999 with 2006.

Greater London

Within Greater London, bus kilometres rose steadily between 1985 and 1999. By 1999 they were 31% greater than in 1985 – a slightly greater rate of growth than that in the English shires.

But it contrasted markedly with the position in the six neighbouring counties, i.e. a rise of 9%. Since then there has been a further 28% rise comparing 1999 with 2006.

Cross boundary levels of service

This table shows the number of scheduled bus journeys on local routes (not express coach services) entering Greater London each day, and all week in 2000 and again in 2008.

On Mondays to Fridays, the totals are subdivided into two peak and three off-peak periods. Saturday and Sunday journeys are shown separately. The last column in italics, shows the percentage change between 2000 and 2008.

Number of bus journeys entering Greater London				
Day	Times	2000	2008	% <i>change</i>
Monday - Friday	Before 0730	341	440	29
Monday - Friday	0730 - 0929	434	524	21
Monday - Friday	0930 - 1629	1607	1834	14
Monday - Friday	1630 - 1829	450	516	15
Monday - Friday	After 1829	709	931	31
Monday - Friday	All day	3541	4245	20
Saturday	All day	3201	3870	21
Sunday	All day	1642	2348	43
All week	All day	22548*	27443	22

*Route 80 figures were mistakenly missed from the 2000 report and have been added in here.

Overall, service levels have increased by 22% between 2000 and 2008. This built on an increase of 6% between 1985 and 2000. The greatest increase has been in early morning peak services and evening (after 1829) weekday services and on Sundays.

The overall increase is in contrast to a drop in bus vehicle kilometres in the English shires, though this is not a direct comparison and is of the same order as the rise in kilometres operated within London.

County by county

Looking county by county there is a great variation in the number of cross-boundary services, both across the week and across time bands for each county.

Berks and Bucks

Journeys entering Greater London from Berks and Bucks*				
Day	Times	2000	2008	% <i>change</i>
Monday - Friday	Before 0730	17	38	124
Monday - Friday	0730 - 0929	27	46	70
Monday - Friday	0930 - 1629	110	178	62
Monday - Friday	1630 - 1829	33	52	58
Monday - Friday	After 1829	51	70	37
Monday - Friday	All day	238	384	61
Saturday	All day	222	356	60
Sunday	All day	104	217	109
All week	All day	1516	2493	64

* Note historically and geographically it seems to make sense to combine these historic county areas which are now a mixture of unitary and two-tier authorities.

Service levels to and from Berks and Bucks have risen markedly by 64%. This contrasts with a fall of 11% between 1985 and 2000. The growth has been mainly on the Slough corridor.

Essex

Journeys entering Greater London from Essex				
Day	Times	2000	2008	% change
Monday - Friday	Before 0730	57	54	-5
Monday - Friday	0730 - 0929	67	67	0
Monday - Friday	0930 - 1629	247	234	-5
Monday - Friday	1630 - 1829	68	65	-4
Monday - Friday	After 1829	89	101	13
Monday - Friday	All day	528	521	-1
Saturday	All day	432	463	7
Sunday	All day	163	268	64
All week	All day	3235	3336	3

Service levels to and from Essex have risen by 3%. This reverses the trend of a 12% decline between 1985 and 1999. Both Brentwood and Thurrock corridors have seen significant reductions, Laindon now no longer has a service.

Hertfordshire

Journeys entering Greater London from Hertfordshire				
Day	Times	2000	2008	% change
Monday - Friday	Before 0730	99	118	19
Monday - Friday	0730 - 0929	124	123	-1
Monday - Friday	0930 - 1629	460	444	-3
Monday - Friday	1630 - 1829	123	121	-2
Monday - Friday	After 1829	244	273	12
Monday - Friday	All day	1050	1079	3
Saturday	All day	953	925	-3
Sunday	All day	490	637	30
All week	All day	6693	6957	4

Service levels to and from Hertford have risen by 4%. This continues the trend of a 17% increase between 1985 and 1999. Rickmansworth has seen a large rise from a low base. However, Cuffley now has no service.

Kent

Journeys entering Greater London from Kent				
Day	Times	2000	2008	% change
Monday - Friday	Before 0730	36	51	42
Monday - Friday	0730 - 0929	45	68	51
Monday - Friday	0930 - 1629	171	238	39
Monday - Friday	1630 - 1829	48	67	40
Monday - Friday	After 1829	77	100	30
Monday - Friday	All day	377	524	39
Saturday	All day	352	486	38
Sunday	All day	134	194	45
All week	All day	2371	3300	39

Service levels to and from Kent have increased by 39%. This is a substantial improvement compared with a stable service level between 1985 and 1999. Swanley, Knockholt and Westerham have all seen substantial increases in services.

Surrey

Journeys entering Greater London from Surrey				
Day	Times	2000	2008	% change
Monday - Friday	Before 0730	132	179	36
Monday - Friday	0730 - 0929	171	220	29
Monday - Friday	0930 - 1629	619	740	20
Monday - Friday	1630 - 1829	178	211	19
Monday - Friday	After 1829	248	387	56
Monday - Friday	All day	1348	1737	29
Saturday	All day	1242	1640	32
Sunday	All day	751	1032	37
All week	All day	8733*	11357	30

**Route 80 figures were mistakenly missed from the 2000 report and have been added in here.*

Service levels to and from Surrey have increased by 30%. This builds on an improvement of 13% between 1985 and 1999. Tatsfield, Chipstead and Merstham have seen large increases in the number of journeys.

Commentary

The results of this analysis can be summarised in a further table:

Percentage change in bus service levels					
County	Bus journeys		% Change	Bus journeys	
	1985	2000	1985 to 2000	2008	2000 to 2008
Berks/Bucks	1699	1516	-11	2493	64
Essex	3643	3235	-11	3336	3
Herts	5723	6693	17	6957	4
Kent	2374	2371	0	3300	39
Surrey	7240	8733*	13	11357	30
Total	20679	22548*	6	27443	22

*Route 80 figures were mistakenly missed from the 2000 report and have been added in here.

The summary table shows that overall, the upward trend in the number of cross-boundary bus services to London from neighbouring counties has contrasted with a downward trend in bus services within the English shires, although because of the lack of county level data the significance of this is limited compared to the comparisons we were able to make in 2000 between cross-border services and the volumes of services in the relevant 'home' counties. This is a much improved situation than we have reported previously (when the rise in cross-border services lagged considerably the rise within London).

It is interesting to speculate why bus service levels across the London boundary have increased to a greater level than generally in the English shires. But to do so with such general data can only be speculative, owing to the change in DfT's policy towards the providing statistics at county level. If the general decline of service levels in the English shires has been mirrored in the 'home' counties, this may mean that, as it contends, TfL has been more actively supporting cross-border services.

It seems significant that services to and from London have, generally, kept pace with those within London. However, there is much variation between routes and between the various counties – Berks and Bucks

seeing a 64% rise in service levels, Herts only a 4% increase. We previously suggested that these service level changes may be related to the willingness of individual local authorities to provide revenue support for non-commercial journeys. Explanations for these trends may have to be sought more locally, i.e. at corridor or route level.

At the micro level there has been great variability (as the tables of analysis appended to this report illustrate). Of note is the huge increase (from a very low base) on the Rickmansworth corridor. The Slough corridor has seen a tripling in service levels and Tatsfield a twofold increase.

But there have been losers too: the Laindon corridor no longer has a service across the boundary and Cuffley, which saw the introduction of a service during the period we previously examined (1985 to 2000), now has no service.

It is said that the fares policy operated by TfL means that operating commercial services along side TfL services can be problematic, because (especially for longer journeys) TfL fares tend to be lower than those charged by other operators.

TfL's response to our original report (received 2004)

Following the publication of our original report TfL embarked on a review of cross-border services. However, this formal review was curtailed and more systematic joint working initiated. The following is a summary of the most pertinent points in TfL's response to us.

TfL told us that "there has been an increase in cross-boundary services contracted by TfL since January 2001 and also a significant number of improvements to both new and existing cross-boundary services contracted by TfL."

TfL has also improved the provision of timetables at stops and improved or taken over the bus stop infrastructure (shelters and bus stop flags) in some counties and are negotiating this with others.

TfL bus maps now include a greater number of cross-border services, but not all as it is considered there should be a minimum level of service available to justify its inclusion on maps. To include a service with low journey numbers on TfL mapping would give a false impression to passengers.

Following negotiations with the county and unitary councils, TfL passes and fares and conditions are valid on all services contracted by TfL over the whole route.

Conclusion

Our 2000 report found that around the perimeter of Greater London as a whole, the trend in service levels since bus services outside London were deregulated, had not matched the trend in the adjacent counties, much less the trend within the capital. This report suggests the gap between cross-boundary service levels and service levels within London has widened a little further, but not significantly.

Part of TfL's role (inherited from London Transport) is to secure services to meet the needs of passengers travelling between Greater London and places within its vicinity, as well as those travelling wholly within its boundaries. There is no *prima facie* reason why passengers between (say) Uxbridge and Harrow should have a stronger claim to improved services than those between Uxbridge and Slough, or why passengers between Brentwood and Romford should have a lesser claim than those between Barking and Romford. There may be demand-led reasons why actual service levels between these points differ, but that is not the point at issue. This report addresses the rate and direction of change. What is of concern to London TravelWatch is that while TfL has systematically enhanced the overall frequency of service offered to passengers within London (in itself a policy to be welcomed), users of services which happen to cross the boundary have not always shared equally in the benefits delivered to their fellow passengers elsewhere in the capital.

Although average traffic speeds in outer London are higher than those in the inner areas, they have followed the same downward trend, so that they are now about equal to those in inner London twenty five years ago. Current forecasts are that most future traffic growth will be in the outer areas and traffic levels will be stable in central London, or indeed, fall slightly. If this is not to be replicated in outer London, action will have to be taken now to foster modal shift. Buses have much the greatest potential scope to increase their market share in the short term. But if more use is to be made of them, the buses must be there to use. For many potential passengers entering (or leaving) outer London every day, from and to the adjacent counties, this is simply not the case. Routes are too sparse and frequencies too low to offer an attractive alternative.

Three developments mean that some of the issues described in this report may be addressed in the future. London has a Mayor with a stated view - in his initial planning document *Planning for a better London* - that "London is not an island... outward commuting from London is increasing and it is impossible to address the issues of outer London without considering what is happening in adjoining places outside the city's boundaries." London TravelWatch applauds this statement and hopes this review of *Crossing the Border* will prompt continuing work to address the deficit of services offered to passengers wishing to enter or leave London.

The Government has also changed its policies in response to the desire of non-London local authorities for more powers to control bus services. It has brought forward legislation intended to enable the counties and unitary authorities to plan and promote bus services in their areas more effectively.

Finally, Government has given the national rail users' watchdog, Passenger Focus, a remit to promote bus passengers' interests across the country too. We hope that they may take on board the issues raised in this report.

Appendix 1

Methodology of analysis

Bus services have been analysed by time period, separately, for those running:

- before 0730 on Mondays to Fridays
- between 0730 and 0929 on Mondays to Fridays
- between 0930 and 1629 on Mondays to Fridays
- between 1630 and 1829 on Mondays to Fridays
- after 1829 on Mondays to Fridays
- on Saturdays
- on Sundays.

Only journeys *entering* Greater London are considered, since the number leaving Greater London is assumed to be identical (though there may be minor differences in the proportions within the peaks, where demand is predominantly uni-directional). The times taken are for the last timetabled stops within the surrounding county areas before the bus enters London.

Services covered in this analysis are those which operate daily from Mondays to Fridays, and/or on all Saturdays, and/or on all Sundays. Those running on schooldays only are included. Buses operating less frequently than this (including purely seasonal journeys) are omitted.

Buses which cross the boundary more than once are treated as separate services on each occasion, unless the intervening distance is very short and has no significant traffic points on the stretch concerned.

Routes which serve more than one of the named corridors are not double counted, and are listed only under the point nearest the boundary. Thus, for example, services shown in the Waltham Abbey corridor exclude those entering Greater London via Waltham Cross, and some of those shown in the Epsom corridor also serve (but are not listed under) Leatherhead.

Premium-fare services (such as Rail-Air links) are omitted, as are those (such as commuter coach routes and motorway services) which do not stop reasonably close to the boundary on either side and are not intended/available for purely local journeys.

Source material for the 2000 services was provided by the area timetables published by local authorities adjoining London (or route leaflets issued by bus operators where more comprehensive publications are not available, notably for Kent). Source material for this study was provided by the area timetables published by local authorities adjoining London, TfL and www.londonbusroutes.net. Each road crossing the Greater London boundary was

examined separately, using network bus maps wherever possible, to ensure that all routes operating in each of the relevant years have been considered.

Service patterns were recorded manually, for each hour of the day. In the case of all-night services, journeys up to 0300 have been included in the previous day's total.

Minor adjustments have been made to the Greater London boundary since 1985, e.g. in the vicinity of Boreham Wood and Heathrow. For the purposes of this study, the 2000 alignment has been used.

Appendix 2

BUS CORRIDOR ANALYSIS : BERKS / BUCKS																		
Corridor	2000 routes	2008 routes	Monday to Friday			Saturday			Sunday			All Week						
			2000	2008	+/-	+/- %	2000	2008	+/-	+/- %	2000	2008	+/-	+/- %				
Slough	74 75 76 81 95	60/61 75 76 77 78 81	93	218	125	134	88	203	115	131	33	135	102	309	586	1428	842	144
Iver	58 335 459	58 459	32	29	-3	-9	28	23	-5	-18	0	0	0	n/a	188	168	-20	-11
Denham	300 305 331 335 724 R1	305 331* 581 724 A40 R21\$	113	137	24	21	106	130	24	23	71	82	11	15	742	897	155	21
County total			238	384	146	61	222	356	134	60	104	217	113	109	1516	2493	977	64

* 331 crosses the border in two directions on this corridor.
§ R21 crosses the border in two directions on the Denham and Rickmansworth corridors.

BUS CORRIDOR ANALYSIS : ESSEX																		
Corridor	2000 routes	2008 routes	Monday to Friday			Saturday			Sunday			All Week						
			2000	2008	+/-	+/-%	2000	2008	+/-	+/-%	2000	2008	+/-	+/-%				
Waltham Abbey	505	505 853	13	13	0	0	11**	11	11	n/a	0	0	0	n/a	76	76	0	0
Loughton	20 167 397 549 667	20 167 397 462* 549	172	285	113	66	111	266	43	39	41	161	53	129	1012	1852	840	83
Passingford Bridge	500 502	375	29	9	-20	-69	16	9	-7	-44	7	0	-7	-100	168	54	-114	-68
Chigwell Row	150	150	94	85	-9	-10	85	79	-6	-7	53	55	2	4	608	559	-49	-8
Brentwood	151 265 350 351 551	498 608	81	38	-43	-53	75	33	-42	-56	7	17	10	143	487	240	-247	-51
Laindon	2A 251	none	11	0	-11	-100	11	0	-11	-100	3	0	-3	-100	69	0	-69	-100
Thurrock	324 348 370 373	55 347 370	128	91	-37	-29	123	65	-58	-47	52	35	-17	-33	815	555	-260	-32
County total			528	521	-7	-1	421	463	42	10	163	268	105	64	3224	3336	112	3

* 462 crosses the border in two directions on this corridor.
** This is a correction to our 2000 figures suggested by Essex County Council

BUS CORRIDOR ANALYSIS : HERTFORDSHIRE																		
Corridor	2000 routes	2008 routes	Monday to Friday			Saturday			Sunday			All Week						
			2000	2008	+/-	2000	2008	+/-	2000	2008	+/-	2000	2008	+/-	+/- %			
Rickmans-worth	R1	R21§ 331	4	56	52	1300	4	54	50	1250	0	33	33	n/a	24	367	343	1429
Watford	142 258 347 348 350 N60	8 142 258 B76 857	180	188	8	4	179	139	-40	-22	95	98	3	3	1174	1177	3	0
Boreham Wood	107 292 606 655	107* 292 615	213	215	2	1	170	180	10	6	102	139	37	36	1337	1394	57	4
Potters Bar	84 298 313 383 614 626 699	84 298 313 610 614 626 699	189	198	9	5	162	162	0	0	60	87	27	45	1167	1239	72	6
Cuffley	610 W10	none	14	0	-14	-100	6	0	-6	-100	0	0	0	n/a	76	0	-76	-100
Waltham Cross	217 279 310 310A 310B 311 317 327 363 517 N279	217 279/N279 317 327 491	450	422	-28	-6	432	390	-42	-10	233	280	47	20	2915	2780	-135	-5
County total			1050	1079	29	3	953	925	-28	-3	490	637	147	30	6693	6957	264	4

* 107 crosses the border in two directions on this corridor.
§ R21 crosses the border in two directions on the Denham and Rickmansworth corridors.

BUS CORRIDOR ANALYSIS : KENT																			
Corridor	2000 routes	2008 routes	Monday to Friday			Saturday			Sunday			All Week							
			2000	2008	+/-	2000	2008	+/-	2000	2008	+/-	2000	2008	+/-					
Dartford	96 428 429 492 601 710 B15 N80	96 423 428 476 492 6 01 B15	262	295	33	13	247	268	21	9	82	131	49	60		1639	1874	235	14
Swanley	233 477	233 423 476 477 B15	68	153	85	125	63	144	81	129	46	45	-1	-2		449	954	505	112
Knockholt	402 R5	402 R5/R10	28	42	14	50	26	41	15	58	0	0	0	n/a		166	251	85	51
Westerham	246	246 694	19	34	15	79	16	33	17	106	6	18	12	200		117	221	104	89
County total			377	524	147	39	352	486	134	38	134	194	60	45		2371	3300	929	39

BUS CORRIDOR ANALYSIS : SURREY																		
Corridor	2000 routes	2008 routes	Monday to Friday			Saturday			Sunday			All Week						
			2000	2008	+/-	+/- %	2000	2008	+/-	+/- %	2000	2008	+/-	+/- %	2000	2008	+/-	+/- %
Tatsfield	464	464	14	37	23	164	13	37	24	185	0	37	37	n/a	83	259	176	212
Warlingham	403	403 409 612	85	98	13	15	82	93	11	13	51	52	1	2	558	635	77	14
Caterham	404 407 409 466	404 407 434 466	178	214	36	20	166	202	36	22	85	114	29	34	1141	1386	245	21
Chipstead	166	166* 866	48	108	60	125	43	107	64	149	32	73	41	128	315	720	405	129
Merstham	405	405	29	63	34	117	27	58	31	115	7	34	27	386	179	407	228	127
Banstead	420 S1 80 ^s	80 166 420 820 S1	143	205	62	43	133	258	125	94	85	125	40	47	933	1408	475	51
Epsom	293 406 408 479 568 668 712 808 868 K9 K10	293 406 418 467 470 668 808 868 E15 E16	146	200	54	37	136	185	49	36	44	105	61	139	910	1290	380	42
Leatherhead	465	465	32	35	3	9	32	35	3	9	18	19	1	6	210	229	19	9
Esher	267 415 471 481 511 512 513 K3 R68	218 471 513 514 515 515A K3 R68	181	189	8	4	167	178	11	7	117	102	-15	-13	1189	1225	36	3
Molesey	411 451 461	411 451 461 641	70	84	14	20	62	70	8	13	26	26	0	0	438	516	78	18
Sunbury	216 235 290 416	216 235 290 635	187	230	43	23	166	212	46	28	109	162	53	49	1210	1524	314	26
Ashford	116 117 400	116 117 813	104	138	34	33	95	128	33	35	69	92	23	33	684	910	226	33
Stanwell	203 441 446 456 555 556 557	203 441 555 557	128	136	8	6	120	135	15	13	108	91	-17	-16	868	906	38	4
County total			1345	1737	392	29	1242	1698	456	37	751	1032	281	37	8718	11415	2697	31

\$ Route 80 figures were mistakenly missed from the 2000 report and have been added in here.
* 166 crosses the border in two directions on this corridor.



London TravelWatch
6 Middle Street
LONDON
EC1A 7JA

Tel: 020 7505 9000 (Monday to Friday, 09.00 to 17.00)
ISBN: 0-9545124-9-9
Email: enquiries@londontravelwatch.org.uk
Web: www.londontravelwatch.org.uk