

---

**Report of meeting from external body**

Author : Carmel Cannon

Information Item (c)

LTW 319

Drafted 19.6.09

---

**Lewisham Council public transport liaison meeting**

**1 Purpose of report**

- 1.1. To record for information the proceedings of a meeting of an external body attended by a representative of London TravelWatch.

**2 Information**

- 2.1. The minutes of a meeting of the Lewisham Council Public Transport Liaison meeting held on 10 March 2009 are attached as Annex A. Tim Bellenger, Director, Research and Development, represented London TravelWatch at this meeting.
- 2.2. The minutes were prepared by Lewisham Council and London TravelWatch has no responsibility for their content or format.

**3 Equalities and inclusion implications**

- 3.1. Not applicable – report is for information only.

**4 Financial implications**

- 4.1. Not applicable – report is for information only

**5 Legal powers**

- 5.1. Section 252A of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 places a duty upon London TravelWatch (as the London Transport Users Committee) to keep under review matters affecting the interests of the public in relation to railway passenger and station services provided wholly or partly within the London railway area, and to make representations about them to such persons as it thinks appropriate.

**6 Recommendation**

- 6.1. That the report is received for information.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM/LONDON TRANSPORT LIAISON MEETING

Action Points and notes of the Operational Public Transport Liaison Meeting held at 6.00pm on TUESDAY 10<sup>th</sup> March 2009 in COMMITTEE ROOM 4, CIVIC SUITE, CATFORD SE6 4RU

Present

Councillor Muldoon (Cllr M)(Chair)	LBL Councillor – Rushey Green ward
Councillor Paschoud (Cllr P)	LBL Councillor – Perry Vale ward
Councillor Peake (Cllr Pk)	LBL Councillor – Forest Hill ward
Sean Farnan	LBL Meeting Co-ordinator
Paul Stewart (PS)	LBL Transport
Peter Stunell (PSt)	LBL Transport
Tim Bellenger (TB)	London Travel Watch
Dave Hooker (DH)	Metrobus
Carol Mew (CM)	Lewisham Disability Coalition
Tony Petim (TP)	Forest Hill Society
Ian Rashbrook (IR)	Southern Rail
Andrew Reid (AR)	Tewkesbury Lodge Estate R.A.
Geoffrey Thurley (GT)	Ladywell Society
Ilse Towler (IT)	Sydenham Society
Des Turner (DT)	London Central Buses
Dave Walsh (DW)	TfL – Network Operations
Adam Wilkinson (AW)	Brockley Cross Action Group

Minute No.

Action

**1. Apologies and Introductions**

Councillor Muldoon began the meeting by emphasising how this was not a public meeting but was held as a public forum and explained that issues could only be raised through Councillors or representatives from FOCAS and other groups involved.

Apologies were received from: Andrew Boag – TfL – London Buses; Karen Bain – DLR; Stephen Diplock – Network Rail; Daniel Francis – London Travel Watch; Mike Gibson – South Eastern and Julie Sutch – L.B.L. Town Centre Manager.

**2. Minutes of last meeting**

The minutes were agreed and there were no matters arising that were not covered as part of the agenda.

### 3. Rail Issues

#### (a) **Service Issues**

Why did Southern provide information to the live departures page of the National Rail Enquiries site which indicated that trains were stopping at Forest Hill Station on 2nd February when in fact no trains stopped there at any time on that day. Does Southern have an estimate as to how many hundreds of passengers were misled by this information?

Cllr M explained that this was during the times of heavy snow and the information displayed on boards was very inadequate and misleading. IR replied that the system would automatically be programmed to display the normal service. A conference had been held with Network Rail the previous evening but the volume of snow and speed at which it all fell had overwhelmed the system. The 'Ghost Train' completed its programme, however, 15 trains were trapped within 20 minutes of start up. Information from Southern's controller should feed to Network Rail but this didn't happen, which meant that the controllers had to telephone through as well as try to run the service, so there was less information relayed. The transport website was also unable to cope with the volume of traffic on the internet due to the level of hits. This was overcome by taking the system down and publishing on the holding page, however, there was then trouble updating. The suppliers were now enhancing systems to ensure that they are more resilient. He confirmed to AW that the problems with giving correct information had lasted for two days, causing difficulties for passengers. A full service was in operation as soon as it was possible and was back on the Wednesday. He also confirmed to Cllr M that refunds were available to passengers, who completed a form (available on the website), for the two days involved and he understood that South-Eastern had a slightly different method of offering refunds.

AW highlighted a similar problem encountered just after Christmas, when there were a lot of cancellations and many ticket machines not being updated, which meant that he could not buy a weekly rail pass. Despite the problems, revenue protection inspectors at the other end of journeys were not understanding and treated people badly. IR explained that Southern's machines were updated but sometimes suffered from vandalism.

On the 9<sup>th</sup> February 2009 the 9.04 Southern train to London Bridge from Brockley, was overcrowded and as a result some 150 people were left on the platform. The one before was cancelled and 6 car is now the norm resulting in overcrowding. Are there plans to run longer trains

IR explained that longer trains could not be run at present, as all of the fleet was in use at peak periods. The situation reported occurred when a previous train had been cancelled and, as peak Metro services were very busy already and were sometimes full even when they all ran, cancellation of a train had a big effect. There was to be some fleet release in May of next year as E.L.L. took over, as well as two further tranches of extra trains in the new franchise, which should mean the

## LTW 319 Annex A

Metro area receiving additional units, in order to provide 6 – 8 car trains and 8 – 10 car trains at certain times.

AW added that he had met previously with Network Rail and Connex (The then operators) in 2003/4 and was told that there should never be less than the 8 carriages agreed for Brockley station, which he felt was the minimum required, together with the avoidance of cancellations. There had also been cuts elsewhere from 8 carriages to 6, which there should not be. IR advised him that this was never done purposefully but could happen when there was a shortage due to all stock being out and not available from elsewhere. Gaps were being plugged from all over the territory covered, as others were withdrawn and stock was more thinly spread. Assessments were made on all trains regarding loadings and lists made as to where to put more on. AW said that Forest Hill and Sydenham Societies had been assured at meetings that more rolling stock would be provided once the E.L.L. was running and AR added that they had been told that there should still be three trains per hour to London Bridge, which AW felt should be run in addition to current service.

IR explained that Southern only had a franchise until September 2009, when there may be a new group of people in occupation with a new franchise agreement. He thought it likely that passenger loadings to London Bridge would decrease as use of the E.L.L. grew and became more attractive to passengers than travelling to London Bridge, at which time more cars could be transferred to other needy services.

Cllr P explained that after discussions on initial proposals with E.L.L. and the current service operators, who were considering cuts in service, Forest Hill and Sydenham Societies successfully lobbied against this, with a compromise that the total number of services increased and the total to London Bridge only be slightly reduced, at some time, on the heavy rail. He felt that there was no guarantee of no reductions. IR confirmed that the number of trains between London Bridge and Thameslink would have to be reduced, due to the reduction in platform slots in and out of London Bridge. There was a decline during construction but then there could possibly be more provision for routes such as Sydenham etc. PS pointed out how there would be more options available for commuters and Cllr M welcomed the exciting times ahead.

Why did no trains run from Hayes via Catford Bridge towards London during the morning peak period on February 3rd despite information on the National Rail Enquiries site (from the evening of 2nd February through the morning peak period) quoting a half hourly service? Does Southeastern have an estimate as to how many hundreds of passengers were misled by this false information

*Written response from South-Eastern Rail - Services were not run as a result of the points being frozen on the approaches to London. Passengers will be aware that 2/3 February coincided with the worse snowfall in London for nearly 20 years and the third rail traction system in use on the Southeastern network is vulnerable to snow and ice as trains cannot pick up power from the conductor rail.*

*The information posted by NRES was incorrect and this has been taken up with them. We apologize to passengers so affected.*

Southern Rail: how effectively did the company communicate with passengers about the lack of services on the morning of Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> Feb on the line between New Cross Gate and Sydenham

On 4<sup>th</sup> Feb Yvonne Leslie was e mailed about the inability of Southern Rail to explain the whereabouts of the 1815 service between W Croydon and London Bridge. Why did the TV screens and dot matrix at West Croydon indicate that the train was running on time when it had not even left Sutton?

IR explained that Countdown information became scrambled, which can happen at any time quite easily but can usually be manually over-ridden, however there were additional problems that day for the control room, making it harder to pick up in time as it happened so quickly.

What scope is there for Southern to run additional services between Lewisham and Victoria?

IR said that this was a South-Eastern service but problems were encountered with the pathway there, as it was so congested already. Cllr M requested a response from South-Eastern.

Sth-East'n

PS added that there was a pinch-point at Lewisham and Cllr Pk said that he had been told that there was no spare capacity but he felt that it shouldn't prevent provision of additional services there.

There have been several problems with Southeastern's service including lots of delays and cancellations. We have suffered terrible overcrowding as a result of shortages of carriages, especially on the 17.07 Sevenoaks service from City Thameslink as well as the Victoria Services: (08.10 Victoria down to four coaches on 19.02.09). Are there any plans to improve this service

*Written response from South-Eastern Rail - I apologise if Southeastern services have been subject to delay and/or short formation over recent weeks. If the Brockley cross action group could give me the dates and times of services that were delayed or cancelled I can give a full explanation. However, in general terms, despite the recent disruption caused by adverse weather conditions, performance on this network is the best since records began.*

AW said that he would contact Mike Gibson of South-Eastern.

## **(b) Information Issues**

Catford Loop railway line which is on one of Lewisham's green corridors onto which our houses back. Network Rail's contractors have cut down all the trees leaving nothing except a barren wasteland and vast piles of detritus, including great swathes of unsightly fly-tipped land.

Network Rail and their contractors have been contacted several times. An acknowledgment letter has been received from Network Rail which is meaningless.

LTW 319 Annex A

and both the local MP , ward councillors and a councillor who is also an experienced ecologist and conservationist

We want to meet Network Rail as soon as possible and these are the questions we would like answered:-

- Are there plans for the area to be replanted with native mixed deciduous and evergreen trees.
- assurance from Network Rail that these trees won't be chopped down when they mature.
- Can Network Rail to clear the vast amounts of rubbish all along the line, for example using Community Payback.
- Can NR carry out enforcement on properties on Avignon Road on reported incidents of fly tipping.
- When will the full ecological survey of the area which was carried out by Network Rail we still have not received anything.
- Will Network Rail consider implementing a proper neighbourhood engagement policy.

Written response from South-Eastern Rail - I have referred this query to my opposite number at Network Rail, Ms. Jana Sparks who will contact the Brockley Cross Action Group direct.

Sth-East'n

TB added that a report on fly-tipping, entitled 'Good Riddance To Bad Rubbish', had been published and was available on their website. It was Network Rail's responsibility to do the job of cleaning up and he would encourage Councils to use the pro-forma provided. Individual's could also go to the Crown Courts to force action.

### **(c) Station Issues**

#### **Brockley station**

Delay to works around Brockley Common along Coulgate Street due to Network Rail and Lewisham Council not having agreed licence terms. There is still a funding gap for this project. Will Network Rail consider making a financial contribution to the project?

PS reported that the licence was now signed and the scheme progressing. It had taken a while, due to legal dealings with Network Rail, as it involved building a ramp on their land. He would liaise with Rupert at Brockley Cross Action Group directly and the project manager would also contact them again. He also explained to AW that a compromise had been reached regarding materials to be used and these would be to match existing. AW added that the barriers that had been put up had badly affected local businesses, especially because of the time it had taken.

#### **Blackheath station**

LTW 319 Annex A

In spite of petitions and lobbying from local residents, a lift for wheelchair users and other people with disabilities still hasn't been installed at Blackheath Railway Station. When is this work expected to be completed?

Written response from South-Eastern Rail - The point is well made.

*In order to progress the works station tenants are required to move, and in nearly all cases we are able to agree alternative premises and/or financial compensation. Works at Blackheath have been delayed as a result of one station tenant (an estate agent) who has rejected our reasonable offer of compensation and is removing to move. We are applying to the court for an eviction order and we are hoping to progress this by the end of May.*

*Funding for the works is secure.*

### **Forest Hill**

The Forest Hill Station shelter and exit at Perry Vale end is still not ready and open for business, as of today 18 Feb 09. Can we get a final deadline from Network rail on when this will be completed?

IR reported that numerous e-mails, calls etc had been made and, although it had initially been said that there would be complete closure of the entrance in December, it was partially re-opened and it should have been completed by the end of January, which had been delayed due to TfL's contractors, Cubic, who were still not on site. The gates could be expected to be switched on in early/mid April and their contractors were on schedule. There had also been a lack of communication between different parts of the company but it was re-opened the previous day with revised instructions to staff to leave open. He apologized for the length of time it had taken and said that they would try to ensure that things went much smoother in future.

He added that there were difficult issues in respect of Honor Oak Station, as a rotting floor would need replacing as part of the gating scheme, with a platform under buildings. Work was proceeding faster, with booking hall partitions done in halves and the kiosk area would be completed at the weekend, followed by swapping over, which could be done in a week too. The ticket office would be closed and R.P.O's will be selling tickets. There was some disruption but it could be potentially clear by the end of the following week, when Cubic could then install the gates.

Cllr P complimented IR on his helpful and polite, response and handling of the situation. He had spoken with station staff at Forest Hill and his main concern was the management of it. He suggested that it was best to leave the gates open at all times at the station, with CCTV coverage, as he was concerned that staff would close the shutters at the entrance downstairs when there were no staff on duty or the gates could possibly be vandalized. It required monitoring by CCTV to avoid another decision to roll down shutters. IR explained that any changes could not happen until the new franchise in September. He would check with the commercial

## LTW 319 Annex A

people but said that the facility was designed to open until the last train, after which the shutters would remotely shut.

IR explained to AR that he had thought that there was to be restricted access works at Honor Oak Station and, when original plans were made, it was not clear as to whether the bridge work would be carried out in phases. It was feared that the whole entrance would be shut while done and he thought that the gate there was a contingency measure. The scheme has been in two phases, so the entrance was not utilized but there would now at least be an alternative entrance.

TP relayed Michael Abrahams thanks for opening gates and his hopes that lessons had been learnt for the future.

IT expressed the concerns with regards to Sydenham Station and how it was felt that the downside should be open at all time. Parity with the upside would be useful and there was also no shelter for the upside, which was inadequate. Cllr P added that lobbying had taken place in respect of both Forest Hill and Sydenham stations, which had slight differences. He agreed that access should be as easy as possible and it was more a business decision from the operators. IR explained that there were problems gating on routes associated with the E.L.L, which were specified by TfL to be compliant with their staffing plans from 20<sup>th</sup> September. There were no provisions for staffing levels until September and the financial situation for South-Eastern, First Capital Connect and South Central was not good at present, with many staff lost over five years. There were no plans to cut back on services, however, there was no scope for extra costs. Revenue Protection was part of another element, as well as safety/security on stations, with crime down by more than 50% in the last five years, as it became more difficult to get in and out of stations for those that should not be there.

### **Lewisham**

Can an update be provided concerning the opening hours of the side gate at Lewisham Station. In particular, are there plans to leave it open in the morning?

*Written response from South-Eastern Rail - Works to provide step free access at the station together with a gating scheme for the entrance to platform 4 will be completed by the summer. As promised we will then be holding a consultation exercise with local stakeholders on whether the side entrance should be opened or closed. As the council will be aware, the number of entrances to a station forms part of our franchise conditions and final approval on the side entrance's future rests with the Department for Transport*

### **Nunhead**

Why are we not allowed to raise concerns about the rail service from Nunhead Station as a significant proportion of passengers using the station come from LB Lewisham i.e. Brockley, and Telegraph Hill?

*Written response from South-Eastern Rail - While Nunhead station is within the boundaries of the London Borough of Southwark, Lewisham stakeholders are*



LTW 319 Annex A

welcome to raise any issues concerning the station with me direct at [mike.gibson@southeasternrailway.co.uk](mailto:mike.gibson@southeasternrailway.co.uk)

#### **(d) General Issues**

Residents report that early morning (6.30/7am) DLR trains from Lewisham have become unreliable since 3 car extension works started. Is this something TFL are aware of and how is it being addressed?

PS said that there had not been a response received from DLR and this would be chased up and circulated.

PS

*Post meeting response from DLR - It is fair to say DLR trains have been disrupted - particularly since the Signalling System SMC upgrade in the autumn last year. There are some problems that have been logged with Thales, the company that manages the system on behalf of the DLR, which are being addressed in software changes all the time so we are expecting DLR reliability to improve over the coming months.*

IR reported that the first phase of Thameslink was to be on 23<sup>rd</sup> March. Bombardier had not completed the building of trains for this, which meant that South-Eastern and Southern were to receive First Capital Connect units, then Southern were to borrow further units. Passengers were warned to be careful, as there could be some confusion with the different rolling stock, especially on mixed routes.

AW mentioned that he had recently read that trains from Manchester that normally stopped at Blackfriars, would cease to from 23<sup>rd</sup> March and IR confirmed that they would then either terminate at Kentish Town or Bedford. The service north of Blackfriars would be operated by First Capital Connect. The fleet swap would take place from 16<sup>th</sup> March over a three month period, with some others taking longer.

AW also mentioned that an announcement at Nunhead regarding different train times and IR confirmed that First Capital Connect and South-Eastern Rail services were also affected. The former had millions of pounds to lead on information at stations and Southern were displaying posters that week.

#### **4. Bus Issues**

##### **(a) Operational Issues**

The bus shelter at the top of Blackheath Hill going east has recently been removed. Is it going to be replaced?

*Written response from TfL – London Buses - This is in connection with the temporary closure of Blackheath Hill to eastbound traffic to facilitate current road works . It will be re-instated when the road re-opens.*

How many more months must my constituents wait for the shelter at bus stop HT in Rushey Green (just south of its junction with Rosenthal Road SE6) to be replaced?

LTW 319 Annex A

Written response from TfL – London Buses - This was raised at the previous meeting. The replacement shelter is due to be provided by JC Decaux on behalf of LB Lewisham.

PSt explained that it was being resolved as to whether it can be done or if TfL were being waited on. Cllr M requested a meeting with whoever was concerned.

PSt

Bus Stop on Sydenham Rise, lower end. This bus stop is constantly obscured by trees and there is no dedicated bus stop road markings, which means drivers stop and park right by the bus stop and thus forcing the 356A bus to stop in the middle of the road. Can TfL look to create some dedicated road markings on this bus stop to discourage drivers from parking in front of the bus stop ?

Written response from TfL – London Buses - The cage will need to be provided by Lewisham Council.

PSt reported that markings would be made on the road, as well as the cutting back of trees, as part of improvements to cages and the footway on the downhill side of the road.

#### **(b) Service Requests**

Bonus Pastor School has raised an number of concerns in relation to bus services along Bromley Road and the inability for existing bus services to clear the schoolchildren in the evening when they leave. Two meetings have been held between the council, the school, the local police and London buses but the situation has not been resolved. Can London buses consider providing having either a 208 or special school bus to leave the stop at Downham consistently between 1515 and 1525 (ideally 1520) ?

PS said that a response from TfL - London Buses would be requested, as the issue of the amount of children congregating in the area needed to be resolved.

PS

#### **(c) General Issues**

There are still ongoing problems with buses speeding in Avignon Road. Are there any plans to ensure that drivers do not exceed the 20 mph zone limit. What about speed restrictors on the buses?

Written response from TfL – London Buses - We continue to monitor the situation. Clearly buses should not exceed the speed limit. Once again Mr Wilkinson fails to provide any factual evidence (dates, times, vehicle nos) to support his claims.

AW felt that the suggestion of taking photographs of any vehicles breaking the speed limit was not practicle as cameras on mobile phones were not sophisticated enough and he had witnessed some touching 60 mph. He also said that, due to the speeds reached, it was very difficult to obtain specific details, as Councillor Muldoon and operators had suggested (DT explained that the registration number and time should suffice) and, despite measures put in by L.B. Lewisham to prevent some drivers from using the wrong side of the road, the speeding continued, evidence of

## LTW 319 Annex A

which had already been submitted by Councillor Cross, who was not happy with the response. Cllr P added that he sympathized and found the customer service helpline/e-mail helpful whenever he took the registration number and time to report each incident.

LM reported that more complaints of speeding were received in respect of Jerningham Road than Avignon Road and a speed camera was used for an hour there, with only two incidents of speeds marginally exceeding the 20mph speed limit. The same exercise was to take place at Avignon Road in two weeks time.

Bus Stop travel information in Blackheath Village and surrounding area (eg Princess of Wales) (bus stops).

In March 2008 we requested LB update/replace the bus stop information sheets as many were badly deteriorated from damp. Whilst some were updated and replaced and the bus info map at the exit of the rail station has been restored (thank you), there remain very many in the same dilapidated state as last year. Can London Buses replace the dilapidated with new and to check and repair the water seals on the display cases.

*Written response from TfL – London Buses - Thank you for bringing this to our attention, I will ask for the displays to be repaired/replaced and for updated information to be provided.*

DW reported that the infrastructure team were looking at the Blackheath area.

### Other Issues

CM reported specific incidents on buses, involving a person using a wheel trolley mobility aid not being allowed on by the driver, who would not lower the platform and another whereby a passenger received insulting abuse from fellow passengers. She suggested that driver training and more information advertising tolerance to disabled passengers, respectively, might help as although there was not enough information to report specifically, these were not isolated incidents. DH explained that drivers were trained in all aspects and were monitored by mystery shopping exercises, with action taken including fines if caught. Cllr M and TB suggested reporting such issues to TOCU (Transport Operational Command Unit), or Safer Transport Team, who should be interested. DH added that cards had been issued to drivers in Bromley to hand out and he agreed to supply Cllrs M, P and Pk with the cards mentioned.

DH

Cllr Pk asked how route 185 was reviewed as it was a long, congested route with an irregular service. DT replied that the route had been affected more recently by works at Blackheath Hill, as well as usual problems at Catford etc and DW added that the VMR (Victorian water main repair) scheme at Westwood Hill/Kirkdale also had an effect on service, with other works in the last 6-8 weeks, as LM mentioned.

Cllr P said that he would like an update on the roll out of iBus replacement and the timetable as to when more displays, which he would like provided on more stops,

LTW 319 Annex A

would be in place. Cllr M agreed and added that he wanted to see new displays on every stop and not just replacements. DW agreed to ask Andrew Boag of TfL – London Buses.

DW

TB added that the fitting of iBus on buses was nearing completion, with more work being carried out on replacement of displays and downloading to mobile phones etc. DH advised Cllr P that he had read that the provision of new signs had gone out to tender and PS offered to ask Andrew Boag for a presentation, to include the current timetable.

PS

## 5. L.B. Lewisham and TfL other Issues

TfL Catford Road, South Circular SE6, at junctions to Halfords and Wickes' retail estate entrances. Can signing in relation to the exits and entering be reviewed as they are confusing. It is accepted that both right turns (entering and leaving the estates) should be illegal so the signage should be made clear. Please can you sort this out as I know that many people will benefit from the improved signage and not contest PCNs which costs you time to process.

Cllr M explained that the issue had been previously referred to Len Duvall of the GLA.

Cllr P suggested that Cllr Alexander be asked to raise the issue with TfL at the strategic meeting.

I have been campaigning for bus stops to be introduced on the hail and ride sections of both the 284 & 336 within the borough of Lewisham. Together with London Buses and Lewisham Council, locations were found and agreed on the 18<sup>th</sup> July 2007. Since then I have been told it has been awaiting consultation Problems in Chudleigh Road, and loadings with Crofton School would necessitate bus stops for H & S reasons.

*Written response from TfL – London Buses - We are progressing this issue and a route test has been arranged for next week. TfL has always said that these routes would be reviewed after fixed stops had been implemented on the 273 in Hither Green, and that is due to take effect on 4 April.*

On the 284, Ravensbourne Park, the section between the 2 junctions of Ravensbourne Crescent has a serious issue with parking. Cars have started to park either side of the road at the edge of the CPZ. Some cars have used some initiative, and put two wheels on the pavement, however despite the fact they are helping the flow of the traffic, they are issued with parking tickets! I would like the opinion of the council and whether anything can be done.

PSt reported that a new route test was expected shortly, after which he would look into the issue. In the short term it might be likely that the yellow line needs to be extended.

PSt

Perry Vale Crossing - The new "crossing" of Perry Vale, by the Berkeley Homes development is considered by some residents as dangerous and "an accident waiting to happen". Concerns raised over speed of traffic, drivers unaware of the

pedestrian crossing at this point, and visibility poor. What options can Lewisham come up with, non-signal based, that could be implemented to improve the situation.

TP suggested that the provision of a refuge would possibly help. Cllr Paschoud pointed out that, with the Sydenham Town centre "Road Narrowing", Perry Vale Councillors were concerned over displacement and they wanted a holistic look at the Perry Vale/Perry Rise area. It had been suggested to Police patrols that they observe traffic and pedestrian behaviour to see where the problems were and then report to the next Assembly meeting. Darien Goodwin also hoped to attend and highways officer's opinion should be sought, as to put something there would create a problem for Dacres Road etc. TP and Cllr P highlighted how various solutions had previously pushed problems elsewhere and all evidence was being collated to take a fresh look at the situation. PS welcomed local input, which was useful and explained that the issue of traffic calming on either side was the reason for the difficult issues. Guard rails, as had been suggested, were not always popular with everyone.

Free Parking – The Sainsburys car park bays to make them free for 2 hours for people who stop and park to make purchase in Forest Hill. Can this be considered?

PS reported that discussion had taken place with Sainsbury, involving Darien Goodwin and it was hoped that there would soon be some news. Cllr Peake pointed out that it was first raised three years ago and there had been talk of funding agreements etc, however, the current 30 minute waiting restriction only suited Sainsbury's and not other local shops. He suggested that a trial possibly be run first. TP agreed that safer parking should be encouraged and Cllr M thought that the whole area would benefit. PS said that he would take back the comments and suggestions.

PS

Has any consideration been given to reducing bus lanes lengths, or bus lane operating hours where they are not sensible, to better share the roads. The bus lane on Stanstead Road, from Wastdale Road junction to Brockley Rise Junction, does catch drivers on empty bus lanes trying to legally turn left. Has this been looked at since the last meeting to see if it's possible to improve this junction ?

Cllr M suggested that this was a high earner for TfL, as drivers felt a false sense of security and turned left across the bus lane. He knew that Darien Goodwin was aware of the issue. PS explained that this was an issue that TfL, who do consider carefully when trying to keep traffic moving, would have to answer. They had not yet responded and he would write to TfL, asking if they had any plans to review this bus lane. Cllr M suggested also raising it with Len Duvall of GLA.

PS

AR suggested that shortening the lane and sign-posting as turn left only would improve matters and the traffic flow.

Moving parking bays further up the road, to allow more room for vehicles turning left on Honor Oak Park into Stondon Park towards Crofton park station. Has this been progressed since the last meeting?

LTW 319 Annex A

PSt reported that consultation etc had been carried out 18 months ago and explained that it was a difficult situation, with any changes made possibly compromising residential changes. It would be re-visited in the next couple of years as it was felt that it should be given a while first.

6. **A.O.B**

7. **Date of next meeting** – 9<sup>th</sup> June 2009.