

---

**Secretariat memorandum**

Author : Carmel Cannon

Agenda item 6

LTW 313

Drafted 22.6.09

---

**Actions taken**

**1 Purpose of report**

- 1.1. To record actions taken by members of officers since the last meeting.

**2 Information**

2.1. Bus service change consultations

Recent bus consultations responses for the reporting period are detailed on the London TravelWatch website at <http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/list/469>.

2.2. Proposed traffic orders and planning applications

A table detailing London TravelWatch responses to recent highway and planning authorities on proposed traffic orders and planning issues for the reporting period is attached at Annex A.

2.3. Bus Consultations stage 1 report

A full response to recent Stage 1 bus consultations was sent to Transport for London on 30 May 2009, and is attached at Annex B.

2.4. Southern safety certification and authorisation

On 16 June 2009 the Safety & Policy Adviser wrote to the Office of Rail Regulation on the joint behalf of Passenger Focus and London TravelWatch in response to a consultation for an application by Southern Railway for safety certification and authorisation under the Railways & Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations 2006. The requirement for this application arises from the award of the SouthCentral franchise to Southern Railway, a different legal entity from (though in the same ownership as) the existing franchisee, and there are no material changes to its safety management system.

2.5. Department for Transport consultation on reforming the framework for the economic regulation of UK airports

On 4 June 2009 the Director, Research and Development, wrote to the Department for Transport detailing London TravelWatch's response and recommendations on this consultation. The key points of this letter were :

- (i) If Passenger Focus is given an extended remit covering airline passengers encompassing the Air Transport Users Council's current role, then London

TravelWatch requests assurances that Passenger Focus will be adequately resourced to do this work and that its existing commitments to rail and bus passengers will not be not compromised in terms of resources devoted.

- (ii) That the legislation to be drawn up gives clarity to the respective remits of Passenger Focus and London TravelWatch regarding surface access to airports in the London TravelWatch area.
- (iii) That the London TravelWatch response to the DfT should strongly emphasise that ‘the voice of through passengers on rail services to airports is not given preference over that of local and suburban passengers using the same route’, and this applies equally both in the London area and at other airports nationwide.

A full copy of this letter is available on request.

### **3 Equalities and inclusion implications**

- 3.1 In accordance with London TravelWatch’s duties under the Disability Discrimination Act and other legislation, account is taken when responding to consultations on proposals from external bodies of their particular impact (if any) on the needs of people whose access to transport may be restricted by reason of disability or social exclusion.

### **4 Legal powers**

- 4.1 Section 248 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 places upon London TravelWatch (as the London Transport Users Committee) a duty to consider - and where it appears to the Committee to be desirable, to make recommendations with respect to - any matter affecting the functions of the Greater London Authority or Transport for London which relate to transport (other than of freight).

### **5 Financial implications**

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

### **6 Recommendation**

- 6.1 None – this report is for information only.

**RESPONSES TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES ON PROPOSED TRAFFIC ORDERS & PLANNING ISSUES Updated 16.6.09**

Highway Authority	Location	Proposal	Letter dated	Reply sent	Notes
Ealing	Greenford town centre	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	1-May-09	7-May-09	Supported but asked for filling-in of bus lay-bys
Brent	Windermere Av. area	20 mph zone with waiting restrictions	6-May-09	13-May-09	Asked that parking controls on adjacent bus routes are upgraded, and that traffic calming is bus friendly
Brent	Besant Way, etc.	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	3-Jun-09	9-Jun-09	Supported
Croydon	Brighton Road	Inset parking bays	13-May-09	1-Jun-09	Asked for assurance that footway width is at least 2 metres
Ealing	Bollo Lane	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	21-May-09	1-Jun-09	Supported
Harrow	Kings Road	Waiting restrictions on a bus route	5-May-09	11-May-09	Welcomed
Hillingdon	Bury Street Ruislip	Waiting restrictions on bus routes	13-May-09	1-Jun-09	Supported
Kingston	K Charles Rd Surbiton	Contra-flow cycle lane	30-Apr-09	7-May-09	Asked for assurance that these lanes are not implemented without clear signage to pedestrians of their presence
Kingston	Coombe Rd Norbiton	Relocation of bus stop clearway	29-Apr-09	7-May-09	Supported
Lambeth	Tulse Hill	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	1-Jun-09	9-Jun-09	Supported
Lewisham	Old Road area	CPZ extension	21-May-09	1-Jun-09	Asked that parking controls on adjacent bus routes are upgraded
Merton	Merton High Street	New bus lanes	30-Apr-09	13-May-09	Welcomed

Highway Authority	Location	Proposal	Letter dated	Reply sent	Notes
Southwark	Lordship Lane	Bus stop accessibility and waiting restrictions	3-Jun-09	9-Jun-09	Welcomed
TfL	A23 Brixton Road	Upgrading of Red Route controls	6-May-09	7-May-09	Welcomed
TfL	Tottenham High Road	New bus stop and accessibility improvements	26-May-09	1-Jun-09	Welcomed
TfL	Battersea Bridge Rd.	New contra-flow bus and cycle lane	n/a	9-Jun-09	Welcomed
Wandsworth	(various locations)	Provision of car club parking spaces	7-May-09	13-May-09	Supported
Westminster	Knightsbridge	New at any time waiting restrictions on bus route	18-May-09	1-Jun-09	Supported
Westminster	(various locations)	Introduction of car club parking bays	11-May-09	1-Jun-09	Supported

**Transport for London 2010/11 Bus Service Review Programme – Stage 1  
Consultation, Tranches 321 to 340**

London TravelWatch comments and observations, by tranche:

**General comments**

The bus network must in general terms be responsive to changes in demand brought about by the construction and introduction of new rail services such as Crossrail, the East London Line extensions and the Thameslink upgrade, and by the substantial changes in healthcare provision that are proposed during the period that contracts for the bus services included in this review will be operational. Further, the opening of East London line in 2010 should include a review of all services that feed into this line.

**Route 222 – tranche 321**

We acknowledge that there are some local concerns about the reliability of this service.

**Routes 4 and 210 – tranche 322 and route 153 – tranche 337**

We believe that there may be a case for a substantive review of the bus network focused on Finsbury Park. In particular route 4 is often quoted as being unreliable and we believe you should consider whether the Archway – Finsbury Park section could be provided by another service.

We have sent under separate cover our extensive survey research, Transport needs in Stamford Hill and Golders Green, and would like you to consider this in any review of the 210.

**Route 168 – tranche 322, route 78 – tranche 328 and route 343/N343 – tranche 335**

We are aware of the areas of severe deprivation served by routes 42, 78 and 343 in North Peckham. The area in particular has very poor links to the West End and central areas such as Waterloo and Holborn. We believe that it would be helpful to consider whether the 168 service could be extended further into North Peckham estates to provide these links.

Route 78 has the worst Excess Waiting Time (2.6 minutes) for a high frequency route in London. Reliability cannot be helped by the current distance from the route of the main operational base. The terminus at Shoreditch should be reviewed in light of East London Line new station at Shoreditch as should route 42, and we would suggest this route might also be included in this tranche for tendering.

Route 343/N343 – we suggest there is a case for changing the terminus for the route to New Cross Gate Sainsbury's, providing a link to the store and also the East London Line.

**Route 271/N271 – tranche 322**

You may wish to consider whether these routes should serve Liverpool Street on a daily basis and to reuse Finsbury Square stand for another service.

**Routes 131, 411 and 641 – tranche 323**

We have no particular comments on these services.

**Route 18/N18 – tranche 324**

We believe that if the contract for this is not extended, and it is decided to replace the articulated buses, then there should be a wider review of whether other routes should be extended or enhanced to provide links, as the 18 is very much on its own over most of the corridor. In particular the N18 may be worth considering for restructuring to eliminate the current pattern where half the service terminates at Sudbury. One idea might be to have a core N18 over the 18 route as per daytime, and a N182 covering the 182 daytime but extended at either end to Pinner and/or via 332 to Paddington, and a West End terminal. This would give greater coverage for night services in North West London.

**Routes 23/N23, 27/N27 – tranche 324**

We have no comment on these services.

**Route 92 – tranche 324**

We would support the reintroduction of two-way working in the Greenford station area. We also suggest that route PR2 is reviewed with route 92, as Neasden Temple is poorly served by bus from areas where its users live and extension of 92 might be worthwhile considering.

**Tranche 325**

As a general comment the Travel in London report of 2007 highlights the very low bus and public transport usage to local district centres in the areas served by the routes in this tranche and very high car usage. This is against London trend and would suggest a need for either a fundamental review of the network or a sustained marketing campaign / smart travel initiative.

**Route 103 – tranche 325**

We suggest that an extension to Rainham station is considered for this service, to improve links with the c2c rail network.

**Routes 128/N128 – tranche 325**

We are aware of a number of reliability issues on this service.

**Routes 150, 174, 175, 296 and 496 – tranche 325 and routes 385, 649, 650, 651, 673, 674, 675, 692, 699 – tranche 326**

We have no specific comments on these services

**Route 173 – tranche 325**

Links to London City Airport from the Dagenham / Becontree areas are quite poor in terms of interchange, in particular for employment at the Airport. We think that an extension to route 173 may be worth considering to provide this link.

**Route 257 – tranche 325**

The Stratford City development needs to be included in any re-assessment of this route.

**Route 347 – tranche 326**

This service has proved quite popular since introduced but could benefit from an increase in frequency and measures to improve reliability.

**Route 33 – tranche 327**

We note the requests for an increase in capacity and better reliability.

### **Route 220/N220 – tranche 327**

We have no comment on the main service but we would ask you to look again at links from Garratt Lane and Putney Bridge Road to South Kensington and Knightsbridge. We are aware of requests to extend at either end to cover stand issues (Wandsworth) and replacement of articulated buses on service 18.

### **Route 267 – tranche 327**

A daily service to Hampton Court would provide a more direct link to/from Twickenham rather than the current rather circuitous route on bus R68.

### **Routes 295/N295 and 419 – tranche 327**

We are aware of and would support the provision of bus links to the Barons Court/Talgarth Road/West Kensington area and Canal Way at the Kensal Green end of route 295.

### **Routes 45, 159/N159 – tranche 328**

On route 45 we are aware of requests for deviation / extension to Tulse Hill but this would either break the existing successful service or add unacceptable additional journey time. However, an extension to Clapham South might be considered as part of a package of measures to relieve overcrowding on the Northern Line.

On the 159/N159 corridor it may be worth considering a limited stop peak service covering 109 Thornton Heath – Brixton then non-stop via 59 route to Waterloo and Russell Square to provide a direct alternative to the tube network from Brixton.

### **Routes 176/N176 – tranche 328**

The stand arrangements at Penge are somewhat unsatisfactory, and it would be worth considering an extension toward Anerley. We feel that the terminus at Tottenham Court Road should be kept once the Crossrail works are complete. Requests for better night services in Penge, Norwood Junction and adjacent areas should be looked at with some caution – an extension to route N176 may not be the best solution, because we believe that the principle demand for night services in this area is likely to come from the night economies of the West End and Brixton, and a more direct routing is more likely to succeed in these areas e.g. improving first and last journeys in both directions on route 196 and/or an extension of route N2 from Crystal Palace to Croydon via either route 157 or 157 and 197 routes. The population of Addiscombe and Woodside is likely to be a good generator of night bus usage.

### **Route 188/N188 – tranche 328**

This service can be badly affected by traffic congestion in Greenwich, and measures should be considered to improve bus priority in this area.

We would also ask you to consider adding route 1 to this tranche of tendering to address complaints about reliability and lack of capacity on this service.

### **Routes 9H and 15H – tranche 329**

These heritage services should be retained as now, but we ask you to consider adding a morning peak service on both routes, and 'livening' out of services where they parallel the main 9 and 15 routes, as these services both add useful additional capacity. We suggest avoiding requests to deviate off the main 9 and 15 routes.

### **Routes 88/N88 – tranche 330**

We note comments about the reliability of these services and need for better links between Clapham and West End, especially in the light of TfL Rail's decision to not replace the Victoria – London Bridge South London Line service in December 2011 when phase 2b of the East London Line is completed. As mentioned under route 45 this is in addition to the need to address capacity problems on the Northern Line in this area.

### **Routes 155/N155 – tranche 330**

We support an extension to the City of this service, and it could be a possible reuse of the stand at Finsbury Square currently used by 271. It should parallel either the Northern Line or via route 344 to Bank to give relief to the Northern Line (see other Clapham issues) and also to improve linkages within the Southwark Bridge Road area.

### **Route 170 – tranche 330**

We have no comment on this service but the new pattern of service is welcome.

### **Route 355 – tranche 330**

We have no comment on this service, but see our comments about route 45 above in relation to Clapham Park.

### **Routes 6/N6, 52/N52 and 98/N98 – tranche 331**

We have no comments on these services other than to say that we are aware of long standing resident (as opposed to passenger) requests to reroute services in the Willesden area.

### **Tranche 332**

As a general comment the Travel in London report of 2007 highlights the very low bus and public transport usage to local district centres in the areas served by the routes in this tranche and very high car usage. This is against London trend and would suggest a need for either a fundamental review of the network or a sustained marketing campaign / smart travel initiative.

### **Routes 99, 178, 229, 244, 291, 401, 422, B11, B14, B16 – tranche 332**

We have no further comments on these recently revised routes. However, it might be worth considering adding routes 132 and 180 to this tranche because of consistent poor reliability.

### **Route 269 – tranche 332**

Requests for a 24 hour service on this route are not necessarily driven by the need for an all night service, but because of the fact that the service does not connect with last train at Chislehurst arrival from Central London toward Bromley, and first train departures from Chislehurst to Central London from Bromley and from Sidcup to Central London from Perry Street. This could be overcome if final arrival at Bexleyheath at 0059 were to run to Bromley at 0100 in service as opposed to 'dead' and likewise if the first morning departures from Bexleyheath were to run 'live' from Bromley instead of 'out of service'.

### **Route 118 – tranche 333**

You will be aware of previous requests that bus N133 should be extended via the 118 to Morden to give 24 hour service over the entire 118 route. Gaps in the early morning between the last N133 and the first 60 and 118s in the Streatham Vale area could be



plugged if current 'dead' N133 journeys returning to depot were to operate in service as far as Brixton either 118 or as N133.

**Route 29/N29 – tranche 334**

We would urge a contract extension on this articulated bus route given the previous TfL research which indicated a preference for this type of vehicle on these routes. However comments on security issues on this service.

**Route 41/N41 – tranche 334 and route W4 – tranche 337**

A reinstatement of the 41/N41 to Ferry Lane estate on these routes would be welcome as this would provide better links to other parts of Haringey and central London. An extension of route W4 to North Middlesex University Hospital would be extremely helpful in dealing with issues arising from the reorganisation of health care in this area.

**Route 121 – tranche 334**

This service has consistently been a poor performer because of the level crossing gates at Enfield Lock. We ask you to consider splitting this service to aid reliability.

**Routes 141, 329 and 616 – tranche 334**

We have no specific comments on these services.

**Route 47/N47 – tranche 335**

We are aware of complaints about passengers being left behind on the Rotherhithe – London Bridge section and poor reliability overall. The terminus at Shoreditch should be reviewed in light of East London Line new station at Shoreditch.

**Route 258 – tranche 336**

We would support an increase in frequency at weekends and evenings, but this must take account of any potential impact on other services in Watford.

**Routes 299 and W5 – tranche 337**

We have no comments on these services.

**Route W6 – tranche 337**

We support the view of Enfield Primary Care Trust that a deviation of W6 to/from North Middlesex University Hospital is essential to cater for revised health care arrangements in area.

**Route W10 – tranche 337**

An improved frequency and reinstated link to Crews Hill station on this service is welcome.

**Routes 423, H22, H37, H98 – tranche 338**

We have no comments on these routes although we might question whether more conventional numbers might be used for H suffixed routes.

**Route N97 – tranche 338**

This service is an equivalent to the Piccadilly line, but we suggest that this service could be covered by enhanced frequencies of other adjacent night routes.

**Routes 138 and 161 – tranche 339**

We have no comments on these services.

**Route 162 – tranche 339**

Capacity can be an issue on this route in and out of Bromley, so we suggest either an increase in vehicle size or frequency at busy times.

**Route 172 – tranche 339**

We suggest that this is reviewed alongside route 4 over the Waterloo – St.Paul's Station section.

**Routes 181, 225, 284 – tranche 339**

We note requests for an extension of 225 south of Hither Green to the Verdant Lane, Whitefoot Lane areas, and for better coordination of departures from Lewisham of 284 and P4.

**Route 359 – tranche 339**

We note requests for combining this with the T32.

**Route 484 – tranche 339**

Currently there are no public transport links from the Myatts Field /Akerman Road area into the local centre at Camberwell Green. Redevelopment means more flats/house being inserted into this area north west of Loughborough Junction station. Therefore we suggest an extension to this route to provide a link between these areas and Camberwell Green.

**Route C10 – tranche 339**

We note requests for links between St.Thomas's and Guy's Hospital sites and would support rerouting the C10 if two way working could be established in roads adjacent to Guy's Hospital.

**Routes 62, 145, 169, 247, 287, 366, 368, 387 and 687 – tranche 340**

We have no comments on these services. However we note requests for a deviation of route 5 to give better links to Queen's Hospital Romford from Barking and Becontree.