
Confidential Minutes

Agenda item: 16
Drafted: 07.10.14

Confidential minutes of the Policy committee held on 16 September 2014 at Dexter House, Royal Mint Court, London EC3

These minutes are in addition to the public minutes of a meeting of the Committee on the same date. In that meeting it was resolved, under section 15(2)(b) of schedule 18 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, that by reason of the confidential nature of the item(s) to be discussed, it was desirable in the public interest that the public should be excluded for this part of the meeting.

Contents

- 1 **Confidential minutes and matters arising**
- 2 **Alternative Dispute Resolution**
- 3 **Highway Agency changes (PC041)**
- 4 **Meeting review**

Present

Members

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

Guests

David McNeill Director Public Affairs, Transport for London (Item 3)

Secretariat

Tim Bellenger	Director, Policy & Investigation
Janet Cooke	Chief Executive
Rob Gifford	Safety Adviser
Sharon Malley	Executive Assistant
Richard Freeston-Clough	Communications Officer

Minutes

1 **Confidential minutes, declarations of interest and matters arising**

The confidential minutes of the Policy committee held on 15 April 2014 were agreed and signed as a correct record, subject to amending Tim Bellenger's job title and that Richard Dilks did not ask about single-led pricing. There were no matters arising. For clarity, Richard Dilks referred members to his standing declarations of interest.

2 **Alternative Dispute Resolution**

The Chief Executive reported on a recent meeting with Transport for London on the implementation of the Alternative Dispute Resolution European directive. It was noted

that London TravelWatch had set out its concerns in relation to becoming an ADR entity itself and had proposed a model along the lines of that operated by Bus Users UK. At the meeting, TfL did not appear to have reached any conclusions about implementing the EU directive and seemed to believe that the directive would not have much impact on them.

It was noted that the Office of Rail Regulation would not qualify as an ADR entity but could potentially carry out accreditation. A member said that the Department for Business and Skills was aiming to put forward its position by mid-October.

The Chief Executive said that she hoped to have further discussions with TfL to consider other options and find a way to take this forward with the rail industry.

Action: Chief Executive

3 Highways Agency changes (PC041)

David McNeill of Transport for London attended to discuss changes to the remit of the Highways Agency. He said that the Highways Agency was a traditional arms-length government delivery body. The government was looking at how such agencies could change to enable borrowing and partnership working as part of the government framework.

Mr McNeill said that TfL had concerns about the changes to the Highways Agency as they involved existing regulators such as the Office of Rail Regulation.

Members asked Mr McNeill's view on the future operation of the Highways Agency. Mr McNeill noted that there had been a history of poor roads investment and poor decisions such as the refusal to toll the A14. There needed to be clear lines of accountability and justification.

Members asked where the TfL and Highways Agency jurisdictions would meet. Mr McNeill said that TfL had generally good relations with the Highways Agency but there were disagreements in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Bridge. Other areas of potential conflict included policing of the approach to the Blackwall Tunnel in Kent and concerns about access to Heathrow Airport if its runway capacity were increased.

The Safety Adviser noted that this was part of the planned growth of the Highways Agency, beyond just road building to include safety and now these new responsibilities including long-term economic planning. Members agreed that it was important for London TravelWatch to remain a part of whatever changes in process were emerging.

4 Meeting review

Members expressed their disappointment that TfL was unable to attend the item on cycling and that it had not yet released the data on the impact of the Cycle Super Highway schemes. Members noted that the item on changes to the Highways Agency had been less structured than they were expecting.

There did not appear to be any areas of reputational risk for London TravelWatch and no specific media opportunities were identified as arising from the meeting.