
Secretariat memorandum

Author : Mark Donoghue

Agenda item 6

TS030

Drafted 11.5.10

Actions taken**1 Purpose of report**

- 1.1 To advise members of matters dealt with by the Chair, Deputy Chair, the Chief Executive and/or the secretariat since the last meeting.

2 Recommendation

- 2.1 That the report is received for information.

3 Information**3.1 Curtailment of buses using Oxford Street**

On 15 March 2010 the Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer wrote to David Brown, Managing Director, Surface Transport, Transport for London, regarding the curtailment of buses using Oxford Street. A copy is enclosed in Annex A of this report.

3.2 London Bus retendering 2011/12 response (Spring tranche)

On 19 March 2010 the Director, Research and Development sent London TravelWatch's response to this consultation to Surface Transport, Transport for London. A copy is enclosed in Annex B of this report.

3.3 Department for Transport Greater Anglia franchise consultation

On 19 April 2010 the Senior Policy Officer sent London TravelWatch's response to this consultation to the Department for Transport. It may be view on the London TravelWatch website (<http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/4114/get>)

3.4 Department for Transport Essex Thameside franchise consultation

On 19 April 2010 the Senior Policy Officer sent London TravelWatch's response to this consultation to the Department for Transport. It may be viewed on the London TravelWatch website (<http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/4115/get>)

3.5 Department for Transport InterCity East Coast franchise consultation

On 19 April 2010 the Senior Policy Officer sent London TravelWatch's response to this consultation to the Department for Transport. It may be viewed on the London TravelWatch website (<http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/4116/get>)

4 Equalities and inclusion implications

- 4.1 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.

5 Financial implications

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

6 Legal powers

- 6.1 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). Section 252A of the same Act (as amended by Schedule 6 of the Railways Act 2005) places a similar duty upon the 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.

Annex A

Our Ref : Oxford Street bus curtailment
Your Ref :

15 March 2010

David Brown
Managing Director, Surface Transport
Transport for London
Palestra, 197 Blackfriars Road
London, SE1 8NJ

Dear David

Curtailment of buses using Oxford Street

At its Transport Services Committee meeting on 3 March 2010 members discussed the general issues around TfL's plans to curtail bus services along Oxford Street – the 10% reduction this year and 10% next year proposals. We were grateful that Beverley Hall attended to discuss this with members.

As you will know we have a statutory duty to represent transport users in London. To do this TfL generally consults us on matters pertaining to changes in bus services and policies associated with bus services. We would particularly have expected TfL to consult us regarding these proposals given the somewhat arbitrary nature of them and the fact that they appear not to be in accord with TfL's bus planning guidance, which has our general support.

We do recognise the impact of motor vehicles on local environmental quality for pedestrian on Oxford Street. We too want to see this reduced. Had we been consulted on the proposal to arbitrarily cut bus numbers along Oxford Street we would have certainly suggested such proposals be part of a bigger picture of traffic management in the Oxford Street area along the lines we presented to the recent Transport Committee scrutiny.

It seems to us simply removing bus services along Oxford Street will result in Taxis and other general traffic 'filling the gaps'. There may well be no detectable benefit to pedestrians, bus passengers will have to interchange more often and some pay more. Some bus passengers will be displaced onto already crowded Underground services. It is not evident what the environmental benefit will be.

However, we understand that TfL Board made the decision in principle and that you are now implementing that decision. We are grateful to be consulted regarding the actual proposals for curtailment.

We would very much like to meet with you to understand :

- i) TfL's rationale for choosing the routes to curtail / divert;
- ii) How TfL is to review the impact of these changes on passengers and how they access Oxford Street, particularly the disabled;
- iii) What traffic management proposals TfL may be considering to ensure other traffic does not take up released road space.

Members agreed that London TravelWatch would resist these reductions in bus services unless they were part of a wider traffic management scheme that benefited the majority of transport users and would not result in the unintended consequences outlined above. We would particularly oppose calls for a further 20% reduction in bus services without a proper analysis of the effect of this initial 20% reduction.

Members suggested that an experimental restriction on Taxis using Oxford Street could be considered as part of any future proposals.

Can we please see the statistics of complaints made to TfL by passengers?

Yours sincerely

Vincent Stops
Street and Surface Transport Policy Officer

Annex B

Our Ref:
Your Ref: GB/1112/Stage1/

19 March 2010

Peter Bradley
Head of Stakeholder Engagement
Transport for London
11th Floor, Zone B2
Palaestra
197 Blackfriars Road
London SE1 8NJ

Dear Peter,

2011/12 Bus Service Review Programme – Stage 1 Consultation tranches 362 to 377

Thank you for inviting us to comment on the proposed bus service review programme for 2011/12.

I have set out our observations in the attached appendix in order of tranche.

I hope that these comments are constructive and helpful in your deliberations. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me at the above address.

Yours sincerely

Tim Bellenger
Director - Research and Development
Direct Dial: 020 7726 9959
Fax: 020 7726 9999
Switchboard Telephone: 020 7505 9000
Email: tim.bellenger@londontravelwatch.org.uk

Appendix

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 extension and the Thameslink upgrade. Also 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.

Routes 251, 288, 303 and 305 – tranche 362

We have no comments on these routes. We believe that the Hail and Ride sections of route 305 should be converted to fixed stop operation in order to allow those with disabilities, particular wheelchair services the same access as the able bodied.

Routes 276, 376, D6, D7 and D8 – tranche 363

We have no comments on these routes.

Routes 160, 199, 660 and P12 – tranche 364

The area around Surrey Docks, Bermondsey and Deptford continues to be redeveloped. This has seen an increase in population in an area that had previously been under populated and relatively deprived. This means that there is going to be a need for additional services and capacity. In particular links to the Jubilee line, East London line, DLR and National Rail stations need to be improved. Direct links to retail and employment centres in central London, New Cross, Greenwich and Lewisham are required.

Route 319 – tranche 364

You have previously proposed an alteration to route 295 to provide improved links from the Trinity Road area to Fulham, which we would support. This service does suffer from delays as a result of negotiating the Streatham gyratory system and it would be helpful to consider alterations here to make this and other bus services more reliable.

Routes 403, 405D and 450 – tranche 364, and 931 – tranche 371

We would like to see later evening and earlier morning buses on route 403. Route 450 is however a very well used 'back roads' service that is able to reach difficult to serve areas. In Upper Norwood / Crystal Palace the positioning of bus stops is poor in relation to going to the main Sainsbury's superstore from the Croydon direction and returning from that store toward Sydenham. The gyratory often gets very congested and makes bus services unreliable. A fundamental review of all parking arrangements and bus stop locations in this area would be a worthwhile exercise. You may wish to consider whether an alteration to the 450 to include Hillrise estate if better bus stopping arrangements could be made at Upper Norwood / Crystal Palace might be a better alternative to operating dedicated route 931 for residents in this area.

Routes 193, 256, 346 and W19 - tranche 365

Please consider a Sunday service on route 346 to bring this into line with other local services in the area.

Route 144, 279/N279, 313, 318 and W3 – tranche 367

The reconfiguration of health services in the areas served by these routes needs to be carefully addressed. In particular there will be increased demand for access to the North Middlesex University Hospital which will require better pedestrian access to stops served by routes 144 and 279/N279. Studies commissioned by the Health authorities have found that there will be significant unmet demand from wards in and around Winchmore Hill. To provide this and interchange with routes 34, 102, 144 and W6, we would suggest could be provided by an extension of route 318 from North Middlesex Hospital. We believe that the Hail and Ride sections of route 318 should be converted to fixed stop operation in order to allow those with disabilities, particular wheelchair services the same access as the able bodied.

We believe that there is a case for either increasing the frequency of route W3 along White Hart Lane or for providing a service along the whole length of White Hart Lane from Wood Green High Road to the Tottenham High Road and then via the High Road to Tottenham Hale station. This would provide a number of links currently not provided which would be useful to various schools in the area and enable direct access to Tottenham Hale. It would also address the reporting overcrowding problems and dissatisfaction with the frequency of the service.

Please see below for comments on Muswell Hill and route 144.

Routes 79, 223, 224 and 972 – tranche 368 and PR2 – tranche 374

We are aware of the London Borough of Brent's long term aspirations for the 'fastbus' network linking Park Royal and Wembley. We would ask that this be taken into consideration when reviewing these services. We would also like to see a Sunday service introduced on route PR2.

Routes 290, 696, 941, H20, H25, U7 and U9 – tranche 369

We have no comments on these services except that consideration should be made of incorporating parts of the mobility bus network in this area into the mainstream bus network. There should also be an extension of route H20 from Ivybridge, Tesco's into Twickenham town centre via the Meadway/Lincoln Road areas, which although physically close to the main bus network are isolated due to the presence of the A316 major road. We also note the comments made by the London Borough of Hillingdon in relation to Harefield and route U9. We believe that the Hail and Ride sections of route U9 should be converted to fixed stop operation in order to allow those with disabilities, particular wheelchair services the same access as the able bodied.

Routes 61, 261, R1, R2, R3, R4, R6, R8 and R11 – tranche 370 and routes 273, 624 and 625 – tranche 372

The enforced diversion of services due to the weakening of the Chislehurst Road bridge, although extremely inconvenient, has shown that there may be some elements of the diversionary routes which may be worth incorporating into the network over the long term. The link between Chislehurst village, Leeson's Hill and St. Mary Cray was previously a difficult and convoluted journey by public transport. Whilst the diversion of routes 61 and 273 would not be desirable, it may be worth considering extending route R6 to Chislehurst High Street and then beyond into the areas of Walden Road, Yester Road, Logs Hill and Chislehurst Road which are remote from the current bus network and which we have previously advised you might be worthy of consideration of a bus service.

Routes R2 and R8 should be considered for Sunday services to serve both Princess Royal University Hospital and Downe House. It would be acceptable for this to be a very low frequency service say using one vehicle on both routes.

We also believe that the Hail and Ride sections of route 273 should be converted to fixed stop operation in order to allow those with disabilities, particularly wheelchair services the same access as the able bodied.

Routes 152, 157, 413, 655, 917 and S1 – tranche 371

We would support comments by the London Borough of Croydon that the evening service on route 157 could be either increased in frequency or better co-ordinated with route 75 on the Croydon–Anerley section of route. We also note the comments of the London Borough of Sutton in relation to the need to increase frequencies at peak times and improve the late night service.

On night services, we believe the priority should be for finding a solution to providing a link between the centres of Sutton, Wallington and Croydon. We reiterate our previous comments made in relation to routes N44 and 154. There needs to be the provision for a more comprehensive service on route N44, with earlier and later journeys from both Victoria and Sutton to cover the long gaps that currently exist between last train services both in and out of central London and the first night bus journeys. We understand that currently route N44 is worked by buses off daytime route 154 which finish at West Croydon. You will be aware of the concerns about the withdrawal of night buses between West Croydon and Sutton. We would like to propose that consideration is given to either delinking the N44 and 154 operationally and instead adding later and earlier journeys to route 154 or to extending route N44 from Sutton to West Croydon via route 154.

I would also remind you of the previous comments we made in relation to a request to extend route N176 to areas served by the 157. Requests for better night services in Pennington, 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 type of housing in Addiscombe and Woodside we believe is likely to be a good generator of night bus usage.

On service 413 we would support an increase in frequency in the evenings and at weekends. We would like to see the current 'Hail and Ride' sections replaced with improved bus stop facilities to enable people with reduced mobility to be able to consistently use this service, without fear of either not being able to board or get off the vehicle.

Route S1 – we would support an increase in frequency of this service, and better connections with late night rail services at Sutton.

Route 452 – tranche 371

This service was introduced as part of the Western Extension of the Congestion Charging zone. It has proved to be a useful and popular addition to the network and we would not wish to see its withdrawal consequent to any proposal to abolish the Western Extension. This is particularly relevant because of the various redevelopment proposals at Kensal Green, Battersea Power

Station and the Nine Elms Opportunity Area which will require additional public transport capacity.

Routes 3/N3, 89/N89, 122, 486 and 658 – tranche 372

All of these routes except the 658 are high frequency long distance services that provide inter borough journeys that are either unavailable or difficult to make by rail, and are therefore important to retain and enhance. In particular it would be helpful to review the 89 and 486 in relation to proposed developments at Howbury and at Crayford.

Routes 101, 104, 238, 308 and 309 – tranche 373

You will be aware of the proposals to reorganise health care provision in North East London and we would ask you to take account of this when reviewing these services. We note the requests for a direct service to the Galleons Reach shopping centre from North Woolwich.

Routes 43/N43, 134/N134, 298, 393, 617 and 629 – tranche 374

We have no comments on these services, except that the issue of the pressing need to ensure that mobility impaired passengers wanting to go east from Muswell Hill (down the hill) can do so by bus. At present the first stop is on a very steep part of the hill and this is the first stop for all buses going east. There is nowhere for a mobility impaired passenger to get on. This is especially important with the opening of the new Hornsey neighbourhood Clinic in Park Rd which is only served by the W7. The solution would be for either the W7 or the 144 to go on beyond Muswell Hill for at least one stop so there was a disabled accessible boarding and getting off stop on a flat surface. TfL have investigated this and have said that this option is too costly, but it is unclear why.

Routes 123, 158, 275, 357, W11, W13, W14, W15, W16 – tranche 375

Our 2009 report on 'out of service' mileage, concluded that from its current operational base a number of out of service journeys on route 123 could be usefully made available to the public. In addition it would be useful to consider enhancing evening, early morning and weekend services on this route.

Given the likely impact of the opening of the Stratford City development on retailing patterns in North East London it would be useful to consider whether any of these services should be extended or diverted to serve that development, for example, routes W14 and W16.

Routes 200, 455 and 493 – tranche 376

The Purley to Old Lodge Lane part of route 455 has always been problematic, with operators tempted to cure late running and uneven service frequencies by turning short buses on route 455 at Purley. We would support an increase in frequency of this service in the evenings and at weekends and would also suggest that you consider an extension to the former Queen Mary's Hospital site to cater for the new school and other developments there.

Routes 20, 167, 362, 379, 397, 462, 549, 647, 667 and 678 – tranche 377

You will be aware of the proposals to reorganise health care provision in North East London and we would ask you to take account of this when reviewing these services. We also believe that the Hail and Ride sections of route 462 should be converted to fixed stop operation in order

to allow those with disabilities, particular wheelchair services the same access as the able bodied.

Date 18/03/10
Author Tim Bellenger