
Secretariat memorandum

Author : Mark Donoghue

Agenda item 7
LTW 343
Drafted 15.3.10

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. Also included for information is the number of orders and planning issues to which London TravelWatch did not see fit to respond.

2.3. Eurostar inquiry response

On 18 January 2010, London TravelWatch submitted its response to the Eurostar Independent inquiry into the problems experienced in December 2009. It may be viewed on the London TravelWatch website (<http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/4035/get>)

2.4. Response to Tottenham Hale gyratory consultation

On 2 February 2010, the Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer responded to the Transport for London consultation on the changes to the gyratory at Tottenham Hale. A copy is enclosed in the annex to this report (Annex B).

2.5. Developing a Smoothing the traffic flow

On 8 February 2010, the Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer sent a response to Transport for London on a roundtable event which he had attended. A copy is enclosed in the annex to this report (Annex C).

2.6. Cycle Superhighways - on-carriageway infrastructure

On 9 March 2010, the Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer sent comments to Transport for London on the Cycle superhighways project. A copy is enclosed in the annex to this report (Annex D).

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). 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.

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.

LTW 343 Actions Taken report Annex A

RESPONSES TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES ON PROPOSED TRAFFIC ORDERS & PLANNING ISSUES Updated 10.3.10

Highway Authority	Location	Proposal	Letter dated	Reply sent	Notes
Westminster	Shirland Road	Bus stop provision	06-Jan-10	15-Jan-10	Supported
Harrow	Queensbury Circle	Waiting restrictions on bus routes	11-Jan-10	15-Jan-10	Supported
Merton	Durnsford Road	Waiting restrictions on a bus route	14-Jan-10	20-Jan-10	Supported
Ealing	Standard Road, etc.	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	15-Jan-10	20-Jan-10	Supported
Lewisham	Hither Green Lane	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	14-Jan-10	20-Jan-10	Supported. Welcomed bus stop extension. Concerned at footway parking if width reduced to <2m.
Harrow	Eastcote Road	Bus stop accessibility	13-Jan-10	20-Jan-10	Supported. Asked for clearway extension and infilling of lay-by
TfL	A232 Cheam Road	No stopping on a bus route	18-Jan-10	20-Jan-10	Supported double red line (no stopping) restrictions
Croydon	West Way Gdns, etc.	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	15-Jan-10	25-Jan-10	Supported
Ealing	Uxbridge Road, etc.	Ex. Change of hours of bus lanes	08-Jan-10	26-Jan-10	Asked for the effect on bus services to be monitored
Westminster	Oxford Street	Waiting & loading restrictions and bus stops	12-Jan-10	20-Jan-10	Supported waiting restrictions but objected to reduction in hours of bus stop clearway. We have been told verbally that this proposal has been withdrawn.
Ealing	Greenford Green	Waiting restrictions on a bus route	29-Jan-10	04-Feb-10	Supported, but asked for bus stop clearway to be of LBI length
Hillingdon	Eastcote Road, etc	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route and bus stop improvements	25-Jan-10	04-Feb-10	Supported
Ealing	Eastcote Lane North	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	29-Jan-10	04-Feb-10	Supported

LTW 343 Actions Taken report Annex A

RESPONSES TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES ON PROPOSED TRAFFIC ORDERS & PLANNING ISSUES Updated 10.3.10

Highway Authority	Location	Proposal	Letter dated	Reply sent	Notes
Ealing	Ealing Dean	Extension of CPZ JJ	22-Jan-10	04-Feb-10	Asked that measures are in place to prevent displacement of parking onto bus routes.
Ealing	Greenford Road	Extension of bus lane and waiting restrictions	28-Jan-10	04-Feb-10	Welcomed
Westminster	Knightsbridge area	Waiting restrictions at junctions with bus routes	28-Jan-10	04-Feb-10	Supported
Westminster	Parliament St., etc.	New bus lane; waiting/loading restrictions	28-Jan-10	04-Feb-10	Welcomed
Ealing	Pitshanger Lane	Bus stop relocation and indented parking	n/a	02-Feb-10	Supported if residual footway width is at least 2 metres
Barnet	A1000 Fortis Green	Junction improvements; removal of guard rail	25-Jan-10	28-Jan-10	Supported
Brent	Harrow Road	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	20-Jan-10	28-Jan-10	Supported
Ealing	Sudbury Heights	20mph zone	29-Jan-10	09-Feb-10	Asked for consideration to be given to upgrading parking controls on adjacent bus routes
Westminster	Strand / Aldwych	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route; new bus stop clearways	28-Jan-10	09-Feb-10	Supported waiting restrictions and welcomed new bus stop clearways.
Croydon	Portland Road	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	29-Jan-10	09-Feb-10	Supported
Lewisham	Honor Oak Park, etc.	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route; footway parking	03-Feb-10	09-Feb-10	Supported restrictions but objected to footway parking unless the residual width > 2m.
Barnet	Dean's Lane HA8	Waiting restrictions on a bus route	11-Feb-10	11-Feb-10	Supported
Southwark	Rye Lane, etc.	Waiting restrictions on bus routes	04-Feb-10	11-Feb-10	Supported
Ealing	The Mall, etc.	Experimental reduction in bus lane hours	04-Feb-10	11-Feb-10	Asked for monitoring of delays in bus services

LTW 343 Actions Taken report Annex A

RESPONSES TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES ON PROPOSED TRAFFIC ORDERS & PLANNING ISSUES Updated 10.3.10

Highway Authority	Location	Proposal	Letter dated	Reply sent	Notes
Ealing	Northfield Ave. etc.	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	05-Feb-10	11-Feb-10	Supported
Ealing	Boston Road	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	05-Feb-10	11-Feb-10	Supported
Harrow	Station Rd. N.Harrow	Loading bay in bus stop lay-by	04-Feb-10	16-Feb-10	Objected as this measure would reduce accessibility
Wandsworth	Putney High St. etc.	Waiting restrictions on bus routes	17-Feb-10	23-Feb-10	Supported
TfL	Kender Street	Removal of gyratory system	15-Feb-10	22-Feb-10	Supported
Harrow	Uxbridge Road, etc.	Waiting restrictions on bus routes	15-Feb-10	22-Feb-10	Supported
Brent	High Rd. Willesden	Waiting & loading restrictions on bus routes	15-Feb-10	23-Feb-10	Supported
Lambeth	Norwood Road	Waiting & loading restrictions on a bus route	15-Feb-10	23-Feb-10	Supported
Ealing	Cleveland Road, etc.	Waiting restrictions at junctions with bus routes	26-Feb-10	02-Mar-10	Supported
Westminster	Abbey Road, etc.	Waiting restrictions on a bus route	24-Feb-10	02-Mar-10	Supported
Hillingdon	Eastcote Road	Waiting restrictions on a bus route	22-Feb-10	02-Mar-10	Supported
Westminster	Knightsbridge	Relocation of pelican crossing with guardrailling	16-Feb-10	01-Mar-10	Asked for reconsideration of use of guardrailling
Merton	Wimbledon area	20 mph speed limit area	18-Feb-10	01-Mar-10	Asked for measures to prevent displacement of parking onto nearby bus routes
Lambeth	Herne Hill Road	Traffic calming on a bus route	17-Feb-10	01-Mar-10	Asked that measures are bus and cycle friendly
Brent	Harrow Road	New bus stop and removal of bus stand	18-Feb-10	01-Mar-10	Welcomed after assurance of TfL's support

LTW 343 Actions Taken report Annex A

RESPONSES TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES ON PROPOSED TRAFFIC ORDERS & PLANNING ISSUES Updated 10.3.10

Highway Authority	Location	Proposal	Letter dated	Reply sent	Notes
Ealing	Carlyle / Noel Road	New bus stop clearways	09-Feb-10	01-Mar-10	Welcomed
Wandsworth	Shaftesbury Estate	20 mph local safety scheme	23-Feb-10	01-Mar-10	Asked for measures to prevent displacement of parking onto adjacent bus route
Ealing	Uxbridge Road	Waiting restrictions at junctions with a bus route	19-Feb-10	01-Mar-10	Supported
NO ACTION TAKEN : 107					

Annex B

Our Ref: TfL

Your Ref:

2 February 2010

Freepost RSAK-YAYS-ACKX
Transport for London
Tottenham Hale Gyratory
Palestra Zone 11G2
197 Blackfriars Road
London
SE1 8NJ

Dear Sirs

Improving Tottenham Hale

London TravelWatch is the statutory watchdog representing transport users in London.

Thank you for consulting us on these proposals and particularly thanks to TfL officers who came to our Board meeting on 26 January 2010 to present the proposals to members.

We note that the proposals have been developed in concert with Haringey Council. For the record two members of our Board are also members of Haringey Council, however they have played no part in our consideration of these proposals.

One-way road systems are problematic for bus users because buses have longer journeys and are often diverted away from their passengers' journey objectives. They are also confusing to bus passengers insofar as the alighting and boarding stops may be on different roads, the bus travelling in the opposite direction to that one may imagine. These systems deter both cyclists and pedestrians. Cyclists are diverted from their objectives and higher road speeds intimidate cyclists and increase danger to them. Pedestrians will be endangered by higher traffic speeds and poor amenity. It is said that the severance created by one-way roads deters pedestrians.

For these reasons London TravelWatch generally supports the reversion of one-way gyratory systems to two-way operation. We welcome the proposal to tackle Tottenham gyratory.

However, Tottenham is not just a link it is also a town centre and transport interchange and there are several aspects of the proposals that need to be addressed as part of a wider strategy to promote modal switch to the more space efficient modes.

i) We understand that a southbound bus lane is not to be introduced as part of this scheme as congestion may be such that the Monument Way junction will be blocked by queuing general traffic. However, there would clearly be a benefit to buses and cyclists if a bus lane were to be installed. We would like to see the cost and benefits of a southbound bus lane properly evaluated.

Annex B

ii) We are pleased to hear that there is to be some more work on how cycling may be catered for. We have previously expressed our concerns to TfL regarding the proposed footway cycling on the western footway near the Underground entrances. Generally, London TravelWatch wants to see cyclists using the carriageways as this will reduce their interaction with pedestrians and provide them with a much more simple routing without having to navigate around junctions on the footway. The emphasis should be on making the roads cyclists use safer rather than routeing them onto pavements and around junctions. For those cyclists that choose to use the carriageway some of the junction designs are problematical. For example a cyclist travelling south on the High Road where it joins Monument Way will have to cross fast moving, left turning traffic.

iii) There are no advanced cycle stop lines shown on the drawings. We understood that TfL policy was to implement these at all signalised junctions. Is this an omission?

iv) The loss of the controlled crossing at Philip Lane will cause difficulty for those wanting to cross at this location. We were told at our Board meeting that usage is very low (five pedestrians an hour). This we question, albeit following a very short observation period. At 10:00 to 10:15am on 28 January 2009 we observed 51 pedestrians crossing at this location, i.e 204 per hour. Pedestrians want to see single stage direct crossings. TfL's Streetscape Design guidelines support this, particularly for roads less than 14metres. It is therefore disappointing to see a staggered crossing proposed for Philip Lane itself.

v) The bus stop on map B is within a lay-by. Given the numerous high frequency bus routes that will use this stop many will not be able to pull into the kerb properly. We would want to see this designed as a conventional stop, parallel to the kerb, preferably within a southbound bus lane. Given the number of buses stopping at this location there will be frequent occasions when a second bus arrives and that will restrict traffic flow in the inside lane.

vi) Many of the bus stops are not marked on the maps. We hope these will be implemented as conventional bus stops, parallel to the kerb.

vii) A surface level pedestrian crossing of Monument Way to replace the underpass would be welcome, as would a controlled crossing near the bus stops marked on Map D, Broad Lane.

Please do contact me if I can be of further help.

Yours sincerely

Vincent Stops
Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer

Annex C

Beverley Hall
Head of Surface Transport Communications & Engagement
Transport for London
11th Floor, Palestra
197 Blackfriars Road
London SE1 8NJ

8 February 2010

Dear Beverley

Developing a Smoothing Traffic Flow Strategy

Thank you for inviting us to attend the recent Smoothing the Traffic Flow roundtable and considering our views. Thank you also for including us in the website discussions and to you and your colleagues for contributing to various meetings we have held to consider this initiative.

We welcome the definition you are proposing as this gives assurance that the intent is not to increase capacity on the network, but to improve journey time reliability.

Generally we support this initiative. A clear aspiration of the London TravelWatch Board and the transport users we represent is to be able to travel reliably from A to B in a reasonable time in the mode of their choice. We have supported TfL in its lobbying of Government to get on with issuing the regulations associated with works permitting, we have previously expressed our concern to TfL at the time taken to review signal timings across London.

We would, however, be concerned if this initiative does not recognise the importance of 'people moving' and 'modal switch' to the more space efficient modes, particularly the bus. It is said that this initiative will benefit all modes, however we want assurance that measure to smooth traffic flow recognise that buses are carrying huge numbers of people, particularly at peak times, often where road space is limited. It is not acceptable that buses carrying 80 passengers are considered equivalent to a single occupancy private vehicle.

To ensure this does not happen we would expect bus journey times to be measured separately to general traffic journey times and similar targets for journey time reliability to be applied to them. We want to see an equivalent graph for buses as that on page 4 of your recently produced draft strategy document.

We recognise that this initiative is only one element of the MTS, but are nonetheless disappointed that the implementation of bus priority is not included as a key part of this initiative. Bus journey times are forecast by TfL to deteriorate over the medium term (2006 to 2016) by 13% as congestion increases. By their nature buses cannot divert from their

Annex C

route to avoid delays caused by congestion and so they need particular protection from the effects of congestion.

We have heard from TfL regarding the work it is undertaking to rephase the traffic lights. We are pleased that this is happening as part of this initiative, but would want to be assured that where changes are made it is transparent who will benefit and where appropriate account is taken of the much greater people moving capacity of buses compared to private vehicles. We want to see selective vehicle detection used to improve bus journey times.

In February 2009 you spoke to the Red Route Forum and described the elements that made up the smoothing traffic flow initiative. Enforcement of traffic regulations was included as part of the strategy then and this was welcome. High levels of compliance with traffic regulations are essential to smooth traffic operations and must have contributed hugely to improved journey times. We would hope this is an omission and can be incorporated into the strategy.

We note the proposal for an indicator of journey time reliability, but it would seem that this is a measure of journey time and would not differentiate between stop / start journeys and reliable smooth journeys. Should TfL not be measuring variation in average speeds rather than journey times?

Members noted the proposal to remove traffic signals. Whilst recognising the need to be continually reviewing the road network and the cumulative impacts of schemes we would nevertheless want to be assured that pedestrian convenience and safety are taken account of as part of the evaluation of such a proposal.

Members noted that 'targeted improvements' to the network were to be part of the strategy. Consideration of such improvement is supported, but we are keen to know what schemes are being looked at.

Yours sincerely

Vincent Stops
Streets and Surface Transport Policy Officer

Annex D

Our Ref: Cycling
Your Ref:

Richard Shirley
Senior Communications & Consultation Manager
Cycle Superhighways
Transport for London
11th floor - Zone G2
Palestra, 197 Blackfriars Road
London, SE1 8NJ

9 March 2010

Dear Richard

Cycle Superhighways - on-carriageway infrastructure

Firstly thank you, Zenobia and Matt for the ride to Tooting Bec to survey the proposed Super Highway 7. I am also grateful to your colleagues German Dector-Vega and Joshua Martin for previously briefing me on these proposals.

I was unfortunately not able to get a slot for a Super Highway presentation on our Board Agenda and so in consultation with our CEO I am writing with the following officers' comments. They take into account the board's views as detailed in our report 'Cycling in London' available at: <http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/document/3765/get>

London TravelWatch is supportive of the Mayor's aspiration to quadruple cycling in London. We are particularly keen that cycling is on-carriageway and that investment is targeted at tackling safety issues on the roads cyclists most use – the main roads; training is offered to all cyclists; enforcement and educational campaigns lead to all road users following the rules.

It is the board's custom not to take a view of trials and pilots and so we welcome the present pilot routes and hope that a thorough assessment will be made of the schemes once they are installed. We do not wish to see these pilots become permanent as a fait accompli without a review.

As part of the development of the super highway proposals we would want you to consider the following concerns:

- i) Where one should cycle on the road is a function of many things: the topography of the road; the traffic conditions; ones confidence and training are important. Thus, particularly at a junction, if there is slow moving traffic flow and the cyclist is approaching a stop line with the signal at red one would cycle reasonably close to

Annex D

the kerb – the proposed cycle lanes may well be appropriate in these circumstances. In faster traffic where the lights are green then one would cycle further towards the middle of the traffic lane, particularly to stop left turning traffic cutting across in front of the cyclist. Thus it is difficult to design cycle lane infrastructure approaching junctions that is useful in both these different circumstances.

- ii) Having a cycle lane close to the kerb may not be appropriate where there is a sharp bend in the road. We saw that at Marshalsea Road.
- iii) As part of the package of Super Highway measures we understand that cycle training will be promoted. This we support. But it may well be the case that this training in the use of the road and positioning oneself to cycle through a junction as described above conflicts with the lanes as painted on the road surface.
- iv) Where a cycle lane is shared by motor vehicles – you described them as virtual cycle lanes – it may be confusing as to who has priority (motor vehicle or cyclists) particularly where the lane is close to a junction. We all have had experience of being hooted at by drivers who consider once cycle lanes are provided the cyclists ought to be in them.
- v) There are clearly some very problematical junctions for cyclists on the TLRN. The one at Kennington is a case in point. We recognise that these cannot easily be tackled, but we would expect some acknowledgement, and an associated time table, in the proposals that safety issues for cyclists at these junctions will need to be addressed

I have previously asked to see the safety audits associated with these lanes at junctions. I look forward to seeing them.

Finally, you may know Joshua Martin set up a meeting with TfL, German Dector-Vega, ourselves and cycling user groups to discuss cycling issues in London. At the time it was suggested this group would meet again. Can you ask your colleagues if this could happen.

Yours sincerely

Vincent Stops
Street and Surface Transport Policy Officer