

# AGENDA

**Meeting**    **Transport Committee**

**Date**        **Thursday 9 January 2014**

**Time**        **10.00 am**

**Place**        **Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's  
Walk, London, SE1 2AA**

Copies of the reports and any attachments may be found at  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/transport>

Most meetings of the London Assembly and its Committees are webcast live at  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/webcasts> where you can also view  
past meetings.

## **Members of the Committee**

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair)  
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair)  
Victoria Borwick AM  
Tom Copley AM  
Roger Evans AM  
Darren Johnson AM  
Murad Qureshi AM  
Dr Onkar Sahota AM  
Richard Tracey AM

A meeting of the Committee has been called by the Chair of the Committee to deal with the business listed below. This meeting will be open to the public. There is access for disabled people, and induction loops are available.

Mark Roberts, Executive Director of Secretariat  
Tuesday 31 December 2013

## **Further Information**

If you have questions, would like further information about the meeting or require special facilities please contact: Dale Langford, Senior Committee Officer; Telephone: 020 7983 4415; Email: [dale.langford@london.gov.uk](mailto:dale.langford@london.gov.uk); Minicom: 020 7983 4458.

For media enquiries please contact London Assembly External Relations on 020 7983 4283.  
If you have any questions about individual reports please contact the report author whose details are at the end of each report.

There is limited underground parking for orange and blue badge holders, which will be allocated on a first-come first-served basis. Please contact Facilities Management (020 7983 4750) in advance if you require a parking space or further information.

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of the agenda, minutes or reports in large print or Braille, audio, or in another language, then please call us on 020 7983 4100 or email [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Si usted, o algùn conocido desea recibir una copia del order del dia, acta o informe en Braille o en su propio idioma, y gratis, no dude en ponerse en contacto con nosotros llamando al teléfano 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Se você, ou algüem que conheça precisa uma cópia da ordem do dia, anotações ou relatorios em prensa grande ou Braille, ou em outra lingu, então por favour nos telephone em 020 7983 4100 ou e-mail [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Haddii ama ama qof aad taqaanid, uu ugu baahan yahay koobiga ajendhada, haddaladii ama warbixinta in far waaweyn loogu qoro ama farta qofka indoolaha akhrin karo, amaba luuqad kale, fadlan naga soo wac telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Ta ba ri enikeni ti o ba ni ife ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kansiya lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

જો તમને અથવા તમે જાણતાં હો તેવી કોઈ વ્યક્તિને એજન્ડા (કાર્યસૂચિ), મિનિટ્સ (ટૂંકી નોંધો) અથવા રિપોર્ટ્સ (અહેવાલો)ની નકલ મોટા અક્ષરોમાં છપાયેલી કે બ્રેઈલમાં અથવા બીજી કોઈ ભાષામાં જોઈતી હોય, તો કૃપા કરીને 020 7983 4100 ઉપર ફોન અથવા [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk) ઉપર અમને ઈ-મેઈલ કરો.

আপনি বা আপনার পরিচিত কেউ যদি এজেন্ডা, মিনিট বা রিপোর্টের একটি কপি বড় ছাপা বা ব্রেইল অথবা অন্য কোন ভাষায় পেতে চান তবে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে 020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারে ফোন করুন বা [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk) এ ই-মেইলে যোগাযোগ করুন।

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਜਾਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਵਾਕਫ਼ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਵਿਅਕਤੀ ਨੂੰ, ਏਜੰਡੇ, ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਦੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਰਿਪੋਰਟਾਂ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ, ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਛਪਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਬਰੇਲ ਦੇ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਾਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਬੋਲੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ 020 7983 4100 'ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਇਸ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਈਮੇਲ ਕਰੋ : [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)

اگر آپ یا آپ کے جاننے والے کسی فرد کو اس ایجنڈا کی کاپی، تفصیل یا رپورٹیں بڑے پرنٹ یا بریل یا کسی دوسری زبان میں درکار ہوں تو براہ کرم ہمیں 020 7983 4100 پر فون کیجئے یا درج ذیل ای میل پر رابطہ کیجئے [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)



Certificate Number: FS 80233

**Agenda  
Transport Committee  
Thursday 9 January 2014**

**1 Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements**

To receive any apologies for absence and any announcements from the Chair.

**2 Declarations of Interests** (Pages 1 - 4)

**The Committee is recommended to:**

- (a) Note the offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, as disclosable pecuniary interests;**
- (b) Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s); and**
- (c) Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA's Monitoring Officer set out at Agenda Item 2) and to note any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s).**

**3 Minutes** (Pages 5 - 58)

**The Committee is recommended to confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Transport Committee held on 10 December 2013 to be signed by the Chair as a correct record.**

The appendix to the minutes set out on pages 9 to 58 is attached for Members and officers only but is available from the following area of the GLA's website:  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/transport>

**4 Summary List of Actions** (Pages 59 - 64)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact Dale Langford, [dale.langford@london.gov.uk](mailto:dale.langford@london.gov.uk), 020 7983 4415

**The Committee is recommended to note the completed and outstanding actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee.**

## **5 Pedestrian Safety** (Pages 65 - 66)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact: Lucy Brant, [lucy.brant@london.gov.uk](mailto:lucy.brant@london.gov.uk), 020 7983 5727

**The Committee is recommended to:**

- (a) Note the report, put questions on pedestrian safety in London to the invited guests and note the answers; and**
- (b) Delegate authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree the output from the Committee's work on pedestrian safety in London.**

## **6 London TravelWatch - Memorandum of Understanding** (Pages 67 - 78)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact: John Bennett, [john.bennett@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.bennett@london.gov.uk), 020 7983 4203

**The Committee is recommended to approve the revised Memorandum of Understanding with London TravelWatch.**

## **7 Transport Committee Work Programme** (Pages 79 - 84)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact: Laura Warren, [laura.warren@london.gov.uk](mailto:laura.warren@london.gov.uk), 020 7983 6545

**The Committee is recommended to note its work programme, as set out in the report.**

## **8 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Wednesday 5 February 2014 at 10.00am in the Chamber.

## **9 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent**

<b>Subject: Declarations of Interests</b>	
<b>Report to: Transport Committee</b>	
<b>Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat</b>	<b>Date: 9 January 2014</b>
<b>This report will be considered in public</b>	

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out details of offices held by Assembly Members for noting as disclosable pecuniary interests and requires additional relevant declarations relating to disclosable pecuniary interests, and gifts and hospitality to be made.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 **That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table below, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests<sup>1</sup>;**
- 2.2 **That the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s) be noted; and**
- 2.3 **That the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA's Monitoring Officer set out at below) and any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s) be noted.**

## 3. Issues for Consideration

- 3.1 Relevant offices held by Assembly Members are listed in the table overleaf:

---

<sup>1</sup> The Monitoring Officer advises that: Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct will only preclude a Member from participating in any matter to be considered or being considered at, for example, a meeting of the Assembly, where the Member has a direct Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in that particular matter. The effect of this is that the 'matter to be considered, or being considered' must be about the Member's interest. So, by way of example, if an Assembly Member is also a councillor of London Borough X, that Assembly Member will be precluded from participating in an Assembly meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about the Member's role / employment as a councillor of London Borough X; the Member will not be precluded from participating in a meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about an activity or decision of London Borough X.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Tony Arbour AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Richmond
Jennette Arnold OBE AM	Committee of the Regions
Gareth Bacon AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Bexley
John Biggs AM	
Andrew Boff AM	Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)
Victoria Borwick AM	Member, Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea; Deputy Mayor
James Cleverly AM	Chairman of LFEPA; Chairman of the London Local Resilience Forum; substitute member, Local Government Association Fire Services Management Committee
Tom Copley AM	
Andrew Dismore AM	
Len Duvall AM	
Roger Evans AM	Member, LB Havering; Committee of the Regions; Trust for London (Trustee)
Nicky Gavron AM	
Darren Johnson AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Lewisham
Jenny Jones AM	Member, House of Lords
Stephen Knight AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Richmond
Kit Malthouse AM	Deputy Mayor for Business and Enterprise; Deputy Chair, London Enterprise Panel; Chair, Hydrogen London; Chairman, London & Partners; Board Member, TheCityUK
Joanne McCartney AM	
Steve O'Connell AM	Member, LB Croydon; MOPAC Non-Executive Adviser for Neighbourhoods
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM	
Murad Qureshi AM	Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)
Dr Onkar Sahota AM	
Navin Shah AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Harrow
Valerie Shawcross CBE AM	Member, LFEPA
Richard Tracey AM	Chairman of the London Waste and Recycling Board; Mayor's Ambassador for River Transport
Fiona Twycross AM	Member, LFEPA

[Note: LB - London Borough; LFEPA - London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority; MOPAC – Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime]

3.2 Paragraph 10 of the GLA's Code of Conduct, which reflects the relevant provisions of the Localism Act 2011, provides that:

- where an Assembly Member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered or being considered or at
  - (i) a meeting of the Assembly and any of its committees or sub-committees; or
  - (ii) any formal meeting held by the Mayor in connection with the exercise of the Authority's functions
- they must disclose that interest to the meeting (or, if it is a sensitive interest, disclose the fact that they have a sensitive interest to the meeting); and

- must not (i) participate, or participate any further, in any discussion of the matter at the meeting; or (ii) participate in any vote, or further vote, taken on the matter at the meeting

#### UNLESS

- they have obtained a dispensation from the GLA's Monitoring Officer (in accordance with section 2 of the Procedure for registration and declarations of interests, gifts and hospitality – Appendix 5 to the Code).

- 3.3 Failure to comply with the above requirements, without reasonable excuse, is a criminal offence; as is knowingly or recklessly providing information about your interests that is false or misleading.
- 3.4 In addition, the Monitoring Officer has advised Assembly Members to continue to apply the test that was previously applied to help determine whether a pecuniary / prejudicial interest was arising - namely, that Members rely on a reasonable estimation of whether a member of the public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, could, with justification, regard the matter as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest.
- 3.5 Members should then exercise their judgement as to whether or not, in view of their interests and the interests of others close to them, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA. It remains the responsibility of individual Members to make further declarations about their actual or apparent interests at formal meetings noting also that a Member's failure to disclose relevant interest(s) has become a potential criminal offence.
- 3.6 Members are also required, where considering a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom they have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25 within the previous three years or from the date of election to the London Assembly, whichever is the later, to disclose the existence and nature of that interest at any meeting of the Authority which they attend at which that business is considered.
- 3.7 The obligation to declare any gift or hospitality at a meeting is discharged, subject to the proviso set out below, by registering gifts and hospitality received on the Authority's on-line database. The on-line database may be viewed here:  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/gifts-and-hospitality>.
- 3.8 If any gift or hospitality received by a Member is not set out on the on-line database at the time of the meeting, and under consideration is a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom a Member has received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25, Members are asked to disclose these at the meeting, either at the declarations of interest agenda item or when the interest becomes apparent.
- 3.9 It is for Members to decide, in light of the particular circumstances, whether their receipt of a gift or hospitality, could, on a reasonable estimation of a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, with justification, be regarded as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest. Where receipt of a gift or hospitality could be so regarded, the Member must exercise their judgement as to whether or not, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA.

## **4. Legal Implications**

- 4.1 The legal implications are as set out in the body of this report.

## 5. Financial Implications

5.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>
--

List of Background Papers: None
---------------------------------

Contact Officer: Dale Langford, Senior Committee Officer
--

Telephone: 020 7983 4415
--------------------------

E-mail: dale.langford@london.gov.uk
-------------------------------------



# MINUTES

**Meeting: Transport Committee**  
**Date: Tuesday 10 December 2013**  
**Time: 10.00 am**  
**Place: Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA**

Copies of the minutes may be found at:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/transport>

**Present:**

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair)  
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair)  
Victoria Borwick AM  
Tom Copley AM  
Roger Evans AM  
Darren Johnson AM  
Murad Qureshi AM  
Dr Onkar Sahota AM  
Richard Tracey AM

**1 Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements (Item 1)**

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

**2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)**

2.1 **Resolved:**

**That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests.**

### **3 Minutes (Item 3)**

#### **3.1 Resolved:**

**That the minutes of the meeting of the Transport Committee held on 13 November 2013 be signed by the Chair as a correct record of that meeting.**

### **4 Summary List of Actions (Item 4)**

4.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat. The Chair reported that since the agenda was published, the Committee had received details from the TSSA union about tube stations left unstaffed. The Committee noted that the Chair would write to Transport for London asking them to account for the reported lack of staffing.

#### **4.2 Resolved:**

**That the outstanding actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee be noted.**

### **5 Cycling in London (Item 5)**

5.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat as background to putting questions on cycling in London to the following invited guests:

- Andrew Gilligan, the Mayor's Cycling Commissioner;
- Garrett Emmerson, Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, Transport for London (TfL);
- Ben Plowden, Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL;
- Charlie Lloyd, Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign;
- Martin Key, Campaigns Manager, British Cycling; and
- Andrew Hill, Contract Director for London cycle hire scheme, Serco.

5.2 During the course of the discussion the Committee requested further information from TfL on its criteria for determining when to install 20 mile per hour limits on its road network.

5.3 A record of the discussion with invited guests is attached as **Appendix 1**.

5.4 The Chair recorded the Committee's thanks to the thousands of people who had responded to its survey on cycle safety, Cycle Superhighways and the Cycle Hire Scheme.

5.5 **Resolved:**

- (a) **That the report and discussion with guests be noted; and**
- (b) **That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree the output from its work on cycling in London.**

**6 Action Taken Under Delegated Authority (Item 6)**

6.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat setting out recent action taken by the Chair under delegated authority.

6.2 **Resolved:**

**That the recent action taken by the Chair under delegated authority, namely to agree a letter to the Airports Commission setting out the Assembly's support for an independent aviation noise regulator and improved surface transport access at airports, be noted.**

**7 Transport Committee Work Programme (Item 7)**

7.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat, setting out the Committee's work programme.

7.2 The Committee noted that proposals for site visits to London Bridge station to view the reconstruction work and to Aldgate East junction on Cycle Superhighway 2 would be arranged for the Committee.

7.3 **Resolved:**

**That the Committee's work programme, as set out in the report, with the addition of site visits to London Bridge station and Aldgate East junction on Cycle Superhighway 2, be noted**

**8 Date of Next Meeting (Item 8)**

8.1 The next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Thursday 9 January 2014 at 10.00am in the Chamber.

**9 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 9)**

9.1 There was no other business.

**10 Close of Meeting**

10.1 The meeting ended at 12.51pm.

---

Chair

---

Date

**Contact Officer:** Dale Langford, Senior Committee Officer; Telephone: 020 7983 4415; Email: dale.langford@london.gov.uk; Minicom: 020 7983 4458

**Transport Committee – 10 December 2013**

**Transcript of Item 5: Cycling in London**

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** To item 5, cycling in London. We are here to explore the progress that has been made in improving cycling safety and encouraging cyclists to take to the roads in London; and also to revisit the work that we did in the past last year on cycling in London and see how things have moved on.

Can I welcome our guests who have made the effort to be with us today? We have Andrew Gilligan, who is Mayor's Cycling Commissioner. Welcome, and thank you for coming. You should note that the Cycling Commissioner was on our wish list this time last year.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Yes, the dream has come true.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** We tick that box and are glad to see you. Garrett Emmerson is the Chief Operating Officer for Surface Transport at Transport for London (TfL). Ben Plowden, who is a regular visitor to this Committee, is Director of Strategy & Planning at Surface Transport. Next to him we have Charlie Lloyd, Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign. Charlie has been particularly doing the heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) campaign work. Andrew Hill is Contract Director for the London Cycle Hire Scheme, Serco. There have been quite a lot of changes of managers, we note, at Serco, so we hope we will get to know you better over time.

If I can start with Andrew, you know that we have been doing a survey with the help of the London Cycling Campaign (LCC), in fact, and we have had 6,000 responses and people have actually quite a detailed questionnaire now, which we want to make available to everybody. One of the findings was that 82% of the cyclists who responded say that they are more concerned about their safety now than they were six months ago. What would you like to say to them about what you are doing in terms of improving cycling safety in London?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** We recognise the issues that there are with cycling safety and also with perceived safety in London. They are both important issues. They are arguably equally important to us and we are doing a great deal to address that. The Mayor in March announced a gigantic expansion in the cycling programme to roughly three times its previous size. We are spending two and a half times more in the next few years than the Government is spending for the rest of the country put together and it includes an enormous amount of new routes, new junctions and other ancillary work not only to make cyclists safer but also to make them feel safer.

The basic elements are on routes. We are going to do a whole set of new and upgraded Superhighways and we will announce the exact scope of the programme, in other words where all the routes are going to be, in February. The reason it has to wait until then is that some of the mini-Holland boroughs, which is another programme I will describe in a minute, have Superhighway proposals in their bids and the final deadline for their bids is not until Friday, so we need to decide which boroughs are going to get the mini-Hollands before we lay out the exact final shape of the Superhighways programme.

You will see a very substantially extended and improved Superhighways programme. You will see a greatly improved quality of route above all. Not all the Superhighways that exist now are of the same quality. They are mixed. Some are pretty good. Cycle Superhighway 3 (CS3), for instance, from the Tower to Barking, is substantially segregated or on low-traffic streets. We have very few complaints about that. Others are less good. We had, of course, a great deal of controversy about Cycle Superhighway 2. We have plans to not only do other routes to higher standards but also to upgrade all the existing routes.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Caroline is going to ask you about the upgrading of the Cycle Superhighways in some detail, so you want to hang on to that bit of the information, but carry on.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** The other main element of the routes programme is something called Quietways, which are essentially the old London Cycle Network done properly. They are back street routes alongside streets, low-traffic side streets and canals through parks and the like. The idea there is for cyclists who do not want to use the main roads we can provide, if you like, secret cycling passages through London for them. London does not have as much space on some of its roads as some cities that were designed in the late 19th or 20th centuries. London was largely designed before that era. What it does have is this matchless network of side streets and backstreet routes that we can thread together to create very attractive cycling routes. That is the Quietways.

The two sets of routes together in Central London will be something called the Central London Grid. That is a mixture of Superhighways and Quietways in Central London. The map for that is being unveiled next week and that has been worked out, of course, in consultation with the eight London boroughs, The Royal Parks and the Canal and River Trust. Those will be some of the earlier routes to be delivered. The first Quietways will be opened next year, probably the first four or five, and the first upgraded Superhighways will be coming along shortly after that.

The other major infrastructure programme is the mini-Hollands programme, which has £100 million to give to four outer London boroughs to achieve dramatic and transformational pro-cycling change. The stage we are at with that is that all the outer London boroughs were eligible, all 20. Eighteen of them bid. We have whittled it down to a shortlist of eight. The final bids from them are due in on Friday. We will consider them over the Christmas period and we will announce which are the lucky four in February. There are some very, very ambitious pro-cycling transformations in the initial expressions of interests they submitted, so I look forward to the final bids on Friday with great interest.

There is a lot more as well. There are changes and expansions to the cycle hire. There are Cycle to School Partnerships to get more kids cycling and that is an infrastructure measure as well. There are superhubs at railway stations. There are a number of feasibility and trial studies on electric hire bikes. There are some minor changes as well, things like an expansion to the enforcement operation that we are doing with the police against bad cycling and against behaviour that threatens cyclists.

Then there is a portfolio of action on lorries, which are a key factor in cyclist safety and particularly in deaths and serious injuries. In September, the Mayor announced that he would consult on a Safer Lorry Charge in January and that is a scheme essentially to remove from London any lorry which is not fitted with basic safety equipment. That is a very high priority for the Mayor. There are other things

we are actively looking at, such as a peak-hour lorry ban, which we have said we will study and we are studying it, and various other measures on lorries as well. We have a great deal of enforcement going on about lorries, which I hope we will get to in the session. We have a good deal of work in the last few weeks.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Again, we are going to do a section on the HGVs.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** It is a very large programme and the preparation phase has been ongoing for the last nine months. The delivery phase has started with the delivery of the first fully segregated stretch of Superhighway on Cycle Superhighway 2 (CS2), but I can outline a fuller delivery timetable in response to your questions.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** I appreciate that is the headlines across a wide range of activity, so we will dig into the detail on all of those. Can I just ask British Cycling and LCC what your general views are at the moment in terms of how well the Mayor and TfL are responding to concerns about cycling safety?

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** When we gave evidence to this Committee last year, we emphasised the need for political leadership and that that was the essence to transform cycling performance. We do not doubt the Mayor's commitment to cycling and a lot of the good programmes and work that we have just heard about. The evidence or the experience of the last few weeks has been quite shocking for everyone who cycles in London. There is pressure on the Mayor to deliver in time before he disappears or is replaced or perhaps he comes back again. We do not know.

We are concerned at the slow progress. There still seems to be barriers to actually transforming some of our streets to make them fit for cycling. One point that was in the Committee's first recommendations included a suggestion that TfL should have a target on the perception of cyclist safety and how safe cyclists feel. The Committee's work and the questionnaire have highlighted that that is still a problem, so we think that should be a very high priority. That is done by doing things quickly. There are things that can be done quickly. Again, some of the recommendations highlighted those about temporary measures that can be done to see how well they work, so we would like to see quick action.

We would like to see the Mayor's commitment and the Commissioner's commitment to cycling reflected in everything that TfL does, all the engineers, not just the cycling crew. They say they have recruited a lot more cycling engineers, but it is still now 2013 and it is maybe 13 years too late for that or not too late but they could have been done first. We would like to see a commitment to making the streets safe for cycling throughout everything that TfL does.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Every time there is a major project, the cyclists and the pedestrians are taken into account, yes. Martin, did you want to comment?

**Martin Key (Campaigns Manager, British Cycling):** British Cycling thinks that the Mayor and Andrew Gilligan have shown political leadership on this issue. It is getting an awful lot of good coverage and they are spending a lot of money. People are aware of it and it is boosting numbers.

The difficulty is the negative perceptions around safety do have a big impact. British Cycling is tasked with getting more people on bikes and we see from our surveys and our own research that safety is by far the biggest barrier. When we do get a lot of media attention, we have to combat that with signs that things are improving. Unfortunately, not just in London, things take an awfully long time. We had the New York transport people over last week and they showed what could be done in just a few months by using paint and planters and moving carparking. They had a small time window and made big changes. We should be doing more of that short-term work to actually show Londoners that we can make cycling safer very quickly.

There is also a big issue to do with HGVs. We need to reassure the public that action is being taken and it was great to see some enforcement measures by the Metropolitan Police Service over the last few weeks on that issue.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Andrew, they have both offered a strong suggestion there. Actually, while TfL is getting itself into gear for major schemes, there is a lot that could be done with trials and with temporary measures. Martin talked about the use of planters and suspending parking. Are we in danger of doing the typical TfL thing of over-engineering everything and spending a lot of money when sometimes something lighter-touch that is flexible and fast could be effective in the short run?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** I have talked about using temporary measures and I did it in the [Mayor's] Vision [for Cycling in London], more for winning political consent where a scheme is politically disputed. I do not think it is necessarily a good idea to try something out on the road to see if it is safe. We have to be reasonably sure that it is safe before we try it out on the road. My idea is essentially to use temporary measures to overcome political resistance to something. If council A says that by doing scheme Y you are going to block up the traffic, we will say, "Let us give it a go and see what happens. If it does block up the traffic, we will take it out". I am not prepared to do that where there is doubt over whether it is safe or not.

What we are planning, really, in inner London is probably the biggest physical change to the road network in 30 years, perhaps longer. It is a network. It is an organism. It is an ecosystem. In order to make those sorts of changes, it has to be dealt with holistically. We will get on to the specifics about Cycle Superhighway 2, but the road that Cycle Superhighway 2 runs on has, for instance, 1,900 cycles a day and 45,000 motor vehicles a day. We cannot just say, "Actually, let us take out some capacity on that road for a cycle lane and all the motor vehicles will go away". What if they do not? What if the whole area seizes up? We are going to be taking out capacity on that road for a cycle lane. We are going to be taking out capacity on that road to improve the cycling provision on it and I will talk in more detail about that when we get to the questions on CS2. In order for it to work, we are going to have to reduce the amount of traffic coming into that one road. In order for that to happen, we are doing traffic changes throughout a much wider area of outer east London. That is just one route. We are doing that on several routes and lots of routes, so we have to have a whole series of holistic traffic changes planned more or less throughout the greater London area in order to make the cycle changes we are doing work. That is why that cannot happen overnight.

There are two reasons why doing something seriously takes time. Part of the problems we see with some of the existing Superhighways is that they were done too quickly and I am determined not to repeat the mistakes of the past in the new programme. Roughly at this point where the euphoria had worn off, the honeymoon had worn off and there was still an interval before we actually saw physical



progress on the streets, I knew we would get questions like this. The answer is simply that, firstly, we have to do things properly. Secondly, we have to consider the factors. Traffic management is one factor that I mentioned.

There are two other factors, I would say. The reason that things are taking the time that they are taking is not because of a lack of political will. It is not because of a lack of official will at TfL. It is not because of a lack of money. We have enough of all three of those. It is for two other reasons. It is to some extent because of a lack of capacity. There just are not that many people in the UK who can design really good cycling schemes and we are hiring most of them. We are hiring an extra 128 people to help deliver the cycling programme. Secondly, it is what I call the 'herding cats syndrome'. We do not own 95% of the roads in London. The Mayor does not have dictatorial powers over the road network. The vast majority of the roads we need for these routes are owned by the boroughs and we have to get agreement from those other people and agreement from a whole range of other stakeholders as well who have a legitimate interest in those roads.

To take CS2 as an example, essentially, I asked people, "What are we not doing already that you want us to do?" They usually say, "Do it more quickly". I say what I have just said to you about why we have to take the time we are taking. Somebody I spoke to a few weeks ago said, "Why do you not just put in temporary segregated lane on CS2 on the Mile End Road and the Bow Road?" I said, "OK, there are 42 buses an hour on that road. What do you do at the bus stops? What happens when people get off a bus and step into the cycle lane and get hit by a cyclist?" He said, "You will work that out, will you not?" I said, "Yes, we will work it out, but it is going to take the time it takes". There is a hospital on the road. It is closed at the moment. It has a very active casualty department or will have when it reopens. We have to work out how that integrates with the cycle route. There is a market on the other side of the same street, directly opposite the hospital. Again, the stallholders there have a legitimate expectation that they are going to be able to take their vehicles to the market. There is the whole business about the traffic. If we did something that would seize up the traffic without introducing traffic mitigation measures and management measures of the type I have described and if the whole area seized up, then we would create a massive backlash and we would probably have to pull the whole thing out again.

That is why it takes time. It is about capacity to design routes and it is about getting the legitimate stakeholder interests in those routes in line.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Can I just ask Garrett what he thinks about that? Are the 128 staff that have been referred to all going to be doing design work? What exactly are they going to be doing?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** That is a range of people across all the disciplines we need. It is a bit of an oversimplification to say these are 128 cycling specialists. At the end of the day, the delivery of infrastructure on the road network involves all types of skills and so on and all of that is integrated whether we are delivering measures that are designed to benefit cycles or any other form of road user, major schemes and so on. This is all the same people working to deliver the Mayor's programme, whatever that may be.

I would reiterate almost everything that Andrew [Gilligan] said, but to avoid repeating him I would just re-emphasise that this is a massive step-change in investment. This is something like a tripling of our ambition for cycling over the next ten years compared to where we have been. It is not only a step-

change in terms of the volume of what we want to deliver. It is a step-change in the standards of what we are looking to deliver. One of the things that we were perhaps criticised for in the past was, "You need to do things to a higher standard". The whole Go Dutch campaign to which the Mayor signed up enthusiastically was about saying, "We want a really high standard of cycling provision that is comparable with the best in the world". We have to engineer that into a city that is incredibly busy and packed. I always think it is somewhat superfluous to try to relate what we do to what other cities do, whether it is

New York or Paris or whether it is about this or whether it is about cycle hire and so on. The circumstances are different. London's streets, as we all know, are very busy and very crowded. They have something like 40% more traffic on them, for a start, than any other city in the UK.

We already rely to a huge extent on technology to manage traffic flows and to keep the city moving and we are talking about putting a massive change onto that network in the way we allocate road space. It is not only about physically delivering cycling schemes. It is not only about managing traffic. It is actually also about changing the way we run TfL Surface Transport as a whole, which is one of the reasons that has contributed to the organisational changes that we are making to create a road space management directorate to enable us to take a holistic look at that. We no longer set up our organisation by defining how many wheels are on the vehicles so we have a department for cycling, a department for buses, a department for roads and so on. We are now looking at this holistically.

It is a big change. A few years ago I probably sat in this Committee and told you about what a big challenge delivering the traffic management changes for the Olympics were going to be. This makes that look like a walk in the park, to be honest. The scale of the change that we have to understand, model, engineer, deliver and then manage the traffic network around in the coming few years is a magnitude several times bigger than what we delivered for the Olympics. All of that does take time.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** The change starts with TfL, though, does it not? I appreciate that you are not responsible for 95% of the roads, but TfL is responsible for the disproportionately most dangerous roads because they are the busiest. How are you managing to change the skill-set of the people you already have? It is pretty clear that for a long period of time there has been this -- 'bias' is not the right word. Perhaps this is a partisan comment, but there has been more anxiety about traffic and traffic congestion and less about the sustainable transport users. How are you going to shift the balance back and make sure that all the schemes, as Charlie says, actually make sense for cyclists and pedestrians as well?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** From the point of view of TfL, I would argue that there has never been a bias towards any one mode of transport, be that road traffic, be that public transport, be that cycling and walking and so on. Our job has always been to effectively balance the needs of all of those users.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Do you think CS2 would have been better if that was true?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** It is a different issue and it is the one that Andrew [Gilligan] referred to, really. This is a learning process in terms of understanding and developing the types of solution that work best for cyclists in a city like London that allow us to continue to balance those needs of all other users. Would CS2 be different if we designed and built it today? Yes, it would. Was it the best scheme that we could have delivered at the time we put it in? I believe it was.

However, the world has moved on. Our thinking has moved on. The scale of our ambition has moved on. The knowledge and understanding we have has moved on. We talked a little earlier about trialling things. One of the things we have spent a lot of time and effort on is actually trialling new ways of doing things off-street down at the Transport Research Laboratory. We have spent several millions of pounds working very closely with them and we are now starting to see the fruits of some of that work coming out and being rolled out onto on-street trials and that will continue.

It is important, as Andrew says, that we learn thoroughly and we do these things right. We would not be thanked for rushing new innovative ideas that get headlines on day one but then cause a problem further down the road that we have not foreseen.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** All of us have said how keen we are to see the mini-Hollands and the Go Dutch-style engineering and how important that is, but if there are some locations where a temporary trial could be helpful and you might learn something and the community would accept it, would you not be willing to do that? I have certainly seen road-narrowing trials and so forth.

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** Absolutely. We would certainly not rule that out.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Let me give you an example. We are planning something like that, actually, at the Holborn gyratory. This is going to happen. As you know, two cyclists have died there this year alone. It is a particularly difficult spot and cyclists have long complained that they cannot use the contraflow bus lane in Vernon Place and Bloomsbury Way. Camden Council as the highway authority is about to do something temporary there with our support that will allow them to use that bus lane and avoid the gyratory altogether when they are going east. It is a very busy cycling route. In the medium term, we are funding Camden to do medium-term work as well that will enable a more permanent change to be made to that. Further down the track, the actual gyratory is going to be removed. That is the kind of thing that we are doing. A temporary change is coming in and the gyratory is to go in the future.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** One of the things that has come up during this transitional year has been TfL's apparent lack of ability to count accurately or model forward cyclist numbers. Would you agree with that? Is that going to be solved?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** TfL has said that the current modelling does not take account of cyclists very well. It treats a cyclist as a fifth of a car and as if it behaves in the same way as a car. That may be a simplistic way of putting it, but obviously a cyclist does not necessarily behave in the same way as a car because a cyclist can weave in and out of the traffic. Garrett, is this something you could comment on?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** Yes. That is part and parcel of the scale of the challenge that we both referred to in terms of managing traffic in its widest sense. When I talk about traffic, I mean pedestrians, cyclists, private vehicles, public transport on the road network, freight and so on.

Traffic modelling, even in its most sophisticated state, is an imperfect science. We have some of the most sophisticated traffic modelling capability in the world in London. We have some of the most

detailed models right across central and inner London. A large part of that is a legacy of all the stuff we had to do with the Olympics. Given the scale of the challenge that we have just described and I have referred to, we have to continue to develop that. We have to expand that not only on geographic terms but also in the capability of what it can achieve. Then we have to relate that to what we do on the ground because traffic modelling is just traffic modelling unless you can actually relate it to the technology you are using to manage traffic.

For instance, we have talked endlessly in the past about using the Split Cycle Offset Optimisation Technique (SCOOT) to improve traffic flows for vehicles and so on. We are expanding SCOOT now to look at whether we can develop it for pedestrians. We are trialling that sort of technology even as we speak. The next logical step is to do the same thing for cycling. It presents all sorts of different challenges. For instance, the way SCOOT loops work in the road is generally using metal to --

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** You are playing catch-up in this area?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** It is difficult to describe it as playing catch-up when I think we are moving ahead of probably anywhere else in the country in terms of our capability to do this. If you want to ask whether we need to go further faster than we have been doing, then yes.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** It is all right to say you are playing catch-up. Charlie wanted to come in and then over to Richard [Tracey].

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** Perhaps just on that issue, what we would like to see is TfL engineers to recognise the limitations of their modelling, particularly the flow modelling and the capacity modelling which they use to design junctions. The scientific basis of that is fairly wobbly and by the time they get incomplete data it is even more wobbly. The current practice is they produce predictions of delays and queues and this has very weak scientific validity. Very often, the predictions never come true. Really, time and again on schemes we hear innovative ideas have been blocked because the computer says no and we do not trust --

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Yes, we have met that computer.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** Specifically in terms of capacity and flow modelling, we think that the scientific basis of that does not justify reliance on the outcomes of those models.

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** I do not think we are relying on those outcomes. I would give you the example of the CS2 extension. If you go back and look at the published data in the business case, it shows you some very significant disbenefits to other modes of transport. If we were adopting a 'computer says no' type approach, we would have said no to doing that. We did not say no. We said yes. We look at these things in the round and we take a balanced view of what is best for London across all modes of traffic.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** I think TfL has admitted there was a huge data problem and they were using out-of-date data. Public transport capacity on that has more than doubled in a decade. The demand for motor traffic capacity has fallen. They were using

old data and came out with negative figures and this is the kind of problem that comes across at many other junctions and roads across London.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** There is a phenomenon of evaporation, is there not?

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** Yes.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** I just wanted to pick up the point that Garrett was making. He compared the efforts that TfL had to put in to deliver transport for the Olympics compared to what they are having to put in to deal with cycling. London is often described as a collection of villages, as I know it, and regularly places like Copenhagen and Amsterdam are mentioned. In fact, the Mayor in his article in the *Evening Standard* recently picked out Copenhagen and Amsterdam as the sort of models we are apparently aiming at. I was in Copenhagen about six weeks ago and the width of the streets and the sheer layout of Copenhagen are quite different from London, apart from being very much smaller. I am not so familiar with Amsterdam.

Can I ask: is there any real prospect that we are ever going to be able to reach the sort of standard for cyclists that they have in Copenhagen and indeed in Amsterdam?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** It depends what you mean by "will London be like Amsterdam or Copenhagen?"

**Richard Tracey (AM):** That is what the Mayor said, following that model.

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** -- because it never will. It will always be London and it will not be like Paris or New York. London has a unique set of conditions, as does every major city in the world. Our aspiration, I believe, is to give cyclists the facilities they need to enable them to move freely and safely around the city in the kind of volumes that we anticipate. We have stated ambitions to treble cycling over the next decade from where it was a while back and we have to recognise that we need the infrastructure in place to do that. We need the traffic management systems in place. We need to understand the flows and so on.

That is why I talk in terms of something that is probably bigger than the Olympics in terms of the change in traffic management - and I repeat again: traffic in its widest sense, all forms of flows of movement on the network - because it is bigger in scale. It is across the whole of London that we have to look at this. It is permanent in duration rather than temporary in duration. The physical interventions on the road network to enable it to happen are of the same scale. There is an obvious parallel if you think about the east-west Cycle Superhighway that I am sure we will get to at some point. It is not very different in Central London to what the Olympic route network looked like along the Embankment and Upper Thames Street and Lower Thames Street. It will require the same sort of changes to be effected in other forms of traffic flow around the network, not only in Central London but in the approaches to London and so on, to enable the city as a whole to keep moving. It is bigger in scale, permanent in duration and of equivalent transformational nature in terms of the physical changes on the road network.

Does all that add up to transforming London to become a Copenhagen or an Amsterdam or anywhere else you care to name? I believe it does, but of course it will be London that will, I hope, be seen as a

cycling centre for a large city. It is also important to remember that London is a city of a different scale to either of those two, a completely different scale.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Indeed.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** There are other parts of the world - I dare mention Tokyo and possibly Seoul - where they actually have quite an interesting culture between pedestrians and cyclists. I am not sure we can do it here, but those kinds of things should certainly be looked at.

The culture I really want to see changed is actually in TfL. It is the traffic engineer perspective about flows and what have you. To what extent will the 128 additional officers actually change that? I have had challenges with your traffic engineers at TfL on congestion charging when they have not really taken on board pedestrian flows as much as the flows of moving vehicles. Garrett, we are talking about a change of culture, essentially. Is that what you are doing at TfL, moving away from the traffic engineer?

**Garrett Emerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** We are always attempting to change culture and move it on and develop it as we learn more about what we can do. We have a set of challenges which is largely about getting more out of a finite road network in many different ways. This actually calls more broadly to the work that the Roads Taskforce did and the ambition that we have collectively now for London in terms of what we want out of our road network, the way streets typologies work and recognising that not all streets and roads play the same role and will have different priorities in different areas. We now have a much clearer focus about what we want to get out of different parts of the network in different places.

That needs to be translated into action. I agree with you. That needs to be translated into traffic engineers, highway engineers, whatever type of engineers or whatever type of people within the organisation working together to deliver what is right for a particular location in the context of what is right for London overall.

Does that require a culture change? I am sure it does. Is it a fundamental shift from what we have been doing? No, I do not believe so because ultimately it is the same. Our job is to deliver as best we can a balance between the collective aspirations that we have for all types of transport and indeed urban rail and public open space. One of the biggest challenges for us is not only about movement but, in high-profile places, how we deliver the highest standard of urban realm that we know we need to sustain London's economic vibrancy and attractiveness to invest in as a world centre and so on which makes the city what it is? There are all sorts of potentially conflicting challenges that we have to reconcile and the job of our engineers, the job of our designers and the job of our traffic operations people is to balance that and make sure we deliver absolutely as best we can.

I have noticed the railings disappearing in Central London, which I welcome as a pedestrian. Was that something that was a product of this new culture?

**Garrett Emerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** Again, I am not sure that is something new. We have had a programme to do that over a number of years now. On the TfL road network, all of the 180 kilometres have been reviewed and over a third of the railings have been removed. We still have an ongoing programme. It is smaller now simply because we have probably removed most of the stuff that we felt delivered no particular value. There are some and there will

always be some pedestrian guardrails that have particular value but it is important we get them in the right place at the right time. We are encouraging it and I know a number of other boroughs are very proactive on this as well.

**Roger Evans (AM):** Thank you, Chair. My questions are about casualty rates and cycling safety, which obviously has been in the headlines over the last month because of the tragic period that we have been through. Can you tell us, this is a good question for TfL, what has actually happened to the rates of cyclist casualties in London since 2008?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** Last year, we have to acknowledge 2012, was a particularly difficult year in terms of fatalities and serious injuries for cyclists but also for motorcyclists and pedestrians as well. The issue really is making sure that we do not draw too many conclusions from one year's data because the provisional data for the current year, although they are still very preliminary figures from the Metropolitan Police Service, suggest that actually that was a particularly bad year. The key issue is the long-term trends, which are broadly still going in the right direction.

2012 was a particularly bad year and we need to make sure that all the issues that Andrew outlined earlier on we press ahead with as quickly as we can, particularly around issues in relation to HGVs including construction HGVs where we know there to be a particular problem in relation to fatalities but also bearing down very hard on the serious injuries, which are of concern. To make sure that as the volume of cycling goes up in terms of the number of trips and miles or kilometres cycled, we do not necessarily see an increase in the rate of fatalities and serious injuries for the distance travelled.

**Roger Evans (AM):** Obviously, it is a little bit too early to be drawing conclusions, perhaps, but was there any common factor in the fatalities that occurred most recently? It has not just been cyclists. I had two constituents killed by a bus in Romford town centre during the same week, so it has been a pretty dreadful few weeks for road safety generally. Is there a reason for that or is it just statistical?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** It is very tempting to seek to draw broader conclusions from what was undoubtedly an appalling two or three weeks in terms of what actually happened on the roads. The total number of fatalities this year is the same in absolute terms as it was last year for the year to date. There clearly, as we know to be the case more generally, was a significant issue in terms of the recent casualties around lorries. There is a particular issue which was addressed at an event here around construction lorries. Because of the nature of the industry in which they operate and because of the sorts of vehicles used by construction companies and their clients and their suppliers, there are some serious issues around the way that safety is managed in relation to off-site safety and the types of vehicles. There is a particular effort going on around that. If you were to draw one conclusion from the recent events, it would be that we still have to do a lot more around lorry safety in particular, which is severely over-represented in terms of fatalities. Then, of course, there is a wider set of issues around the serious injuries, which have slightly broader conclusions. I would not want to draw any conclusions about the overall situation, but what it did confirm certainly in terms of the terrible recent events is the need to really keep on with this broader set of things around lorry safety, which Charlie and the LCC have done a lot of work on.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** You asked about rates and Ben has answered in terms of a casualty rate rather than casualty numbers. This is one of our strong points we made to the Committee last year. All casualties should be measured in terms of rates by

exposure, so how many people are killed or injured compared to how many of that particular road user there is, so compared to the number of cyclists or pedestrians.

Also, part of our problem at the moment is the media focus on cycling, which highlights the issues but perhaps takes attention away from the other issues in terms of the pedestrian casualties you have mentioned. We would like to see TfL express all of their casualty data in terms of rates but also explore other rates. As well as just looking at the victims, look at all the HGVs and see the all the casualties they are involved with, whether they cyclists, pedestrians, motorcyclists or car users. Again, look at white vans and take the same approach. That is where we identify the sources of danger. At the moment, we are not quite sure what all the real problems are. Some of these problems are hard to define, so there needs to be a different approach to measuring rates and really to understand. There are common factors that we have seen already, but perhaps they are there and they are not seen because the data has not been examined in any other way than except through a victim focus.

**Roger Evans (AM):** I always think there is a problem with just focusing on fatalities, partly because the numbers are low so there is likely to be a level of spiking and sampling error in it, but also because you are sometimes measuring the effectiveness of medical intervention.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** Serious injuries are a much better measure. Slight injuries are a problem in that they are not always recorded, but serious injuries are recorded and the numbers are bigger and give you a better idea of what the trends are. For cycling, the trends on serious injuries have not been good.

**Roger Evans (AM):** Do you have any evidence that the perception of cycling safety is actually reducing the amount of cycling in London going on?

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** I do not have direct evidence of that. The questionnaire done by the Committee suggests that it might be a problem and definitely anecdotally, after these horrific five or six weeks we have had, people are saying that they are considering cycling. The really big problem is that there are literally millions of people who are thinking about cycling and can see the benefits of cycling and would greatly benefit from the health benefits and time and wellbeing benefits of cycling. They are being put off by some of the events and the publicity around the recent events.

**Martin Key (Campaigns Manager, British Cycling):** On the perceptions of safety and whether people are being put off cycling, it is interesting to see the stat in the recent survey saying that 22% have decreased their number of trips. That is approximately in line with what British Cycling and Sky see in our much wider survey nationwide. We get a churn rate of about 20% to 25% of people who take up cycling and drop out and we know the biggest factor is concerns about safety.

That is broadly in line, but clearly there is an effect of the increased focus of media attention here. We need to combat that by showing that cycling is safe, which it is by a considerable factor with the benefits to your health compared to the risks. There is roughly only one death across the country for every 1,000 times pedalled around the world. It is a very, very safe activity, but we need to show that we are making improvements all the time. We need targets to help that and a rate-based target would be incredibly helpful.



**Roger Evans (AM):** Is there a seasonal effect on numbers, just while we are talking about it, because obviously more people must cycle in the summer than they do right now.

**Martin Key (Campaigns Manager, British Cycling):** There is a seasonal effect and, on the question about whether your cycling rates have decreased in the last six months, the season will undoubtedly have an effect on that.

**Roger Evans (AM):** You can build that into your survey over time, presumably, because it will be similar every year.

**Martin Key (Campaigns Manager, British Cycling):** Of course.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** People do say that one of the reasons that perceptions of safety are poor is that the roads are poor. Of course, there is a lot of justice in that. As I think we all agree, cycling is essentially quite safe and has become dramatically safer over the last ten years. The fatality rate in London per journey has more than halved and the serious injury rate has gone down, but perceptions of safety have got worse. It is not entirely due to the safety of the roads. We saw a poll last week in which 51% of people polled said that they believed cycling had become less safe over the last year. Actually, the roads have not changed for better or for worse, over the last year. They are no more safe or unsafe than they were over that time.

What has changed is the perception. The perception is driven by this all-consuming focus on deaths. The intention in that is right. People want to create pressure for action to get more people cycling and strengthen my hand, but the execution is in danger of causing the opposite. There needs to be a balance in the debate between the justified anger and concern that there is and the risk that people are being scared away from this actually life and health-giving pursuit. It is far more likely to prolong your life than to end it and it is far more likely to improve your health than to harm it.

**Roger Evans (AM):** There has been a slackening-off in the growth in cycling in London recently.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** There has, yes.

**Roger Evans (AM):** Do you think the Mayor is in danger of missing his long-term targets now?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** In the first four years of the Mayor's term, we saw roughly 8.5% or 9% growth a year in cycling in the TfL Road Network (TLRN), the TfL main roads, and significant growth in cycling in London as a whole as well. Last year was the year when that growth more or less stopped. It was about 1% last year. Probably, that was mostly due to the weather. It was a very wet spring, a very poor summer and a cold winter. Then there were special events like the Jubilee and the Olympics.

I cannot help wondering also if this all-consuming focus on death and so-called carnage on the roads helps put people off. It was when a lot of this started coming up and as we know, deaths in 2012 were lower than they were in the previous year, 14 compared to 16. I cannot help wondering whether that might also have been a factor in the sharp slow-down in growth that we have seen on the network.

**Roger Evans (AM):** Do you do any work on the sort of demographic of people who might be more easily persuaded to take up cycling and what you need to do to get those people to take it up? It might be that you have exhausted the potential of the particular initiatives you have in place and you need to do something else to get the next tranche of people to be convinced they should do it.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** It is a very good question. We have done some very detailed work looking at the combination of types of trips that could be cycled in terms of their length and their purpose. For example, we have excluded the ones that involve too much shopping that you could reasonably carry on a bike or that are over a certain distance that most people would not choose to cycle. We have overlaid that with some market research data about household types based on postcodes to come up with the sorts of trips that are most likely to be cycled in the areas and the types of journeys that are most likely to be taken up by, if you like, the near market.

What we know is that if we want to meet the Mayor's long-term cycle increase target, we will not be able to do that solely by recruiting more people like the current dominant demographic, which is men predominantly between 25 and 40, in generally well-paid jobs and generally commuting to Central London from inner and parts of outer London. We must get into other groups in the population who are not in that demographic.

That is partly why the programme that Andrew [Gilligan] outlined at the beginning of the session does not just deal with commuter trips into Central London, although it does do that, very importantly. It also deals with trips within and around outer London town centres, which is what the mini-Hollands will very much exemplify. If you significantly increase the cycling environment in a suburban town centre, there is a huge potential for cycling trips which would not be taken by the people who currently commute to Central London and crucially, from London's transport point of view, would mainly come from cars rather than public transport because that is the easiest switch to make in those outer London town centres.

You are absolutely right. It has to be a much more focused effort not only to increase the proportion of people from the current demographic but also to spread the appeal of cycling to a much wider part of the population.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** One of the key aims of the Vision, which I have said on many occasions, is that it is not really aimed principally at people who cycle now. It is aimed at them but they are not the principal audience. The principal audience is people who would like to cycle now but do not for various reasons. It is very much about getting more women cycling and more older people cycling and broadening it out beyond the traditional white, professional man in his 20s, 30s and early 40s that we have at the moment. Without that, we will not get more women cycling, more older people cycling and more black and ethnic minority (BME) people cycling. Without that, we are not going to see the growth we need.

Our measures are specifically targeted at those groups. That is who the Quietways are for. They are for people who do not necessarily want to get girdled up and strap on the Lycra and all that kind of thing and charge off on a fast bike. That is what the mini-Hollands are for. They are for people who make short journeys in the suburbs. The vast majority of journeys in the suburbs under two miles now are made by car. We want to transfer a significant proportion of those from cars to bikes. That is what the mini-Hollands are designed to do. That is what the rail superhubs are designed to do.

Rather than maybe getting a bus to the station in somewhere like Thamesmead, which is badly served for rail transport and lots of people get buses, you have a superhub at Abbey Wood and you cycle from Thamesmead to Abbey Wood, so short journeys. It does not always have to be the professional man in his 30s going a long distance on a commute. It could be a woman in her 60s going to the shops.

**Roger Evans (AM):** I am going to ask a philosophical question here, Andrew, Do you think the Superhighways are in the right place?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** They are not all in the right place. No, absolutely not. We can talk about this. We are moving them. Frankly, some of the roads on which they were originally supposed to go are completely unsuitable, so we are moving some of them. I have said this and you will see this in February when we announce all the routes. Some of the existing ones are coming off the existing routes and moving on to other routes where they are going to be safer and we can do more interventions. Some of the planned ones are coming off the existing routes. Some of the planned ones are going to be canned and then we have new ones on new roads as well, some of which you know about.

**Roger Evans (AM):** If you look at CS2, which I am quite familiar with - it is not in my patch but my constituents use it to get in and out of town - you will see a map of Tower Hamlets. It shows you have a lot of residential roads running parallel to CS2 which are largely under-capacity because years ago the council closed them to through traffic. You would need to deal with residents and you will need to deal with the authority that owns those roads. It is much more difficult to set up a route along roads like that, but do you not think that that would actually attract a lot more people? I do not cycle. I walk, but I do not walk in the middle of the road. I do not try to claim my piece of road space from other users. I like to walk not even in a busy road but down a side street or somewhere. You see a lot of streets in London actually that are under-used and are under-capacity and could be used for other forms of transport.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Yes, that is the Quietways. We are not going to move CS2. We are going to upgrade it in place. What we are also going to do is provide a high-quality parallel Quietway route to it so that people do not have to use it if they do not feel they want to tackle the Bow roundabout, for instance. In fact, there are going to be two. There is going to be one that goes to the north on borough roads and quiet roads --

**Roger Evans (AM):** I have seen the map of the Bow roundabout alternatives that you have provided.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Yes, we are going to do a better one than that.

**Roger Evans (AM):** Yes, good.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** It is going to go through the Olympic Park. Essentially, it is going to go up on minor roads, very quiet roads, residential roads to the north of the Whitechapel Road and the Mile End Road and then it is going to go up through the Olympic Park and then out into outer east London, so you are going to be able to avoid the whole of CS2 and the Bow

roundabout completely if you so wish, although you probably will not want to so much as you do as the moment because it will be upgraded, too.

The Quietways are very much intended as that. One of our early Quietways, Quietway 2 it is going to be called, is going to be in southeast London and it will offer a completely low-traffic or traffic-free alternative to both the A2 and the A20. That is going to be significantly attractive to a lot of people.

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** There is a connected point to some of the comments that have been made about the changing flows of where cycling is going to grow in the future. A point that is just worth making very briefly is that we have used up until now cycling levels on the TLRN as a proxy for measuring cycling growth in London on a regular basis. That is not the way we measure it in the annual travel in London report, but that is the way we report it on a month-by-month basis. It has become increasingly obvious to us that that is not going to be a reasonable way of measuring growth in cycling overall. One of the reasons potentially why you have seen a slowing down in the reported measurement is because we will start to see more growth in cycling away from those roads for all the reasons you have just heard. We are now currently looking at how we develop a new measure of cycling that we can report on a periodic basis and on an ongoing basis so that we continue to plot and track accurately growth in cycling across the whole network, not just on the TfL roads.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Thank you.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** We have already started to touch on some of the Cycle Superhighway issues, but clearly there is huge support to have the Cycle Superhighways improved. There is huge support for other roads to be improved. I know a petition was handed in last week about Mitcham Lane, which I am sure will have reached you.

In our survey, to which we have 6,000 responses, 79% of those think the Superhighways are not respected by other road users. They do not necessarily feel safe using them. Do you want to outline a bit more detail on Cycle Superhighways, starting with a bit on CS2, and whether you can outline a bit more? You said you might be changing some of the roads that are actually going to have the Cycle Superhighways on.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Like I say, the Cycle Superhighways are mixed. They are not all of the same quality. CS3 is actually quite good and we get very few complaints about that. CS2 is the least good and I have said that from the beginning. I do not believe in just blue paint on the road for Superhighways. I have impressed that strongly on everybody here and that is not going to be in the model in the future.

The Cycle Superhighways are going to be substantially upgraded. I will talk about CS2. There are basically three options in ascending order of ambition. What we have here is an ambition versus time situation. The more ambitious it is, the longer it will take to do. There are three options, but all the options include two things. They include the removal of Aldgate gyratory, which is not actually on the route but it is something you have to pass through to get onto it. That is not our road, of course, and it will be delivered after the rest of the route because it is a City of London road and they are doing it, but plans have been published for that. Improved plans including separated cycle lanes will be published for it shortly. Essentially, what is happening at Aldgate gyratory is that both Aldgate High Street and St Botolph Street are going to become two-way and there will be a new public square on

what is the western side of the gyratory now by the church. There will be separated cycle lanes along Aldgate High Street, so that is the Aldgate gyratory.

The other thing that is going to happen in all three options is that all the major junctions along the route are going to be given new cycle-separated junctions. We showed a picture of this, actually, ironically, on the very day that the first of this tragic spate of deaths happened. It includes a segregated run into the junction and includes new cycle-specific traffic lights. It includes largely separated phases for cyclists through the junction to minimise conflict with other traffic. That is a template we hope to roll out across London at busier junctions because, of course, 85% of deaths and serious injuries happen at junctions, so the junctions are the key things to tackle. Those two things are common to all three options.

Essentially, option A is a mixture of segregation and what we are calling semi-segregation, which is essentially traffic wanders on a wider shared bus-and-bike lane and then segregation for about 37% of the route and semi-segregation for the rest. That is the quickest. It will take the least time and will not require massive re-planning of the bus stops. The bus stops might have to be inset so that cyclists can pass them, but the cycle lane will be wide enough so that cyclists can pass them anyway.

Option B is a fully segregated track along the kerbside, very much like the extension between Bow and Stratford already has. That is more ambitious. It is going to take a bit longer and cost a bit more. There is a significant impact on buses with that one. You need to remove the bus lane over quite a long way for it.

Option C is a segregated track in the middle of the road. In many ways, that is the most ambitious and it avoids a lot of the problems with the buses. It avoids a lot of problems with the kerbside activity, things like the hospital, the market and so on. However, it is something new for us, so it will take longer. The key issue, of course, is how you get on and off. If most of the cycle movements on and off the main road are at the five major junctions, then it should not be too bad because they can be signalised. If, however, there are significant turning moves into smaller roads like Tredegar Square or Bancroft Road or whatever, then that is going to be more problematic. Are you going to have gaps in the central segregation and people will then shoot out of the gaps and maybe get run over by a bus coming on the road or are you going to have to make people double back? Those are the kinds of issues with a central track.

Those are the three options. I have described them publicly already. There was a meeting organised by John Biggs [AM], which I think you were at, Caroline, about two weeks ago at which I described these. We are going to show them to people and get some initial views and then we will take some views on what people want to see there. It is a trade-off between ambition and time, as always. That is CS2.

The key issue with this route and with a lot of other routes is the buses. Most of the Superhighways are busy bus routes and of course, if you just put the cycle lane in between the kerb and the bus, anyone stepping off a bus risks being hit by a cyclist. That is not acceptable because bus passengers are just as important to us as cyclists and there are a lot more of them. We have to work it out in a way that avoids that kind of conflict between bus passengers and cyclists. On the extension, we have done it by using floating island bus stops so you step off the bus onto a little island. That seems to be working all right and that may be how we do it here if we do the fully segregated option. The other way we have done it, of course, is to put these things on routes where there are no buses, the Victoria

Embankment being one example. That is where the east-west Superhighway is going, largely on non-bus roads, which is one reason we can, again, be categorical that we are going to do segregation all the way along there. The bus is the main issue. The kerbside activity is a secondary issue but not unimportant.

Therefore, those are the three options for CS2. As I say, we are also going to create a parallel Quietway route to it through the Olympic Park.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** It is great to hear the detail and to hear it before the Committee here. Your routes seem to vary from about 37% segregation right up to 100% segregation, but the key thing for cyclists is when they will actually notice some improvements. When will we actually see some of these things implemented? It is the timing of it. I know you said the early Cycle Superhighways were rushed and perhaps their poor quality is as a result of that. You have all these engineers now. Surely we can get this worked up quickly and introduced really quickly on the highway. Talk to us about CS2 and then I want to come to the others.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** In terms of CS2, like I said, it is an exceptionally complicated road. I went through some of the issues on it: the market, the hospital, the huge amounts of kerbside activity, the huge numbers of buses, 42 buses an hour on that road. There are actually almost as many buses, according to the Department for Transport (DfT) traffic counts anyway, as there are cycles. There are 1,500 buses a day on that road compared with 1,900 cycles and they carry gigantic numbers of people. That is the key issue we have to resolve. On the first Quietway routes, let me give you a timetable --

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** No, I do not want to talk about Quietway routes. I am talking about CS2. You have given me three possible options. When is the timescale for those to actually be introduced on the highways so cyclists will see a difference?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** When the Mayor opened the extension, he said that he hoped to see the improved CS2 next year. That is 2014.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** By the end of the 2014, there will be substantial works carried out and open for cyclists on CS2?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** It depends which option is chosen. It will take longer if we do the most ambitious option, the middle-of-the-road track.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** If it was longer, how long are we talking? Until the end of 2015?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** One of the things we want to do when we lay out the options is bottom-out exactly how long the middle-of-the-road track is going to take and I do not have an answer on that yet. Garrett, do you know?

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** An approximate answer. Garrett, do you have an idea?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** On that particular option, we will be doing something we have not done before, so I do not have an answer for you today any more than Andrew has. We will look to understand that as part of the consultation, we can say, "Here are three options. They can be delivered in these three timescales", because --

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** If the Mayor has already said he hopes works will be completed by the end of next year --

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** Yes, and Andrew has already said it depends on which option that is taken.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** If we chose the least ambitious option, the mixture of segregation and semi-segregation, which actually does offer significant amounts of protection for cyclists because there will be something physically separating them from the rest of the traffic the whole way along, that could be done by next year. The fully segregated track might be possible by the end of next year. It might be a little bit longer than that. The one on Stratford High Street took about 18 months from beginning to end. We can hope to improve on that. As I say, the most ambitious option, the middle track, will require longer than the other two.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Eighteen months was a very long time, particularly as you have already done this before and it was tried and tested, so let us hope we can go for something quicker than that.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** I think we can improve on that.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Can I ask about the other Cycle Superhighways, the other three? When can we expect some changes on those, particularly given that there are some difficult junctions that need to be resolved, Stockwell being just one example?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** OK. CS3 is going to be integrated into the new east-west Superhighway. It will form part of a continuous route from east London to west London. It will be joined up with the new bit that we are doing along Upper and Lower Thames Streets and the Embankment, so there will be a new section through the Tower gyratory to connect that up.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** The timescale for that?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** The east-west Superhighway is going to go out to consultation in June, so the full designs will be published in June. The construction phase is currently planned to be early 2016. I am hoping to see if we can advance that. The Mayor is very keen to advance it, but it is an incredibly complicated thing.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** OK. For CS3 we are talking improvements early 2016, but you --

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** No, CS3 is not really essentially going to change. It is reasonably good already. There are few changes in the Canning Town area I would like to see.

The proposal for Cycle Superhighway 7 (CS7) is far greater semi-segregation. The timescale of that is going to be announced when we do the full scope of the Superhighways programme announcement in February, but again --

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** You cannot tell us now; you are going to tell us in February?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Yes. The Mayor has promised in the Vision that they are all going to be upgraded by 2016. It is just a question of where in the programme it comes.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** OK, so by 2016 we will expect all of them to be upgraded?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** All of the existing Superhighways will be upgraded and all of the new Superhighways that we are going to announce in February will be completed.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** What proportion of the Superhighways by 2016, when all the works will be done, will be fully segregated?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** I will not give you an exact figure on that. I have a rough figure, but it does depend on what happens at the mini-Hollands. Essentially, there are a couple of very ambitious proposals for Superhighways in the mini-Hollands which would make a significant difference to any figure I could give you.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** I accept that, but is it your hope though that over 50% of them would be fully segregated?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** There is going to be a mixture of provision. There is going to be segregated. There is going to be semi-segregated. There are going to be low-traffic streets. There are going to be painted lines.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** I accept the roads mean you cannot always have full segregation on every element, but approximately how much of them do you think? Are you wanting 50% of the roads --

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** All right. These are very rough figures. They depend very much on the mini-Hollands. I think roughly 50% segregated or traffic-free, roughly 20% semi-segregated, roughly 25% on low-traffic streets and then 5% paint, but that is very, very rough and I do not want to be held to it.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** No, but it gives us a steer of where you are looking to go and I think that sounds really, really positive.



One of the other issues that came up, which actually surprised me, from our survey was that 66% felt that the signage on the Superhighways was bad or very bad, which is rather worrying. What are you going to do to improve the signage as part of this overall of the Cycle Superhighways?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** I was surprised by that. I do not agree with that, actually. That is one of the findings that I do not agree with. We do have quite a lot of work going on with way-finding. The Quietways in particular are going to need quite substantial way-finding. One of the ways the London Cycle Network currently falls down is that it is very difficult to follow. You need to be in no doubt when you are on one of these things that you are on one of them and that you can follow it. That is not going to mean streaks of paint all the way down the roads because residents would not accept that, but it is going to mean adequate way-finding at every decision point plus some in between to make you confident you are on the right route. We are developing a whole set of way-finding signs. Mostly, it is going to be on-carriageway, I hope, rather than having lots of signposts and street clutter. That depends to some extent on what the Government allows us to do.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Is the DfT an obstacle here?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** The DfT, yes. Essentially, there is something called the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions, which is a rather prescriptive set of standards that sets out, among other things, what size letters you are allowed to paint on the road.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Probably the font as well.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Yes. At the moment, if we are going to achieve what we think of as adequate standards of way-finding, it would require letters about six feet high in some cases. That is a little bit of an exaggeration, but substantially large letters, probably too large letters for the residents of some Georgian square in Kensington to put up with. We have a whole list of wants in with the DfT, which we are hoping to hear an answer to in the next few days, actually. One of the things we are asking for is a relaxation of the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD) to allow us to put more information on-carriageway. Typically, on a Quietway, hopefully, you will see a square and then you will see the route number and you might see "Central London" and an arrow, "Brixton" and an arrow, "Northbound" or "Southbound" or something like that.

A lot of these routes are going to be way-marked but they are going to be named after bus and Tube routes so that they align with people's mental maps. For instance, you will see in the Central London Grid next week we are going to show a Circle line Quietway. That runs on quiet routes roughly parallel to the route of the Circle line. It is not going to run straight above the Circle line because part of the Circle line runs underneath the Euston Road, for instance, which is not very suitable for a Quietway, but it will run on a road parallel to the Euston Road. We are going to have a Victoria line Quietway. You will probably see on the sign something like "QV" to denote the Victoria line Quietway and, if you get on there, you know where the Victoria line goes so you know where it is going to take you next. If you get on there at Brixton, you know the next place it is going to take you to is Stockwell and Vauxhall after that. You just follow those arrows. Hopefully, that is how the way-marking is going to work and it is going to be much better than now.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** That sounds very good and I hope to hear that we are going to get improvements from the DfT on this.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Yes. We still do not know.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** We would support that. Can I just ask before I bring in the cycling groups? There is a huge amount of work you have to do here. You have 128 new members of staff. Have you looked internationally to ensure that we are going to learn from international best practice? Maybe seconded in some experts to really help you on this? Because I have to say, if they are all, with respect, British engineers, I do not think they are going to have the international vast experience and expertise that we really need to bring and draw on to the challenge we face in London.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Yes is the short answer to that.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning at Surface Transport TfL):** We have done some of that already, Caroline, so we have had, for example, a secondee - she left recently - who was from the city of Copenhagen which is well known for its commitment to cycling. There is a mixture of things which include both offering opportunities for people to actually come and work with us but also making sure that everybody who works for us is fully aware of what other countries are doing, what other cities are doing. Therefore, that might involve visits, it might involve shared workshops, so there is a range of ways that we can take advantage of what other cities have learned.

Also it is worth saying that, within London, there is a very significant range of experience and expertise. There are some boroughs like Camden who are at the front edge of what works on London streets and they are starting to do things now which they have tried in parts of Central London which they are now evolving. Therefore, some of the ideas about semi-segregation have been tried in Camden and are working. For example, on College Street, there is a new scheme gone in there, so I think that whilst we need to look around the world for both insights and expertise, we need to make sure also that the kind of pool of knowledge we have London, particularly in some of the boroughs like Camden, is also being taken advantage of to make sure we are not avoiding that knowledge.

Just a quick word to follow on Andrew's point of way-finding, as he mentioned, we have some research underway looking at how cyclists route plan and there are two things which have come out very clearly. One is that what experienced cyclists feel able to use in terms of information when they are on their journey is quite different from what a novice cyclist would do. So, for example, it looks like experienced cyclists can process information much more quickly because they are not thinking more about the actual physical act of cycling like a novice cyclist might be. Also you need to complement what you have on the street, as would be the case with any journey, with what is available online, in paper maps, in terms of route planning before you actually get your bike out and set off on the journey. Therefore, we need to make sure that whatever we end up with on streets, how it looks and how it fits with DfT, is also supported by stuff on our website and the boroughs' websites, all the paper maps we produce, so it looks like a suite of information that does not just meet the needs of commuter experienced cyclists but actually people who are trying it for the first time that do not get put off by getting lost.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Lovely, thank you for that. I want to bring in Martin and Charlie to find out what other things you want to see to make the Superhighway safer.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** Where do we begin? We criticised the design of Superhighway 2 before it happened and we said the money should have been better spent on upgrading the routes that were already there. I think now, TfL recognises there are problems there. We do welcome the development of superhighway routes off the main roads and that was the original conception under the previous administration, was for superhighway routes off main roads, so we welcome that.

There is a risk that if nothing is done, there are some hugely hostile main roads out there. They may not be Superhighways but still cycling needs to be addressed on those roads because they will be used by cyclists, so it is not just the Superhighways. We need not just 120 cycling experts in TfL; we need every engineer in TfL to be a cycling expert which supposedly they undertook to do in 2006 but not much came of that.

The Superhighways, we welcome the developments, we welcome the ones on main roads being much safer. We have heard Andrew's description of some of the options and I think, based on past experience where you have say, for example, if the option is segregation and semisegregation, will we get what we have had so often before, that the bits that are easy have wonderful segregation and are very comfortable and the bits that are difficult i.e. the bits that are dangerous or the junctions where they prioritised high capacity motor traffic, those are the areas that are not done so well.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** The answer to that is no. I have already said clearly that in every option, all the junctions are going to be provided with cycle separated junctions.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** We will come on to junctions in the next area of questions.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** Also it links back to the Quietways network. Andrew has described that as London Cycle Network done properly and I am sure, as all of you know from issues in your areas, most of the problems in the London Cycle Network have been where it has crossed the TfL road network, the Mayor's road networks, where they have not historically made safe provision for crossing the main roads. It is wonderful, the idea of quiet networks everywhere, but to be real, quiet networks only work if they have safe crossings off the dangerous roads.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** That is absolutely the intention. Let me be clear about this. We will not give up at the difficult places, Quietways or Superhighways. Let me give you an example of a Quietway that will do that. At the moment, we have London Cycle Network 3 (LCN 3), which runs from Waterloo to Clapham. Quite a nice backstreet route except where it takes an awful sort of dogleg to avoid Vauxhall. It is going to go straight through Vauxhall in our proposals for directness and it is going to do so in a segregated track.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Let Charlie finish his exposition.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** London Cycle Network 3 also is a good example of where, disregarding the DfT, the engineers did put road-markings down on road-markings showing cyclists the way to find that route. I think TfL should have the same courage that the Lambeth Council did all those years ago.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** I wanted to focus on the cycle Superhighways if we could, Charlie. What else could be done to improve them?

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** I think anything that is done to Superhighway 2 is an improvement and I think everyone, every Committee Member here and every engineer at TfL should go to Aldgate East and just stand for half an hour on the junction of Whitechapel High Street and Leaman Street and Commercial Street and that is such a hostile area, not only for cyclists; for pedestrians. You see the bus drivers are all tensed up. They do not know what to do with the traffic turning across them and the cyclists. I think that is an example and it is on the superhighway. All of the thinking should be around resolving such horrendous places as that. They should not exist in a city like London.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Let me be clear about that as well. That is going to be fully segregated in all the options.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Andrew, just hold your horses a bit. We know you feel strongly about this but let us extract the value from Charlie first.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** Therefore, that is an expression, that is of the scale of the problem and I recommend everyone to go there and stand there and just see it.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** We will do a site visit. We were talking about this beforehand and you have made a clear suggestion now, so that is very helpful. We will make a note of that.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** Some of the designs we have seen on the new superhighway, and we have seen very, very few of them, they do look encouraging but I am a bit surprised Andrew says he has had no complaints, or very few complaints on Superhighway 3. One of the issues there is the western end of that route is over-capacity, so there are beginning to be conflicts with pedestrians. That needs to be realised.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Just some tweaking to that one.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** Also I think Andrew did recognise there are problems where that crosses some of the main roads around Canning Town. I think the essence for a superhighway is in the delivery of a route which does not impose a time penalty for cyclists. Taking them off the main roads is very good if it is not going to have circuitous routes because the evidence from the Netherlands, the evidence from London, the evidence from the rest of the UK is that cyclists will not use a route which means they have to take a long diversion and lose time over the main road route.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** If it adds considerable time, people will not use a quiet route.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** People have transport choices every day and if a cycling route is put up and labelled a cycling route which takes them around houses

and takes a lot longer or has difficult junctions, people do not use them. Therefore, the test is in its usability.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** That is very helpful.

**Martin Key (Campaigns Manager, British Cycling):** I think cycle Superhighways have been a process since their first inception and it depends which sort of group of potential cyclists you are targeting. I think the first set of Superhighways were really good about making cycling more visible in London, that this was a desired transport mode. It did help to boost cycling on those routes but clearly there is a demand for better all the time. I think the issue to do with signage and continuity of routes is very important and that links into the perceptions of safety. People want to be confident on their route. They do want to have to worry and that will help greatly with the perception of safety of cycling in London, so I think the issue to do with the DfT is really interesting. Lots of other cities around the country are having those same issues. They want to do these things but they are not being allowed because the regulations are not right or the continuity of the guidance is not correct.

It is interesting about the question of do we have the expertise in this country to create these? Why do we not just ship a load of engineers over from the Netherlands and Denmark? I have asked this question on several occasions and people have told me we do have the expertise over here, we do know what to do but it is about priorities and often a design, when you start sketching it, about a wonderful cycle route, will look fantastic on paper, but then you get all those blockages that are in the way and the different priorities about keeping traffic flowing, about car parking. It is about what we want to do. Do we want to promote cycling or do we want to promote other modes of transport? We need to make sure that all those are aligned to get the perfect route and it is great to hear about what is happening on the rest of the superhighway network. We are clearly making big advances. It is just a question of speed.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Thank you very much.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Thank you. We need to talk some more about junctions as a key priority.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** This is certainly something that has been raised as a serious concern by many cyclists. Originally, Andrew, the Mayor had published a plan for safety improvements at 500 junctions. That has now been whittled down to 33. Presumably there are still key concerns that TfL have about the other 467, so I would just like you to lay out, at the moment, what sort of improvements we can expect to see in the next year.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Let me talk you through this. The original junction programme was, as you say, 500 junctions worth £19 million which was about £40,000 a junction; not enough to do anything even remotely serious at any of them. £38,000 I make it actually, with my mental arithmetic. I said and the Vision said when we published it that the junction review had lacked resources and focus and it would be refocused to concentrate far greater resources on to the worst junctions, the junctions through which most cyclists pass.

Therefore, what we have done is increase the budget for the junction review more than fivefold from £19 million to £100 million and that is not all in fact that we are spending on junctions. We will be spending well north of £100 million on junctions including money from other programmes like the

Superhighways and the Quietway programmes. We have reduced the number of junctions we are going to tackle to 33 and those junctions are the worst, nastiest, most intimidating junctions and there is enough money there now to deliver. Instead of doing very minor changes at lots of junctions, we are doing genuinely transformational changes at the worst junctions.

The others are not going to be ignored. Garrett can talk about that in a minute. They are going to be funded from other programmes and not necessarily the cycling programme but we are talking about the Elephant and Castle. The 33 include Elephant and Castle, they include Vauxhall, they include Swiss Cottage, they include Aldgate, which I already mentioned. These are locations which need significant amounts of money spent on them to do them, to make them genuinely cycle friendly, and that is what they are going to get.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** I think we all want to see dramatic, complete redesigns at those nastiest junctions you mentioned. However, cyclists do use other junctions and I would like to hear about what plans there are for other junctions around London that you had previously identified as something that is being a barrier to the cyclists.

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer for Surface Transport, TfL):** I think Andrew need not beat himself quite so hard on behalf of the Mayor. The original commitment was to review 500 junctions. The commitment was not to carry improvements at 500 junctions. The commitment was to review them, to understand what needed to be done. That is actually the case, Caroline. What that review concluded was there were around 100 junctions where substantial works were required of one sort or another and that was the programme we were then progressing.

At that point, Andrew felt that actually that was spreading the jam too thinly and that we should look to focus to do substantial improvements at those junctions that were highest priority. That is where the Vision moved from where we were heading to where we are today. Those 33 junctions are not the only 33 where we are doing work. I think that is the key point because on top of that, you have all the work that will now be going on with the Superhighways' programmes, of which the major junctions, many of the junctions that were originally identified, are now cycle superhighway routes potentially, or are on East/West or North/South routes, on Quietway routes.

There are some 200, if I remember rightly, junction crossing points of the TLRN that we were just talking about five minutes ago whereas part of the Quietways network or the Central London Grid or whatever, we will have to do work to improve the safety of those junctions as part of those schemes. To kind of characterise that somehow we have gone from 500 junctions down to 33 junctions is to misrepresent where we have gone. There are 33 junctions in what is now the better junctions project/programme where we are going to do substantial work but there is a far, far higher number of junctions across the city, on the TLRN and on borough roads, where we will be doing work to improve cycle safety which I am sure is what we all want.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** So if we have Andrew's 33, can you just tell us how many additional junctions and what sort of timescale we are looking at.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Let me give you an example. As I mentioned, the five junctions, the five major junctions on the CS2 are all going to be upgraded with these cycle safe junctions. Now, not all of those five actually appear on the list of 33. Aldgate does because it is

a big one. It is not actually on the superhighway, as I mentioned before, but the other five do not. Therefore, that is five extra already which are going to be significantly upgraded.

Each of the new Superhighways, each of the new Quietways, as Garrett said, is going to involve junction improvements along it. Can I give you an exact number? No because we have not scoped every single one of the routes yet.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** When might you be able to give us that because I think it will be useful to be able to track the rate of progress on that given, not you personally, Andrew, but TfL did do a big fanfare around the 500 junction review and so on. I think it would be useful if we started to get some figures on that and some timescales.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** The answer to that is when we have scoped the routes, Darren, and we still have not finished discussing all the routes with the boroughs. This is what I mean about having to get the agreement with stakeholders to do things on their roads.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** In terms of the Better Junctions Review, how would you rate the progress to date?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** We published designs as I hope you have seen for Elephant and Castle, which is the busiest single cycling junction in London. We are going to remove the northern roundabout completely and we are going to install segregated tracks through that location. That is pretty significant. We are about, I suppose, a month, two months, maybe a little longer, not much longer, off publishing designs for Vauxhall. We have designs on the way for Aldgate. You will see designs for Swiss Cottage when we do the CS 11 proposals, so as each route and as each individual junction comes out; you will see it as it comes. We are going to publish the 33 list probably in January or February.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** OK and in terms of the previous line of questioning about capacity, is that a barrier as well in terms of how many junction improvements can be delivered at the TfL? You discussed that in the context of cycle superhighway.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Yes. What do you mean?

**Darren Johnson (AM):** Capacity in terms of expertise amongst TfL and recruiting new people.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Yes, of course. It certainly is but I do think we have enough capacity, or we will have enough capacity by the time we finish the recruitment drive to progress it.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning at Surface Transport TfL):** It is worth saying, notwithstanding Charlie's doubts about traffic modelling, one of the big technical constraints is the availability of people who can traffic model because that is a particular skill set which historically, in the UK, has been in relatively short supply. We probably have, as Garrett mentioned earlier on, some of the best traffic models in the country, whatever Charlie may think of their skills. It is worth saying, in that context, that it is not only the cycling programmes that are in scope for London in the next five or ten years. There is a substantial amount of other changes to the network that is going to be brought and came out very clearly in the Roads Taskforce Review. It will be happening because of

major developments in particular, so a lot of these locations, Elephant and Castle being the case in point, which Val will be very familiar with, is the site of a very substantial development which is going on alongside the cycle superhighway and the cycling improvements. The same is true at Vauxhall, at Waterloo, and Croydon. In lots of places, there are very substantial developments going on which also need to be factored in.

The other thing is the boroughs themselves have ambitions partly to do with cycle but partly otherwise around town centre improvements. Therefore, there has been a debate around Twickenham. Most boroughs have at least one substantial project they have in mind or is underway for their town centres, to improve their economic and social vitality. Therefore, although the cycling programmes we are doing are very significant, quite rightly for the reasons we have been discussing, there is significant change in scope for the road network in London which had nothing to do with us and we are happy to enable and understand it. It is not just the cycling that will affect cumulatively what is going on in the network. It is that other people want to be thinking of the network as well in a relatively short period of time because luckily London does.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** The junctions have exemplified, Darren, the kind of discussions we have to have and this is what we have been doing over the last nine months. Often quite involved discussions with stakeholders, developers, local councils, individual business interest groups about what they want out of these junctions. It has taken absolutely months to get agreement on the Elephant and Castle. It has taken months to get agreement on the Aldgate. That is what we have been doing.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** I can see that. When we accepted that petition outside this morning, one of the key demands of that petition was a clear plan and I think this is something very much where a clear plan in the public domain is demanding pulling together the 33 in the Better Junctions Review, the other junctions that TfL are involved in, the other schemes, the borough schemes and so on. I think Londoners would want to see that brought together into a clear plan with a clear timeline. Are you able to commit to that?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** I think it is a reasonable demand and yes, but with the caveat that some of these things will depend on negotiation with other people and some of them are, in other words, out of our control. I am discussing something potentially very important and significant and I would like to announce next week with the Central London Grid; I cannot tell you what it is because one of the stakeholders, one of the five stakeholders involved has not agreed to it yet, or at least I thought they had and they have changed their mind again. That is the kind of thing we have to cope with.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** Before I hand back, I would very keen to hear from both LCC and British Cycling of their initial take on what you have heard regarding junctions. Charlie.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** I think 500, 100, 33, it shows the scale of the problem. We are trying to play catch-up with 40, 50, 60 years of transport engineering which disregarded cycling and made it very difficult for a lot of people to cycle in London. It is a huge job. We have been involved with some of the discussions on the Better Junctions Review and we have seen incremental changes in the thinking of TfL and that is to be welcomed, but we are distressed, as I think you, are that we have seen nothing on the ground. We are also distressed that



we too have been asking for this list when the shortened list was announced in the Mayor's Vision which I think is nine, ten months ago.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** You will get the list soon, Charlie. It is going to be another month or so.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** There is progress here but the scale of the problem is enormous and I think what is really important for us is that the lessons that are being learned, we are not supportive of all of the designs we have seen, so we think there are more lessons to be learned but those lessons should be carried forward into everything that TfL does. The engineering, to make every road junction safe for cycling should become part and parcel of what every road engineer in London does. We think there is an opportunity for change but we are very distressed that there is nothing on the ground that we can see.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** You want to see a very clear plan then.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** Absolutely a plan. One of our roles in representing the stakeholders, the London cyclists, is we are finding it very difficult with short notice sometimes to bring in the people with local expertise to talk about the plans, to look at the options and to be effective as stakeholders.

**Martin Key (Campaigns Manager, British Cycling):** Just to say that clearly from the recent survey, the junctions are an absolute key issue; 92% rate it as important or very important and that backs up British Cycling's own data. We welcome the announcement that this funding is going into junctions but I totally agree with what Charlie was saying is that we need to be thinking about planning cycling in from the very start, when roads are redesigned, when every opportunity we have to make improvements to cycling should be taken.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** Obviously new junctions are being designed and so on. Do you feel that we have learnt from the mistakes of the past or are we still designing in failure from the beginning?

**Martin Key (Campaigns Manager, British Cycling):** I think there will always be room for improvement. You go over to the Netherlands and they are constantly trying new things to make cycling more attractive and more appealing. Therefore, we will make mistakes, that is undoubtedly but we are on the road, we are going in the right direction. Let us not beat ourselves up about too many things. As long as we are setting ourselves the right goals and the right targets and we have heard some very good announcements today.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** Do we need to try to lure some Dutch engineers over here?

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** I think we should be sending our engineers to the Netherlands to see what how it works there on the street and talk to the Dutch engineers. I think the point has been made that London's solutions will be specific to London but I think there is a learning process. One of the things we would be very keen on is to see a proper audit of every road scheme beyond the safety audit. There was a system called a non-motorised road user audit. I am not sure if TfL still uses that. They did undertake to do it for all schemes about seven or eight years ago. We would like to see a new audit process based on the new London cycle design standards so that every engineer working on London roads is familiar with those standards, that they

do not design junctions whether they are on the superhighway or Quietways or anywhere else; any junctions which put cyclists at risk. That is the core of Dutch road transport engineering. They recognise that junctions are where the danger is, so they design junctions to be safe places. They do not design them to be places to expedite motor traffic to go through at high capacity and high speed. That is the fundamental difference.

**Garrett Emmerson (TfL):** Just two quick points. There seems to be an impression that somehow there is an artificial divide between engineers that design cycling schemes and engineers that design road schemes generally. There is not. They are one and the same thing and the ramp up in resources, the extra 120-odd people, is because we have a bigger programme and we need more engineers to deliver it. It just happens to be that most of that bigger programme is to do with delivering cycling but there is not some kind of artificial divide.

Charlie, you will be reassured to know that if you have to sign off the international travel approvals that I have to sign off, you will know that we are going to Copenhagen and Amsterdam and places like that to do exactly the kind of things you suggest we should be doing.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** That is good to know. Charlie said before that he wanted every traffic engineer to be a cycling expert. Are you confident that is the case in TfL now?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer for Surface Transport TfL):** I want every traffic engineer to be a cycling expert, a bus expert, a pedestrian expert, a freight expert and a private vehicle expert.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** Are they?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer for Surface Transport TfL):** To understand all the uses of the road network, they have to know an awful lot about urban rail --

**Darren Johnson (AM):** Are you confident you can say that for TfL?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer for Surface Transport TfL):** Yes. I think we are always learning. As Charlie says, if we were an organisation saying, "Yes, I am confident we know all the answers to this", then we would be failing you and we would be failing the public. We are always learning and we should always be learning and we can always learn from things we get wrong in the past, we can always learn from things that other people do right and indeed things that people get wrong and say, "Well, we tried this. It did not work. Do not do that". It is a continuous process. We are learning fast. We will continue to learn fast. It is a huge challenge for us. The people we have are dedicated, enthusiastic, and I do not think anybody would dispute this, and are looking to deliver better solutions for us in the future. We have made some massive steps forward, I truly believe that, and I think we will make further massive steps forward in the weeks and months and years to come.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** There are a number of junctions that have not been mentioned, particularly in West London which I am very concerned about and some of them are huge gyratories like the Hammersmith gyratory, Earl's Court gyratory. I am sure there are cyclist concerns with those and I suspect they are red routes and part of TfL's network already, so I would like an update of what you are proposing there.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Hammersmith is on the list. It is one of the 33. It is a huge junction. It is going to be a lot of money to make it genuinely unthreatening for cyclists but it is necessary because there is no real way round it.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** Earl's Court, that one drops off very often because I suspect it is probably mostly pedestrian concerns which are raised rather than cyclists.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Yes. That is not one of the 33. It is a long gyratory but there are other proposals.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning at Surface Transport, TfL):** There are very substantial development proposals in Earl's Court which, certainly based on their aspiration for that whole area, will pick up a lot of these issues for a path that wide.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** That is one of your gyratories, is it not?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning at Surface Transport, TfL):** Yes, absolutely. I think there is a vast development, as you know, proposed for Earl's Court and basically a whole new city court which Sir Terry Farrell has [Terry Farrell & Partners] been doing the master planning for which I think will both be within the estate that will be created but also how that connects to the wider road network. Obviously you have to take this into account from the very beginning in terms of how that fits into the wider network.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Let us stick to the general issues at this stage. I know we all want to know about our list but we need to get into HGVs.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** We do obviously want to discuss with all of you the matter of HGVs and the apparent threat, it is a very, very real threat that they pose to cyclists. Can I start with you, Andrew, and with your colleagues from TfL? How are you improving the HGV safety in the light of the recent police operations and the rather alarming reported facts that apparently two-thirds of HGVs do not comply with regulations?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** That was a figure that came out of one specific operation at Vauxhall which is a kind of tryout for the operation we started, Operation Safeway, two weeks ago. The total for the Operation Safeway is still very high, very, very striking levels of non-compliance by HGVs. As of the day before yesterday, out of 724 stopped, 217 were given fixed penalty notices, 30%, for various legal offences. Eleven were so dangerous, they were taken straight off the road. Therefore, we are seeing striking levels of non-compliance with existing regulations by HGVs and that is something we have really taken note of and we are going to do an enormous amount more of enforcing the existing regulations.

We have already boosted our enforcement capability in this area, as the Vision announced, both the police, the police's commercial vehicle units, which we fund, and also VOSA, the DfT's Vehicle and Operator Services Agency, have more staff to enforce the regulations that already exist against HGVs. That is one key element of what we are doing and I think we can make really significant headway with that actually.

A second element is the Mayor's safer lorry charge, safer lorry scheme. As you know, in September, he announced a proposal to essentially require all lorries in London to be fitted with safety equipment to protect cyclists. That is typically mirrors and bars beneath the lorry to reduce the chances of cyclists being swept underneath.

At the moment, significant numbers of HGVs are exempt from national legislation which requires these things to be fitted, mainly construction HGVs, construction lorries, on the theory that they need to go up hillsides and fix electricity pylons or something. There are not terribly many hillsides and electricity pylons in London, so we do not think we need that exemption and so the Mayor has made clear that he is going to effectively prevent any vehicle going into London, subject to consultation, without this basic safety equipment.

There are various other initiatives in that area. There will be other areas in which we can complement powers that London Councils have, for instance, under their lorry control scheme, so we are working very closely with London councils and the Mayor spoke to Jules Pipe [Chair of London Councils] first thing this morning about it.

We also are doing a study on whether to have a complete ban of lorries in the peak hours. We want to compare the experience with other countries. The position on that at the moment is we are studying it. I think it is quite finely balanced actually. I think a peak hour lorry ban could have prevented two of the 14 cycling deaths we have seen so far this year. The other 12 did not involve HGVs and did not occur in the peak, but there might be impacts on health in other ways. You might see, for instance, a lot more lorries moving at night. If they cannot move during the day, they would deliver at night which would have quite serious effects on people's sleep and, therefore, on their health in other ways and we are talking very large numbers of people.

We are also worried about the possibility of a kind of flood of HGVs on to the streets at 9.00 am when the thing ends and there are fewer cyclists on the streets at that time but there are more other vulnerable groups like pedestrians. This is another one of the issues we are having to look at which is whether it shunts them all through to later in the day as well, so you get more of them travelling at night, particularly in the winter when it gets dark at 4.00 pm and again would that be more dangerous? Therefore, those are the kinds of things we are looking at.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** I went over that final point you were making with the Mayor at Mayor's Question Time, so we have certainly heard his views about the idea of the ban in peak time. I will come back to that with the other representatives.

As far as legislation is concerned, how are you getting on in discussions, you and the Mayor with the DfT about any changes in legislation to deal with HGVs because very clearly, this is a bit of a sticking point at the moment, is it?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** We have a list of 21 wants. I have it here actually of which about five or six involve HGVs. They are not all for the DfT actually. Some of them are for the European Union (EU). There are a couple of directives that restrict what a lorry's cab can look like and, at the moment, they prevent some quite important safety modifications being made to those cabs.

We are a bit depressed about progress on that. It is not going very well. It is caught up in Brussels' infighting and we are more hopeful on some of our asks from the DfT. They include things like increased cyclist awareness training in the HGV test and the Certificate for Professional Competence which is the thing they have to renew every few years to carry on driving, changes to other rules of that nature. We are asking for the end to the exemption on safety equipment and we are asking for more flexibility on other forms of HGV rules as well.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** What about the fact that there is regulation against lorries encroaching into the stop boxes though? Are you able to enforce that rather more stringently and indeed perhaps to even enlarge the stop boxes if that is appropriate?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** One of our asks is about ASL (Advanced Stop Lines) because obviously that is not an HGV only issue. That applies to all traffic. It is in one of our lists. In fact, it is number one on the list to allow deeper reservoirs at signal control junctions and also to create a kind of specific offence for the infringement of an ASL by motorised traffic.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning at Surface Transport, TfL):** One of the particular issues that was revealed by some research we did with Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) in February was that not only are HGVs overrepresented in cycle fatalities but construction HGVs are even more overrepresented.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Vastly overrepresented.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning at Surface Transport, TfL):** Therefore, yesterday, in fact, in this building, I think I mentioned before, there was a very important event where the entire construction industry and their principal logistics' suppliers have signed up to standards right across the industry for offsite road related safety. What we discovered with the research was that the huge improvement to onsite safety, largely brought about as a result of some terrible accidents on construction sites over the last five to ten years, does not extend beyond the site gate in many cases. Therefore, what this standard will do is that all people who signed up to it will agree to a whole set of standards around vehicle choice, driver training, contract structure, so that you minimise the risk at source of lorries which otherwise would be driven in very inconsistent ways, often with subcontracts. Although it is quite an arcane sounding device, making sure that all people involved, certainly at the responsible end of the construction market and their suppliers, are adhering to same single set of standards will make a huge difference in terms of the risk being reduced at source.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Yes. I must say I have been impressed hearing from Crossrail management about what they are doing in terms of checking lorries and insisting in their contracts about particular standards being met and, of course, obviously the driver training, making sure of that and even to the point of apparently insisting on routes being checked so it minimises the left turning of lorries.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning at Surface Transport, TfL):** That is exactly the kind of thing which will now be in this standard. What we discovered was that a company, if it had a standard, it had its own standard around things like route choice, around vehicle choice, around driver training. There is now a single standard which has been developed over the last five to six months that everyone who came yesterday, which is most of the large players in the construction industry, have now signed up to. That will absolutely play through to the contract design of vehicle choice.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Apart from Crossrail, we have heard from the City of London as to what they are doing. There are a lot of construction sites, as we all know, in the City of London and I have noticed that there seems to be far more of these large lorries in the City of London that actually have an audio signal that they are turning left or turning right, which makes a lot of sense. We are all used to it on refuse carts but it surely must be a point alongside the other things Andrew was pointing out about skirts and mirrors and so on.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning at Surface Transport, TfL):** Yes, absolutely and I think the crucial thing, Richard, is to make sure that procurement, which is a very powerful tool in this area, is used consistently certainly by all major public sector procurers of construction projects; Crossrail, the Underground, the boroughs, to your point, and the major construction projects, so the supply chain and everybody in the supply chain is using the same standards irrespective of who they are working for and the lorries that cause these problems are made as safe as possible.

**Garrett Emmerson (Director of Strategy & Planning at Surface Transport, TfL):** With respect to the construction industry, I think we talked earlier about culture change. One of the things we are very clear on is that we are looking for a big culture change in the construction industry. The construction industry itself has, over the last ten, 20 years, delivered huge amounts in terms of onsite construction safety and changed the cultures right up and down the industry. What we are saying is effectively we need to do the same thing for safety, road safety off the site, before or after vehicles get to the site. That is a big further change and it is one I think we cannot do alone.

We can do an awful lot because we are a major procurer of many of the engineering works or we have powers to control utility works or so on, and our utility partners are being very supportive in putting in place the same kind of requirements as we are, but we cannot do it all. We are looking to the construction industry and we would like to see the Health and Safety Executive support more of this work too in the future because it will require a culture change to ingrain road safety and construction vehicle safety on the road in the same way as it has been ingrained into the industry when they go through the site gates and get on the site.

Could I just also come back very briefly to the point you mentioned about ASLs because I think there is an important point just worth getting out there about the encroachment into ASLs? It is the case, at the moment unfortunately, that there is no difference in law between the primary stop line in front of the red light and the secondary stop line at the back of the ASL. It is a criminal offence. It is basically jumping a red light to go over either of them which means it can only be enforced by the police and you are seeing the police do that very effectively at the moment through Operation Safeway. One of contentions is actually there is a difference between those two things. Encroaching on to an ASL is potentially not the same offence as running a red light and going across a junction. Actually, creating a new separate effect that potentially could be decriminalised and enable us to use TfL's wider enforcement powers would enable us to do this in the longer term to a far greater degree more effectively and provide a much better measure of protection for cyclists.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Thank you. That is very helpful. Could I just move to Charlie and Martin? This point about the restriction during peak hours, what do you think of that because we have been discussing the criticisms and the Mayor has some doubts about it? What do you think about that?

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** We have seen the numbers. Two or three of the fatalities this year happened in the morning peak hour and there is a real problem there. That is when most cyclists are on the road. I think the main issue is that there are a lot of vehicles particularly in the construction industry which are inherently dangerous; they are unfit for purpose, for operation in city streets and that needs to be addressed, more than just the safety gadgets that fit on. The fundamental design needs to be reassessed. Therefore, there is the risk of just moving those lorries out of the peak hour into another time. You are still allowing dangerous lorries on the streets and if 30% of the lorries are running round with offences because they do not have the right equipment the law requires, that is a significant proportion of the fleet. Basically that is saying the operators do not care or they do not care enough to actually do what is needed to be safe.

The ban is one element but it is not the main element and we are not supportive of relaxing the night-time ban as a quid pro quo. I think the dis-benefits of that are very significant. I am perhaps one of the older people in the room. I can remember before the ban and the impact of traffic noise at night, of lorry noise at night. I also was a lorry driver at the time, so some of that was my fault.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** You have had some inside information.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** I have been both sides. As a lorry driver, I was kept awake at night by other people delivering which impaired on my performance. The whole safety issue is very complex, particularly getting the construction lorries out of the peak hour or getting them to be not coming in with the cyclists, to be going out. It is a matter of scheduling. I think the standard for construction logistics, the new standard, is welcome in terms of the evidence of the shift in culture change, the safety culture beginning to get into the offsite the on road performance of the construction industry. I do not think it goes nearly enough in terms of driver training, in terms of the type of vehicles they use, but it is a change of direction so that is to be welcomed.

**Martin Key (Campaigns Manager, British Cycling):** On the issue of restrictions you have to think about what we are trying to achieve. Getting more people cycling is one of the aims, so, yes, we need to answer some of these questions about what would the effects be. We need to look at existing restrictions, are they effective, are they still fit for purpose? What would be the effect of shifting that sort of peak time movement to later in the day, and what would the effect be of restrictions on the busiest roads at the busiest times? Not every road. We need that review that was promised several months ago.

It is quite interesting to think about what would restrictions have on the perceptions of safety. If we can get more people cycling by saying HGVs will be shifted to a different hour of the day that has massive benefits to the city and that should be factored in as well. We desperately need that review to answer some of those questions.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** I believe that in Paris and Dublin there are some of these sorts of restrictions. Do you have any information about that? Is it working there?

**Martin Key (Campaigns Manager, British Cycling):** Just a small point. Paris and Dublin, as we mentioned before, every city is unique and they do have different restrictions for different types of lorries at different types of day for different reasons.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** With very wide roads, particularly in Paris.

**Martin Key (Campaigns Manager, British Cycling):** Not in Dublin.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** No.

**Martin Key (Campaigns Manager, British Cycling):** Interestingly, when they built the tunnel in Dublin to get the port traffic from the sea out to the edge of the city, obviously that helped to reduce congestion. It also helped increase cycling as an effect, and so those are the sorts of things we should be looking at.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Studies in Paris is one of the things we have looked at as part of this exercise. Neither the figures, nor indeed the Mayor's office in Paris, support any claim that the lorry ban in Paris has helped reduce fatalities. In the four years before it came in, there were nine cyclists' deaths in the City of Paris, which is an area roughly equivalent to our zone 1, slightly larger but not much larger. It is a small area. In the four years before it came in there were nine deaths. In the four years after it came in there were 18. There were more cycle deaths in Paris. Last year there were five cycle deaths in Paris compared with one in our zone 1.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** It is worth saying - Paris and Dublin are often quoted - the number of vehicle types that are exempt from the Paris ban basically includes any kind of vehicle you would want to have banned from the roads, construction in particular, delivering flour to bakeries. There are a very long list of vehicles that are not covered by the ban. The ban in Dublin, as Martin suggested, was part of a much wider process to increase the volume of HGV traffic serving Dublin port without having to go through the city centre. They spent several hundred million euro on a tolled tunnel that now takes nearly all the port traffic out of the city centre.

I was in Dublin last year for a conference and went through this in some detail with the relevant traffic manager. If you are caught in Dublin without a permit to go to a particular destination, like a supermarket, i.e. is you should not be there or you are not on the right route, you are fined very heavily. That was only made possible because they have taken all the port traffic out of the city centre through a very expensive tunnel that is now tolled. Although it looks like a very attractive model, it is designed to do a very specific thing in a very specific geographical context, it has been very effective but it is not the same issue as we have here because it was all about traffic going through Dublin to get to Dublin port, which is obviously not the issue in London.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** Can I just ask a question on the lorries front because I think this is the major concern for cyclists by far. When you are talking with the construction industry, to what extent do you persuade them not to have lorries and use, for example, barges? A barge can take 1 000 tonnes which 40 lorries could take.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** It is a very good question, in terms of could you move some of this stuff off the road on to the river.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** It is. That is the biggest highway we have.



**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** One of the issues that came through the construction research we did with TRL was that unlike things like supermarkets, which tend to be purpose built on sites that have proper access to and from the main road network, construction sites are unfortunately where construction sites happen to be.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** Yes, I accept that.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** They are often on very unsuitable roads and the lorries that are using those roads are often highly unsuitable for those roads too. To some extent you are constrained by where the construction materials are going to. However, we did spend a substantial amount of money on improving the lock that provided river access to the Olympic site to take construction materials in and spoil out, which moved a lot of noise off the road onto barges. I know that Thames Water are looking very closely at the scope for taking some of the spoil from the Thames Tideway Tunnel out on the river. We are asking that they look even harder at that because it will be coming out on the embankment.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** Well, I just hope that something similar is done on Battersea Power Station because I do not want the southwest suddenly hit by huge numbers of lorries, clearly, from that when it becomes a building site.

Two buses were involved in the recent fatalities. Is it time that we considered them HGVs within TfL?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** Clearly, any accident involving a bus is thoroughly investigated, obviously both by the police but also by us and the operator. In general, the bus safety record is relatively good considering how many of them there are and how large they are relative to other vehicles. I do not know whether legally they would count as HGVs, but certainly part of our effort needs to be making sure that as the contractor for the bus service in London we are absolutely minimising risk, not just to cyclists but I think somebody else mentioned pedestrians as well, to make sure that is --

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** I do not think that unless you count passengers as goods you could ever call them --

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** That is why I did not say --

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** I think the point that Charlie made earlier about the need for some analysis about the types of vehicles involved would really open that up. I think we all nodded at that point.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** Just one more point on the HGVs. I went to the cycle safety event at Charing Cross last Thursday, and I welcome that, predominantly Metropolitan Police Services officers. One thing I learnt was that the newer HGVs have a sharper turning circle, like a Black Cab. Is that something cyclists need to know a lot more about, given that most of these incidents are happening on the left side of a HGV?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** We do a lot around raising cycle awareness of the dangers that you run into if you go up the inside of an HGV. A lot of

our on-street marketing campaigns are around that. We support the Metropolitan Police Service on the Exchanging Places events that I am sure you know about and you may have been in one. I think that is, as much as anything else, about raising driver awareness and visibility - to Charlie's point - when they are in the cab and being aware of the risks that there will be cyclists on the inside, and also making sure that cyclists are aware of the difficulty of being seen by a driver in an HGV and the strong possibility that they may, even if they are not signalling, be going to make a left turn or a left manoeuvre, so I think it is critical.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** That is the development in newer vehicles, isn't it?

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** Most road vehicles are safer than they were 40 years ago. Large lorries are more dangerous, and that is one of the reasons why they are more dangerous. We would like to see the drivers be made aware of that because most of them are not aware that they create far more risk than their fathers and grandfathers did. That is it very briefly. I could go on about that as well.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** I will accept that you feel comfortable with that. If you get a Black Cab doing a left on you, it is not going to kill you but a lorry would if you are cycling.

Can I now move to Operation Safeway, which is one of the initiatives that came from these recent spate of fatalities, and on 25 November we had several hundred officers out. Andrew, what impact do you think the operation made in providing more enforcement for road safety.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** The police have issued just under 7,500 Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN) as of yesterday, of which just under 5,000 - 4,884 to be precise - were to motorists, and 2,555 were to cyclists, so roughly 2:1 motorists to cyclists. It is a balanced operation and these operations cannot be anything else. If one group feels that they are being targeted then they will not work. We think it has had significant effects. You will see that huge numbers of officers have been out on the streets and the significant deterrent effect that that has had for bad cycling and bad driving. Also, the effect of somebody being stopped and told off or given an FPN is potentially quite lasting. It is quite a big event in somebody's life and it will go in. I think that is tremendously important. It is of course a short-term measure, but it was one of the most important short-term measures we could have taken to try to halt this appalling spate of fatalities that we had.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** It should reassure cyclists that they have not been picked on and it has mostly been motorists.

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** Just in terms of that, could I add that the police are also challenging pedestrians where pedestrians are behaving inappropriately at junctions, so this really is about balance across all users of junctions. This is certainly not just about cyclists.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** Can I just deal with the motorists and the cyclists angle. It should reassure cyclists that they are not being picked on particularly.

Can you just give us the nature of some of the offences we are talking about? Was it lights? Headphones? Mobiles? That kind of stuff where I think we need to get some basic messages over about being more sensible.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Yes, jumping red lights, both cyclists and motorists. It is talking on mobiles. It is seatbelt compliance, a lot of that. You have a breakdown haven't you?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** My numbers are not quite as up-to-date as yours so I will not contradict you on that because that is overall numbers. Yes, it is mobile phones. It is seatbelt compliance. For cyclists it is not using lights after dark and things like that. Police officers, for instance, are also looking to let cyclists off FPNs for that if they come within three days and demonstrate that they have lights properly fitted to their vehicle and things like that. This is not about trying to hammer anybody. This is about trying to improve the way people use junctions because that is a component part to this.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** It sounds as though a lot of people have to learn their highway codes again and what is considered to be the norms. I know I am out-of-date by 20 years on that front.

To what extent can we expect this to continue until, say, after Christmas? It must be quite expensive for the Metropolitan Police Service to roll something out like this day in day out.

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** I think the simplest thing is to say we are looking at what the scope is to sustain this on an ongoing basis. We are keen that that happens. The Metropolitan Police Service is keen for that to happen. Obviously we cannot necessarily carry on at the level that we are doing at the moment but clearly it is having an effect. Clearly, this is an important part of the solution. It really goes without saying, in terms of the wider safety debate, safety on the road network is always partly about the design of the road and the infrastructure. It is always partly about the design of the vehicle and so on, but if you do not have people using those two things in an appropriate way, driving correctly, using the road network correctly, no amount of safety features you can design into a road or on to a vehicle are going to protect you from misuse. I think understanding that we have to improve the way we use the road network, as a collective group of users across all modes of transport, is a part of the debate and this is playing to that part of the debate.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** Yes, I will start with Martin. What are your thoughts on what has happened with this enforcement?

**Martin Key (Campaigns Manager, British Cycling):** We welcome more enforcement. Road traffic police numbers across the country have reduced massively over the last few years, so we welcome the enforcement in London. In a way, cyclists have more to gain because they are at more risk when they are on the road and, therefore, more compliance with traffic laws is helpful and a recent survey backs that up. Over three-quarters rate more police enforcement as important and very important. Cyclists want more enforcement on the road. It will help with perceptions of safety. It will help with the actual safety. So, yes, a bit more of it please.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** Charlie, you wanted to come in as well.

**Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer, London Cycling Campaign):** Yes. I think generally cyclists reported that they were quite surprised and welcomed the sight of more police on the road, because it is the experience of cycling in London that every journey you make you have to take action to avoid

careless driving or even sometimes outright dangerous driving by people in motor vehicles. Particularly when there are minor collisions, cyclists' experience is, "Where are the police?" If you report a collision where you are not seriously injured you do not get any response from the police because generally traffic enforcement has a low priority. We know the police are overstretched but we think it should have a higher priority.

One lesson that is quite interesting is that there are a lot of reports of police not understanding what the rules are about cyclists. There is an example of one of the senior cycling instructors in the country being stopped because he was filtering on the right side, because he believed filtering in that situation was the left side, and the policeman told him that he should not be doing that when actually the guidance says he should be doing that, so it has exposed the lack of training for quite a large proportion of the police.

We know the Cycle Task Force, the police who are based with TfL. They are experts and they are very good, but a whole range of the other police do not have cycle skills and we think a suggestion should be that every police officer should be cycle trained, should have level three cycle training, particularly if they ever drive a police vehicle. It is the same demand we ask for lorry drivers and we think police should meet the same thing. Generally the idea is good, but it has highlighted weaknesses in the performance of some police.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** In the long run I suspect our traffic wardens probably have a role to play in this through the boroughs, but I will leave that idea hanging.

What are we doing with kids? I can remember being on a Chopper bike going around Hyde Park corner. How can we stop kids doing that in the City of Westminster?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** We are doing a lot of work with children, because the growth we have seen in adult cycling has not been replicated in the growth of children's cycling, and I am worried that unless we do something about that we are going to create a generation growing up that does not cycle.

We have something called Cycle to School Partnerships, on which we are spending a fairly substantial amount of money. That is basically involving local schools, groups of schools, to design safe routes to schools for themselves. We have two pilot schemes about to get underway in Dulwich and Tufnell Park. That involves actual routes to school, segregated sometimes where there is a main road, safe back street roads. It is aimed as much at giving the parents confidence to allow their children to cycle as actually the kids. The kids are often quite keen but the parents are less keen.

I grew up in suburban London, in Teddington. I cycled to school and about 150 other people cycled to my school each morning. I went back there a couple of years ago and hardly anybody cycles now.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** They are being dropped off, aren't they, by their parents.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** That is right. The traffic conditions in Teddington and Ham where I went to school have not changed very much in 30 years. What has changed is the level of parental fear and the level of parental unwillingness to let the children cycle.

As well as the Cycle to School Partnerships, we are doing things with Bikeability. That is the successor to the old cycling proficiency test. We fund a lot of that. Any child of a certain age who wants it can have it in London and we fund it. It is delivered at three levels: level one is you do not leave the playground; level two is you go out on minor roads; level three is you go out on busier roads. My concern at the moment is not all of it is delivered to level two. Some of it is only delivered to level one and very little of it is delivered to level three, so I want to do more of it to level three and all of it to at least level two. I want to get the parents involved in the training as well, so that they can come out and train with their children and gain the confidence to allow their children to cycle.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** You are right to emphasise that parents need to have confidence to let their children in future go on the streets, but there is one extreme to it. I think there are some eccentrics that put their kids in tricycles or cargo bikes on the front rails, which I just think should not be done at all on the streets of London.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** It was just a point on this about 20 miles per hour and the rollout of that. Particularly in light of the recent announcement by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) about the police tightening up on enforcement of 20 miles per hour. I wonder if you have any reactions to that?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** The Road Task Force, Darren, which I suspect you are aware of, set out the context in which the question around 20 mile an hour on the TLRN which I think presumably is what you are referring to needs to be taken forward. That is to say, as Garrett mentioned in passing earlier, we are now looking at what we call the street family type for London's roads, ie what is it that we want these roads to do for us as well as moving goods and people around. Are they public places? Are they residential areas as well as being potentially busy roads? One of the questions that will flow from that is: are there parts of the TLRN - and we have some work going on on this at the moment - that actually would be suitable for 20 mile an hour, given the kinds of place that they are. You would not necessarily do that on the A13 going out through East London through industrial estates, but what you might do is look at parts of the TLRN that are clearly also important economic and social and residential centres and say, "Well, actually, in this location this is clearly an area which, although it carries traffic and is important for freight and servicing, is also a critical part of the fabric of the local community where we should look at the possibility of doing 20 mile an hour limits", particularly now that ACPO has expressed that view.

There are a small number of examples that we have of the 20 mile an hour limit enforced by traffic lights on Camden High Street. There is a 20 mile an hour limit at the southern end of Waterloo Bridge, so there are a couple of examples where we have done that already but I think looking more broadly at where it might work elsewhere is something we are doing at the moment.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** It is obviously not suitable for every single road for the reasons that you gave, but it should be the default. Is that a vision that the Mayor and TfL are signing up to following the publication of the Roads Task Force report?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** I do not think you would want 20 mile an hour on the North Circular.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** No. The default speed limit rather than the absolute blanket speed limit we are talking about.

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** It is difficult to talk about a default speed limit when you have a road network that includes 70 mile an hour roads and includes 20 mile an hour roads. I think we have to look at what is appropriate for that section of the road. The TLRN, in particular, is a very diverse network. It goes from near motorway standard down to high street. I am not sure where the idea of a default setting gets you because there is such diversity. The approach has to be, using the typologies and using the work that was done by the Roads Task Force, what is the right speed limit for each bit of the network, and that has to be the default position.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** Some boroughs have been lobbying desperately to get TfL to agree to 20 miles per hour on some parts of the TLRN.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** We are indeed doing that. We have done four new 20 mile an hour zones in the last few months at Camberwell, New Cross, and two at Waterloo. We are absolutely open to 20 miles an hour on the TLRN where it is appropriate.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** Thank you.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Perhaps it might be useful if we could see the criteria for what appropriateness is measured as.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** The other thing is, 20 miles an hour, do not forget that only 15% of deaths and serious injuries to cyclists happen on links. That is the bits between the junctions where traffic is travelling at speed. Do not imagine it is a silver bullet but it is definitely something that we are looking at.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** It helps create a more pleasant and welcome environment for everyone, cyclists and pedestrians.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** It does, absolutely.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Speed is certainly an issue for pedestrians but I think the definition of what is appropriate would be quite interesting to see. That might be where the debate sits. Richard was going to come in on mini-Hollands.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Andrew particularly mentioned them much earlier on. I happen to represent as part of my constituency one outer London borough, Merton, and I want to get some idea - apart from what you said - about when specifically, this will be coming into place. At the meeting you held a month or so ago I did say then publicly that I do think that there needs to be a good deal of consultation about this and I am not convinced that there has been enough. When is it going to happen and what about the consultation?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** It is up to the individual borough to handle it how they feel most appropriate. This is probably a question for Merton rather than me.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Yes.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Their plans are public and I know several of the other mini-Holland finalists, Kingston, for instance, have made quite a big play about their plans and they have had some responses.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** We have talked about one of aspects of Kingston's plans, Richard, and you and I have been in correspondence about the effect on the river.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** We have.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Therefore, it is up to them to ensure public acceptability. One of the criteria for the award is we want to understand how much political support there is for a proposal that I am not going to give --

**Richard Tracey (AM):** I mean public support too, not just the politicians.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** That is what I mean when I say 'political support', public and political support. Firstly, I want to make sure that it is supported on a cross-party basis, and secondly, I want to make sure that there is not going to be huge public opposition to what is done because obviously there is no point in giving somebody a lot of money if they cannot do it.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** All right. Therefore, when do you see the timescale?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** As I mentioned before, the deadline for the final submissions is this Friday.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** That is this week, yes.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** We are then going to have a kind of beauty parade of them early in the New Year. I will have looked at them over Christmas and TfL will have looked at them over Christmas, and then we will make an announcement on which of the four of the eight are going to get it in February.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** I think it would be a shame if there are good credible bids that do not get in this round. If they have to reapply again I think it would be a waste of a good proposal.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** One of the reasons I did this, to be honest, is to try to flush out from the boroughs what they wanted to do for cycling anyway; what they were prepared to propose. One of the key elements of the process is that nobody is going to go away from this empty-handed. Even the ten who did not make the finalists, I have seen and spoken to them all and said that they will get a substantial part of the unsuccessful bids they have done paid for us anyway.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Andrew, you have been waiting very, very patiently on this. We have seen that cycle hire scheme usage has really declined. It has fallen hugely. It is down not only year on year in recent months but it is lower than it was two years ago, and that was when the scheme was smaller as well. Andrew, why do you think that the cycle hire scheme has fallen off in terms of usage in recent months?

**Andrew Hill (Contract Director for London cycle hire scheme, Serco):** I am sure there are a whole range of reasons. One of the reasons that is also the case I think TfL had some estimates of what would happen this year compared with last year. I do not think we are very far away from those projections, in terms of scheme usage. We do not have data that is able to tell us why we think that is moving in that particular direction. We know that we are looking at opportunities to expand the scheme. That is obviously happening again at the end of this week, when a very considerable expansion is taking place that might bring in another group of potential customers on to the scheme. We are also looking at other opportunities, like corporate accounts and things like that, to bring in others.

I think it is an interesting dynamic. From a Serco perspective, we do not have a specific view on why we are seeing a drop off. Oftentimes I think people will make a link between the ability to use the scheme, whether or not it is functioning well and whether or not that is impacting usage. For the most part over the last year we have seen an improvement in performance, and some reasonably strong performance in terms of the availability of bikes and so on. There is still more to do and it is still improving.

As that stands, I cannot see that as a particular influence. For the operational elements that Serco controls, I do not think we are seeing availability or the way the bike scheme is presenting to the customer as things that should be holding back usage.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** It is interesting you say that, and I think distribution of bikes is a huge issue.

**Andrew Hill (Contract Director for London cycle hire scheme, Serco):** Yes.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Over half the respondents to our survey - so 59% - reported that those that use the scheme have had to contact Serco's call centre, including reports of difficulties in paying or being overcharged for use. That is completely within your control. Over half the people that use the scheme have said, "We have issues with it".

**Andrew Hill (Contract Director for London cycle hire scheme, Serco):** Yes. I have read those stats with interest. I think it would be great to get underneath the skin of that. TfL conduct their own research on that and that does not necessarily show the same feedback. The first thing I would want to know is where that is related to. Is that over the whole scheme? Are we talking about people's experience since day one or are we talking about their recent experience? I think we need to get under the skin of that.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Your view is that it is probably historic and that recently you are working so perfectly that nobody would have had that problem?

**Andrew Hill (Contract Director for London cycle hire scheme, Serco):** 'Perfect' is obviously the wrong word, but certainly our experience over the last year is of an improving service. The feedback that we are seeing from surveys that are conducted by TfL is that we are getting quite high scores in terms of customer satisfaction. That is not to say that this is not the type of scheme that you want to continually see improving, and we are being quite rightly pressured to make those improvements. I am not sure that I recognise the statistics that that would imply, which is of very significant numbers of people having problems with payments. That is certainly not the stats that I recognise.



**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** I am going to come to TfL in a minute. I just want to finish with Andrew if I could at this point, and ask how are you responding to concerns about the operation of the scheme? What other things are you doing to make the scheme work better in terms of distribution and other things?

**Andrew Hill (Contract Director for London cycle hire scheme, Serco):** Sure. The redistribution is a really interesting and difficult challenge. I am sure you are all familiar with the tidal flows of the use of the scheme and the need to move cycles around. Over a period of time we have done a number of things, and we are just in the process of re-thinking how we match our staffing on the right restoring, etc, and making it more responsive to the peaks of work as we go through the day. That obviously involves long negotiations with employees and making sure that that all works in the right way for them. I think that will make some improvement.

This scheme is probably one of a kind in the world, in terms of the demands it puts on redistribution and the very high levels of performance that are required from the scheme. There are no templates out there. If you go to other cities there are not templates saying, "This is how you do redistribution". For some time now we have been running software support, which tasks redistribution drivers throughout the scheme in terms of what they need to do at various times of the day. At the moment we are trialling with TfL some further software that gives artificial intelligence-style approaches to this, which is much more predictive in terms of what is happening on any given hour in the day on the scheme.

I think it is work in progress. I think we need to improve it. It is already quite high if you look into the possibilities or look at the availability stats, but I think we do need to improve it. I do not recognise the characterisation, though, that the scheme is not performing against the contract. I think we are performing pretty strongly against the contracts that we have in place.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** You think it has improved considerably from when I think you were issued a notice from TfL?

**Andrew Hill (Contract Director for London cycle hire scheme, Serco):** I think so, yes, certainly over the last 12 months.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** The Mayor originally had a target that he wanted to get to 40,000 cycle hire trips per day. We are running at about 25,000, so considerably lower than the target. When are you going to be able to meet that target?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** We have run at 40,000. We ran at 40,000 for a number of days through last year when we saw some peak levels of activity during the Olympics, so we have seen that level of usage. We are not seeing that at the moment. I would not hope to suggest or claim that we do on a regular basis, but the scheme is certainly capable of delivering that. Obviously, at the end of the day, the scheme is there to deliver the demand that presents itself.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** When do you think you are going to get to 40,000?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** As I say, I think the scheme is there to deliver the demand that presents itself. When we set that, it was an ambition before the scheme started.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** There is not the demand?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** That was based on not a lot of practical knowledge of what would happen. What we have seen is a vast number of Londoners have used the scheme. We have seen over 25 million journeys on the scheme since it started. We are about to expand it further into south London. It will become one of the largest schemes. I think it is the second largest scheme in the world already. It will be even larger by the end of the week when we develop it. It will cover 100 square kilometres. That will clearly increase the number of people that are using it. I am not going to attempt to put some figures or some projections on when we might get to certain numbers because we will see what they are.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** OK.

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** I would like to go back and reinforce a little bit of what Andrew said. We have seen significant improvement in the performance of the scheme and the performance of Serco as the operator, in the distribution of bikes and the availability of bikes. That is going up. That is reflected in the customer satisfaction scores that we are seeing. Customer satisfaction with the scheme is now higher than it has ever been, higher even than it was in the early days when it was first launched. To characterise it as somehow not performing and not delivering I think is wrong.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** OK. However the number of people using them is falling, month on month, compare it year on year. Is that partly do you think because of the cost? Your charge has doubled. Has that had an impact?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** I am sure there are a number of factors involved, and, yes, as you heard Andrew say, we projected that there would be some decline in usage this year for a number of reasons coming off the back of a very exceptional year last year, for a start, with the Olympics, etc. What we can say is that the reduction in numbers is largely in the area of casual hires. Member hires are still developing and expanding strongly, and we are seeing on average around 1,000 new members a month join. The scheme is expanding among perhaps Londoners who make the most use of the scheme because they are using it regularly, but yes you are right we have seen less casual usage. That could be down to the price. It could be down to the weather. It is almost certainly down to last year and this year not being a particularly valid comparison.

What we are seeing is we know cycling is weather dependent and we can plot graphs that show by temperature of degree the number of cyclists you can predict on a given day, so there are any number of factors going on there.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** There have been a whole series of measures to increase use as well, it is fair. Of course the changes we are doing to the cycling programme generally, the new routes, segregated routes in Central London, quiet routes in Central London,

should have a big impact on the use of the scheme because there is going to be much more scope. It is going to be much easier to use it.

We are going to increase the size of popular docking stations to address some of the availability problems. We are going to expand it a little further, incremental expansion, taking it into the Olympic Park. We are going to do docking stations on private premises, some of them for the public to use, some of them just for the people who work in the premises, done at the expense of the companies that own the premises. We have a whole series of ideas to drive up usage, and in the medium-term there is going to be integration with the successor to Oyster as well.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Integration?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** With the successor to Oyster - pay as you go - contactless debit/credit cards.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Contactless payment. That is good to hear. Garrett, you mentioned earlier that it is expanding south. I think it is expanding west and south.

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** South and west.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** You are not going southeast and I have to say those of us south of the river feel rather strongly about that, but perhaps that is a phase in the future.

Garrett, is TfL considering not extending the contract with Serco beyond July 2015?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** Are we considering not extending it?

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Yes.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** There is a two-year extension option, isn't there?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** There is an extension option and we are currently reviewing that. To say we are not considering it would probably be wrong, if you see what I mean.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** I see what you mean, yes. I phrased that wrong. You are considering options on whether you will?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** Yes

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** OK. When are we likely to hear the outcome of that?

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** I cannot give you a date but in the not-too-distant future.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** OK. Then what changes might you put in place to run the cycle hire scheme in the future, to improve its performance? Perhaps with a future contract whether with Serco or with another --

**Garrett Emmerson (Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, TfL):** One of them Andrew has just referred to in terms of bringing in contactless payment, etc. There is a wider question that is related to how and whether and when we might or might not extend the Serco contract, which is where do we want to get to in the longer term? In the light of the experience that we now have over a number of years, how do we deliver the best service to the customer. There is active work going on to look at that. It is probably premature to say where that might lead because I do not honestly know, but I can reassure you that we are taking a very deep and long look at how best to procure and deliver the scheme in the longer term.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** OK. When do you think the scheme will break even?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Operationally?

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Yes.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** It needs a subsidy of about £9.5 million a year at the moment, which is very modest. I have always said that it is part of the public transport network and every other part of the public transport network needs a subsidy and why should this not. We are hoping that some of the changes we are doing to increase usage, and integrate it with the pay as you go successor to Oyster, will help bring down the need for operational subsidy. It may not eliminate it, though.

**Tom Copley (AM):** Following on from that, how will the expansion of the cycle hire scheme improve its performance?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** The cycle hire expansion is actually known as the cycle hire expansion intensification, for the reason that we are already installing more docks outside the expansion area. In other words, in Central London rather than in the areas which it has grown to: southwest London. That is simply to cater for the larger numbers of bikes that are going to come in from southwest London. That will improve performance generally. Of course it will be available to far more people. It is going to serve areas inhabited by, what, 600,000 to 700,000 people. It has been very, very eagerly awaited. It is opening on Friday.

**Tom Copley (AM):** The other Andrew, do you want to come in on this as well?

**Andrew Hill (Contract Director for London cycle hire scheme, Serco):** Yes. I would pick up that point where we talked earlier and frequently about the typology of London and some of the streets. I think when the scheme was first introduced it was a first for London. What we have learnt from that collectively is the larger the stations the more the docking points, the easier the redistribution task is. Part of the exercise that has been taking place, in terms of its next phase, is trying to get wherever possible more docking points, particularly associated with the smaller stations. I think that will help. It is all incremental but it will help a little bit with the redistribution activities that take place over the course of the day, because you have more availability on those larger stations.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Thank you. I think one of the reasons why we ask critical questions about this is that we have all had a lot of casework in the past with regard to the cycle hire scheme; although I have to say it has quietened somewhat in the last year.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** It does have a very high satisfaction rate.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** We have had a lot of bad casework in the past but I think it has calmed down in the last year I would say.

Last questions then, if I may. Looking at the expenditure going on generally on cycling - I am not sure who this should be to, TfL I think - there has been a lot of slippage for the current year. Why is TfL not managing to spend the planned £104 million on cycling in 2013/14? This is the pub question of the day. You have some money unusually, nobody else has. Where is it? What are you doing with it?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** Andrew may want to comment. Part of what has been going on is looking at the programme post the publication of Vision and making sure that what we had planned - the level of scheme delivery - is still the right thing to be doing. We have talked about the change and the better junctions that are going to be dealt with. We talked about the review of the Cycle Superhighway. I think partly what is going on is making sure that, for example, as Andrew said, rather than spending a small amount of money on 100 junctions we are spending large amounts of money on smaller numbers of junctions. The corollary of that of course is it takes longer, given the scale of the investment and the consultation you have to do to get the money actually out on the street.

I think partly that is a short-term issue around having looked at the programme, again in light of the vision, and making sure that what we are planning to do is what the Mayor wants to do. I am very confident that that will resolve itself over time. This is a ten-year programme and of course money will often move around between years and between budgets within years as things come up.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** You are having difficulty managing a cycling budget for a number of reasons?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** No, we are not having difficulty managing it. We are looking at the programme as originally conceived and reviewing some of the content and then doing it differently, and in some cases smaller and better than we might previously have thought.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** It is not really a management question. It is about what the budget is for. I have knocked back some things they wanted to do because I do not think they are good enough.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Right. It is part of the quality control process.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Yes. The money that was going to be spent on that has not been spent because I want something better.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Right. We hope it will not be lost to the --

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** No, not at all.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Right. That is helpful. What is the likelihood of slippage to the plans to spend £640 million on cycling between now and 2020 then? Are we going to see this pattern that there is going to be lots of slippage?

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** No, that is being resolved because, as I say, a lot of it has been caused by my throwing things out that I do not want, and now we are getting what the Mayor does want and that is what the money is going to be spent on so that problem will go away.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Right.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** It is worth saying as well that the money will be put in place, crucially, between the 2012 business plan and the draft business plan that is just about to be discussed with the TfL board. We had the Comprehensive Spending Review and the cycling provision pretty much survived unscathed.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Totally unscathed.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy & Planning, Surface Transport, TfL):** Yes, totally unscathed.

**Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner):** Virtually the only part of the whole portfolio that did.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Yes. That is very good news. Unless there is anything else any of you want to add as a last word, can I say thank you very much. I am sorry we have overrun but I think it was a really useful, meaty session. If there is any additional information you want to send to us that would be gratefully received.

# Subject: Summary List of Actions

**Report to: Transport Committee**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 9 January 2014**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

1.1 This report sets out the actions arising from previous meetings of the Transport Committee.

## 2. Recommendation

2.1 **That the Committee notes the completed and outstanding actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee.**

### Action arising from the Committee meeting on 10 December 2013

Item	Topic	Status	For Action
6.	<p><b>Cycling in London</b></p> <p>The Committee requested further information from TfL on its criteria for determining when to install 20 mile per hour limits on its road network.</p>	The Chair has written to Transport for London to request the additional information.	Chief Operating Officer, Surface Transport, Transport for London

### Action arising from the Committee meeting on 13 November 2013

Item	Topic	Status	For Action
6.	<p><b>Transport for London and Borough Liaison</b></p> <p>During the course of the discussion the Committee noted the following commitments from guests to provide further information:</p>	The response from Transport for London is attached at <b>Appendix 1.</b>	Director of Planning, Transport for London

Item	Topic	Status	For Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A breakdown of accident rates on red routes and borough roads and how this compares to the proportion of traffic carried on the respective networks;</li> <li>• Further information on any hierarchy of road users and street types that TfL has produced; and</li> <li>• How TfL monitors the Freedom Pass scheme to verify that the passes are being used validly.</li> </ul>		

### Action arising from the Committee meeting on 16 October 2013

Item	Topic	Status	For Action
5.	<p><b>Transport for London's Value for Money in Operational Activities</b></p> <p>The Committee noted the following commitments from guests to provide further information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The General Secretary of the TSSA offered to provide details of when stations were being left unstaffed.</li> </ul>	Completed. The response from the TSSA is attached at <b>Appendix 2</b> . The Chair has written to TfL to seek an explanation.	General Secretary, Transport Salaried Staffs' Association by 21 November 2013

### 3. Legal Implications

3.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

### 4. Financial Implications

4.1 There are no financial implications to the GLA arising from this report.

---

#### List of appendices to this report:

Appendix 1: Letter from TfL following up 13 November meeting

Appendix 2: Letter from TSSA re stations left unstaffed

#### Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers: Minutes of the Committee meetings on 16 October, 13 November and 10 December 2013

Contact Officer: Dale Langford, Senior Committee Officer

Telephone: 020 7983 4415

E-mail: [dale.langford@london.gov.uk](mailto:dale.langford@london.gov.uk)





Val Shawcross CBE AM  
Chair of the Transport Committee  
London Assembly  
City Hall  
The Queens Walk  
London  
SE1 2AA

Transport for London  
Group Planning  
Windsor House  
42 – 50 Victoria Street  
London SW1H 0TL  
Phone 020 7222 5600  
Fax 020 7126 4275  
www.TfL.gov.uk

13 December 2013

Dear Val,

**RE: Follow up to London Assembly Transport Committee meeting on 13 November**

Thank you for your letter of 18 November.

As you are aware, the Mayor has confirmed that Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding will be held at 2013 levels for the next three years. I am sure you will agree that this is welcome news for London Councils and the London boroughs.

The Mayor's Roads Task Force (RTF) set out a bold new vision for the future of London's roads and streets, to ensure the capital can cope with major population growth, support jobs and thousands of new homes, while remaining one of the most attractive, vibrant, accessible and competitive world cities.

The full RTF report, 'The vision and direction for London's streets and roads', an Executive Summary and our report, 'Delivering the vision for London's streets and roads: TfL's response to the Roads Task Force', is available to download at [www.tfl.gov.uk/roadstaskforce](http://www.tfl.gov.uk/roadstaskforce). Detailed information on the hierarchy of road users and street types is set out in Annex 2 of the main RTF report.

In addition, we published a fuller account of the 'case studies', which helped develop the street types and their links. This can be found in the supporting documents section under the heading 'Street family: theory, application & case studies'.

With relation to accident rates on red routes, the casualty figures for the London Boroughs can be found here:

**MAYOR OF LONDON**

Page 61



<http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/corporate/collisions-and-casualties-on-londons-roads-2012.pdf>.

In summary, this shows that fatalities on capital's roads are at the second lowest level since records began. Tables 3.1 to 3.4 in particular show the casualty figures for the London Boroughs, Highways Agency and the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) that you may find useful.

Also provided is the link to the 'Safe Streets for London', London's Road Safety Plan, at <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/corporate/safe-streets-for-london.pdf>. Section 4.2.1 confirms that "The 580km of London's road network that is managed by TfL constitutes only five per cent of London's total road length, but carries more than 30 per cent of traffic. Nearly a third of all road collisions in London occur on the TLRN."

I agree however that more can be done to reduce the number of serious injuries occurring, particularly involving vulnerable road users. Through sustained long-term investment, we will deliver the actions outlined in our recently published road safety action plan and the Mayor's Cycle Vision for London to make the capital's streets safer for all.

As you know, the Freedom Pass is a London Councils administered scheme. However in cases where our Revenue Protection Inspectors (RPI) come across a Freedom Pass holder on TfL services, they check if the passenger is in possession of the appropriate accompanying photocard. Where this is not the case, the card is withdrawn and we report the passenger for consideration of either a penalty fare or a prosecution.

London Councils are notified of withdrawn Freedom Passes with full details of the travel irregularity reports received from the RPIs, including reasons for withdrawal. We take fare evasion seriously and have a number of RPIs who ensure that passengers are in possession of a valid ticket or Oyster card while travelling.

I hope you find this useful and please contact me if you need any further information.

Yours sincerely



Michèle Dix  
Managing Director, Planning  
[Michèle.dix@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:Michèle.dix@tfl.gov.uk)

Letter from Regional Organiser, Transport Salaried Staffs' Association (TSSA)

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM  
Chair of the Transport Committee  
London Assembly  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
London SE1 2AA

3<sup>rd</sup> December 2013

Dear Valerie

**LONDON ASSEMBLY TRANSPORT COMMITTEE MEETING ON 16<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2013**

Thank you for your letter of 21<sup>st</sup> October 2013.

I am sorry I was unable to provide the requested information by your preferred date of 21<sup>st</sup> November 2013, but hope you find the attached of use to you nevertheless.

Yours sincerely

**John Leach**  
**REGIONAL ORGANISER**

**Stations left unstaffed.**

Chigwell Station Uncovered During November 2013

13 Nov 23:00 – 07:00

14 Nov 23:00 – 07:00

15 Nov 01:00 - 05:00

19 Nov 07:00 – 15:00 also 15:00 - 19:00

21 Nov 07:00 – 11:00 also 23:00 – 07:00

25/11/13 Barkingside Station unstaffed 1400 – 2200

East Putney was unstaffed on Friday 15<sup>th</sup> November 2013 – 2330 hrs Until 0600 and Saturday, 16<sup>th</sup> November, 2013 .

Chesham 18;30 – 06:30 24<sup>th</sup> November

Moor Park / Sunday 27 October 2013 / 0600 – 1900

Roding Valley 10:50-19:00 hrs Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> November

Roding Valley from 14<sup>th</sup> November 22:30 until Friday 15<sup>th</sup> 07:00

Roding Valley from 22:30 12<sup>th</sup> November until 07:00 13<sup>th</sup> November

Buckhurst Hill from 19:00-23:00 Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> November.

Buckhurst Hill From 1900 hours Monday 18<sup>th</sup> November 2013 until 23:00 hours.

Fairlop from 06:00hrs - 14.00hrs Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> of November 2013.

Fairlop from 22:00hrs Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> of November 2013.

Snaresbrook from 22:30hrs Saturday 16<sup>th</sup> of November 2013 To Sunday 17 Nov 07.00 approximately.

Snaresbrook from 01:10hrs Wednesday until 06:30 Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> November

Grange Hill 5 Nov – No night turn (23:00-07:00)

23 Nov – No early turn (07:00-15:00)

24 Nov - No staff 07:00hrs – 19:00hrs

Also the vast majority of open surface stations have rosters that do not cover the Station Supervisors 30 minute meal break so these would be unstaffed for this period every day.

# Subject: Pedestrian Safety

**Report to: Transport Committee**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 9 January 2014**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report provides background information to the Transport Committee in relation to its meeting with invited guests to discuss pedestrian safety in London.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 **That the Committee notes the report and puts questions on pedestrian safety in London to the invited guests and notes the discussion.**
- 2.2 **That the Committee delegates authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree the output from the Committee's work on pedestrian safety in London.**

## 3. Background

- 3.1 The Committee has agreed to use this meeting to discuss pedestrian safety in London. This will cover progress in improving pedestrian safety and encouraging more people to make journeys on foot. This will include exploring the underlying factors contributing to injuries to pedestrians and exploring the impact of existing road policy on pedestrians. It provides an opportunity for the Committee to follow up its previous reports and recommendations on these issues including its report on provision for walking in London, *Walk This Way* (October 2010), and its previous work looking at the possible benefits of introducing 20 mile per hour (mph) speed limits in London.
- 3.2 At its meeting on 4 November 2013, the Assembly passed a motion expressing its deep concern at the rise in the rates of pedestrians killed and seriously injured (KSIs) and calling on the Mayor to provide a full report to the Assembly on the actions he plans to take as Chair of Transport for London (TfL) to reverse this rise. The motion also requested that TfL should publish more complete data including quarterly figures for fatal and major accidents involving buses and the worst performing bus companies and routes. The motion also called on the Mayor and TfL to lobby Westminster Council to encourage the wider use of 20 mph zones within the borough particularly at high risk locations including Oxford Street. This follows on from a motion in January 2013 in which the Assembly called on the Mayor to review speed limits on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and introduce more 20mph speed limits in response to requests from stakeholders. The motion also called on TfL to publish the rationale for retaining the 30mph limit where they decline a request from a local council to reduce it to 20 mph including modelling data and supporting detail.

- 3.3 The Mayor's Road Safety Action Plan (June 2013) set out a number of action points to reduce the number of total road casualties in London by 40 per cent by 2020 and committed to the publication of a targeted Pedestrian Safety Action Plan.

## 4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 The following guests have been invited to attend this meeting to discuss pedestrian safety in London:
- Tom Platt, London Manager, Living Streets;
  - Kate Carpenter, Technical Director, Jacobs Engineering and Chair of Road Safety Panel, Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation;
  - Richard Holmes, London Region Campaigns Officer, Royal National Institute of Blind People;
  - Amy Aeron-Thomas, Executive Director, RoadPeace; and
  - Representatives from Transport for London (TfL).
- 4.2 Follow this meeting, the Committee may wish to produce findings on progress in improving pedestrian safety and encouraging more people to walk in London. The Committee is recommended to delegate authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree the output from its work on pedestrian safety in London so that the findings can be sent to the Mayor, TfL and other stakeholders at the earliest opportunity to inform the development of the Mayor's Pedestrian Safety Action Plan which is due to be published in Spring 2014.

## 5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

## 6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 There are no direct financial implications to the GLA arising from this report.

---

### List of appendices to this report:

None.

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>
List of Background Papers: None
Contact Officer: Lucy Brant, Assistant Scrutiny Manager
Telephone: 020 7983 5727
E-mail: <a href="mailto:lucy.brant@london.gov.uk">lucy.brant@london.gov.uk</a>

# Subject: London TravelWatch – Memorandum of Understanding

**Report to: Transport Committee**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 9 January 2014**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out for the Committee's approval a revised Memorandum of Understanding with London TravelWatch, the operating name of the London Transport Users' Committee.

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the revised Memorandum of Understanding with London TravelWatch be approved.**

## 3. Background

- 3.1 The Transport Committee and London TravelWatch have previously agreed a Memorandum of Understanding to establish a clear and transparent basis upon which the Transport Committee, the Greater London Authority and London TravelWatch will work and interact with each other. The Memorandum of Understanding needs to be agreed between the Transport Committee (acting on behalf of the London Assembly) and the London TravelWatch Board.
- 3.2 The Memorandum of Understanding with London TravelWatch may be amended from time to time by the Chair of the Transport Committee (in consultation with the Deputy Chair and the Group Leads) and the Chair of the London TravelWatch Board (in consultation with the London TravelWatch Chief Executive and the Board) agreeing to the proposed amendments.
- 3.3 The Memorandum of Understanding is reviewed from time to time in order to ensure its relevance and effectiveness. Following the suspension of the Memorandum of Understanding in July 2011 and the ensuing deliberations, the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Committee agreed to defer the review and revision of the document pending the appointment of the new London TravelWatch Board. The new Board members were all in place early in 2013 and discussions commenced once those members had familiarised themselves with the issues. The attached document is the product of the exchanges that have taken place over recent months.

#### **4. Issues for Consideration**

- 4.1 The draft Memorandum of Understanding, attached at **Appendix 1**, has been revised in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Committee and the Board of London TravelWatch.

#### **5. Legal Implications**

- 5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

#### **6. Financial Implications**

- 6.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

---

#### **List of appendices to this report:**

Appendix 1: Revised Draft Memorandum of Understanding with London TravelWatch

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>
List of Background Papers: London TravelWatch - Protocol for accounts and financial procedures London TravelWatch - Protocol for Board appointments London TravelWatch - Protocol for recruitment and employment of staff of London TravelWatch
Contact Officer: John Bennett, Head of Special Projects and Elections Telephone: 020 7983 4203 Email: <a href="mailto:john.bennett@london.gov.uk">john.bennett@london.gov.uk</a>



## **Memorandum of Understanding between The Greater London Authority and London TravelWatch<sup>1</sup>**

---

### **Contents**

1. **Introduction**
2. **Support and assistance from the GLA**
3. **Liaison and co-ordination**
  - Relationship
  - Urgency
4. **London TravelWatch Board appointments**
5. **Operation of the London TravelWatch Board and its interaction with the GLA**
  - London TravelWatch Board meetings
  - Sharing information
  - Guidance and directions
6. **Staffing of London TravelWatch**
  - The staffing establishment of London TravelWatch
  - Staff restructures
7. **Finance and performance**
  - Members' and staff salaries and expenses
  - Budget process and business plan
  - Virements
  - Accounts
  - Complaints from members of the public
  - Annual report
  - Performance management and reporting
8. **Amending this Memorandum**

### **APPENDICES**

- A. Budget process and business plan
- B. Performance management and reporting

---

<sup>1</sup> London TravelWatch is the operating name of the London Transport Users Committee

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This Memorandum of Understanding has been agreed between the London Assembly's Transport Committee (acting on behalf of the London Assembly) and the London TravelWatch Board, and may be amended from time to time in accordance with paragraph 8.1 below. It cannot override any of the requirements of the GLA Act or any other relevant legislation.
- 1.2 The aim of this Memorandum is to establish a clear and transparent basis upon which Transport Committee, the Greater London Authority and London TravelWatch will work and interact with each other.
- 1.3 To this end, the Transport Committee and London TravelWatch will:
  - Maintain an open and constructive working relationship which recognises that London TravelWatch is independent from all transport operators and providers, and needs to work within the strategic framework that the Transport Committee sets; and
  - Adopt a "no surprises" policy based on telling each other well in advance, where possible, of significant announcements and developments that have a bearing on their common interest.

## **2. Support and assistance from the GLA**

- 2.1 Where there is no conflict of interest, after consideration by the GLA Executive Director of Secretariat, who may take legal advice, the Secretariat, Finance and Human Resources & Organisational Development departments of the core GLA may on request provide assistance to London TravelWatch.

## **3. Liaison and co-ordination**

- 3.1 Generally, but not exclusively, the protocol shall be for communication to be conducted between the Chairs (or their designated representatives) or between the officers of the two bodies. Nothing shall be regarded as the formal position of either body unless it is ratified as necessary and confirmed in writing.
- 3.2 The Chairs of both the Transport Committee and the London TravelWatch Board will meet on a regular basis to discuss the progress of their respective work programmes and other matters of common interest.
- 3.3 In searching for the maximum benefit, officers will consult annually in February / March (or in June/July in the years of ordinary elections to the Assembly) on the provisional work programmes for the following year in order to identify opportunities for—
  - joint or complementary working
  - inputs to projects being undertaken by the other body, and
  - information sharing opportunities or other measures to eliminate duplication.

- 3.4 Systematic joint working between the officers of both bodies will monitor progress and developments, and identify further opportunities for London TravelWatch to contribute to the Transport Committee's work programme. The London TravelWatch work programme will be sent to the Chair of Transport Committee within 10 working days of its approval. London TravelWatch will produce updates on its work programmes as part of its six-monthly reports to the Transport Committee.

#### *Urgency*

- 3.5 Where anything in this Memorandum of Understanding requires the consideration, agreement or approval of the Transport Committee, or involves an urgent response to a major incident, but the matter is of such urgency that it cannot wait for a meeting of that Committee, the Chair of London TravelWatch Board will refer the matter to the Chair of the Committee in writing, copied to the Chief Executive of London TravelWatch and the GLA's Executive Director of Secretariat, giving a short explanation of the decision required and why it is urgent.

## **4. London TravelWatch Board appointments**

#### *The establishment of London TravelWatch Board*

- 4.1 Transport Committee will determine how many members (not more than 24 and currently 6 plus a Chair) will comprise the London TravelWatch Board<sup>2</sup>.
- 4.2 Transport Committee will not change the membership size of the London TravelWatch Board without first having consulted with the Chair of the London TravelWatch Board.
- 4.3 Procedures for the recruitment and appointment of the Chair and other members of the London TravelWatch Board will be set by the Transport Committee and, before any change is proposed, there will be prior consultation with the Chair of the London TravelWatch Board and its Chief Executive.
- 4.4 To ensure continuity the appointment of new members will normally be phased so that the terms of office of no more than half of the membership of the Board will finish at the same time
- 4.5 In the event that this normal phasing of appointments is broken the Transport Committee will consult with the Chair of the London TravelWatch Board to agree what action should be taken to recover the situation during the following three years.
- 4.6 Where vacancies occur the Transport Committee will take steps to make a replacement appointment as quickly as possible.

---

<sup>2</sup> The GLA Act 1999 s 247(2)

## **5. Operation of the London TravelWatch Board and interaction with the GLA**

### *London TravelWatch Board meetings*

- 5.1 The London TravelWatch Board should operate as a strategic body and will programme meetings throughout the year, giving directions and guidance to the permanent Secretariat of London TravelWatch, which will then carry out the Board's decisions.

### *Sharing information*

- 5.2 In addition to the statutory requirements for the notification of decisions and provided that it would not be unlawful or in breach of commercial confidentiality to do so, -
- a) London TravelWatch will share any information that it holds (except that which was given to it in confidence) with Transport Committee where it is prudent to do so, or on request from Transport Committee; and
  - b) Transport Committee (or its Secretariat, if more appropriate) shall, on request from London TravelWatch, make available any information that it has that would assist London TravelWatch in its work.

### *Guidance and directions*

- 5.3 If the Transport Committee resolves to issue to London TravelWatch any guidance or directions as to the manner in which it is to exercise its functions<sup>3</sup>, this must be issued in writing and sent to the Chair of London TravelWatch and copied to its Chief Executive.<sup>4</sup>
- 5.4 Ordinarily, Transport Committee will not issue any such guidance or directions without first having consulted with the Chair of the London TravelWatch Board and the Chief Executive of London TravelWatch, and having had regard to any representations made by them either in writing or made orally at a Transport Committee meeting.

## **6. Staffing of London TravelWatch**

### *The staffing establishment of London TravelWatch*

- 6.1 Transport Committee must approve the overall staffing cost of London TravelWatch's secretariat and be informed of the staffing establishment and structure, both of which shall routinely be reported as part of the annual submission of the draft budget and business plan.
- 6.2 Procedures for the recruitment, appointment and employment of staff of London TravelWatch will be set by the London TravelWatch Board in accordance with the protocol attached to this agreement.

---

<sup>3</sup> The GLA Act 1999 s 251(1)

<sup>4</sup> The GLA Act 1999 s 251(3)

### *Staff restructures*

- 6.3 If a staff restructure is proposed that is not within budget, the London TravelWatch Board shall formally notify Transport Committee in writing of its proposals. Transport Committee will then notify the Board as to how it should apply for approval to proceed with the proposed restructuring.
- 6.4 The Transport Committee will determine whether or not to authorise any London TravelWatch staff restructuring that is not within the budget, and London TravelWatch will be bound by Transport Committee's decision.

## **7. Finance and performance**

### *Members' and staff salaries and expenses*

- 7.1 Transport Committee shall provide London TravelWatch with the funds with which to pay a) its Members such travelling and other allowances as Transport Committee may determine<sup>5</sup>, and b) its officers such remuneration and such travelling and other allowances as the London TravelWatch Board may determine.<sup>6</sup> Transport Committee's determinations will be made in accordance with the Mayor's budget guidance.

### *Budget process and Business Plan*

- 7.2 The annual procedure for the submission of a draft budget and accompanying business plan is set out in Appendix A and may be varied from time to time by the Transport Committee following formal consultation with the London TravelWatch Board (made via the Chair of the London TravelWatch Board).

### *Virements*

- 7.3 After consultation as appropriate with London TravelWatch Board, the Chief Executive of London TravelWatch may approve London TravelWatch budget virements of up to £100,000. Any such virements will be recorded in the quarterly reports and outturn projections to the GLA's Executive Director of Resources that may be required under the provisions of paragraph 7.6 below, and in the periodic performance reports to Transport Committee.
- 7.4 Any London TravelWatch budget virements in excess of £100,000 need approval by the Chair of Transport Committee (in consultation with the Deputy Chair and the Group Leads), following a written request by the Chief Executive of London TravelWatch to the GLA Liaison Officer and the Chair of Transport Committee.

---

<sup>5</sup> The GLA Act 1999 Schedule 18 paragraph 6 (1)(a)

<sup>6</sup> The GLA Act 1999 Schedule 18 paragraph (6)(1)(b)

### *Accounts*

- 7.5 The Chief Executive of London TravelWatch (as accounting officer) must ensure that accounting records are kept, which set out and explain London TravelWatch's financial transactions, disclose with reasonable accuracy the financial status of London TravelWatch at any time, and enable London TravelWatch to prepare a statement of accounts.<sup>7</sup>
- 7.6 The accounting and financial procedures are set out in the attached protocol and may be varied from time to time by the Transport Committee following formal consultation with the London TravelWatch Board (made via the Chair of the London TravelWatch Board).

### *Complaints from members of the public*

- 7.7 Where a member of the public makes a complaint (oral or written) about the conduct or behaviour of a member (other than the Chair) of the London TravelWatch Board, the complaint shall be logged (and recorded in writing if made orally), and will be referred to the Chair of the Board who will determine how the matter should be taken forward. Once the matter is concluded, the Chair of the Board shall inform the Chair of the Transport Committee in writing of the complaint and any action taken, with copies to the Chief Executive of London TravelWatch and the GLA's Liaison Officer.
- 7.8 In the event of a substantive complaint about the Chair of the London TravelWatch Board, an independent person will be appointed at the time with the agreement of the Deputy Chair of the Board and the Chair of the Transport Committee to investigate and report to the Chair of the Transport Committee and Deputy Chair of the Board.
- 7.9 All other complaints, including complaints about officers or London TravelWatch service provision, will be dealt with in accordance with London TravelWatch's complaints procedures and /or its relevant employment procedures. Once those procedures are exhausted, and if a complainant remains dissatisfied, they should be referred to the GLA's Liaison Officer.
- 7.10 In this section "complaints" do not include those that London TravelWatch receives from members of the public concerning the services or actions of any transport providers which are subject to London TravelWatch's remit, but do include those about London TravelWatch's handling of such complaints.

### *Annual report*

- 7.11 The London TravelWatch Board must make an annual report to Transport Committee and the Secretary of State<sup>8</sup>.
- 7.12 London TravelWatch will log, and in its annual report will record, all complaints (referred to in paragraphs 7.7 – 7.10 above) received under, and dealt with in accordance with, its complaints procedures.

### *Performance Management and Reporting*

- 7.13 London TravelWatch will comply with the requirements for performance management and periodic reporting as set out in Appendix B.

---

<sup>7</sup> The GLA Act 1999 Schedule 18 paragraph 8(1)

<sup>8</sup> The GLA Act 1999 s 250 (2)

## 8. Amending this memorandum

- 8.1 This Memorandum may be amended from time to time by the Chair of Transport Committee (in consultation with the Deputy Chair and the Group Leads) and the Chair of the London TravelWatch Board (in consultation with the London TravelWatch Chief Executive and the Board) agreeing to the proposed amendments.

Approved by:

..... **Date**

*And*

..... **Date**

**For the London Assembly**

..... **Date**

*And*

..... **Date**

**For London TravelWatch**

### Budget process and Business Plan

- A.1 Within two weeks of receipt of the Mayor's budget guidance, the Transport Committee will issue budget guidance to London TravelWatch. This will set out the proposed cash limited budget for the next financial year and may set out indicative cash limited budgets for the following two years. London TravelWatch will then prepare a budget submission based on these cash limited budgets having regard to the requirements set out in the budget guidance.
- A.2 During the preparation of the draft budget submission, the London TravelWatch Chief Executive will confer (in confidence if required) with the designated lead officer in GLA Resources Directorate to ensure that the submission is based on a full understanding of the Mayor's budget guidance and GLA procedures generally.
- A.3 The London TravelWatch Board must produce an annual Business Plan for the following year that must be sent for consideration to Transport Committee at the same time as the proposed budget. The Business Plan will
- a. be based on the broad objectives set for London TravelWatch by the Transport Committee,
  - b. include an organogram showing the existing staffing structure and establishment, and
  - c. set out how London TravelWatch will seek opportunities for joint working with the Transport Committee, and the contributions that London TravelWatch can make to the Transport Committee's work programme for the following year.
- A.4 The London TravelWatch Board will (with the advice of the London TravelWatch Chief Executive) submit a draft budget proposal to Transport Committee (to be sent to the GLA Liaison Officer and copied to the Committee Officer for Transport Committee who will arrange for it to be sent to the Chair, Deputy Chair and Group Leads of Transport Committee) in line with the timetable set out in the budget guidance.
- A.5 On receipt of the London TravelWatch Board's draft budget submission, and before the London TravelWatch Board submits its final budget submission (in accordance with paragraph A.6 below), the GLA Liaison Officer, and Chair, Deputy Chair and Group Leads of Transport Committee will, if appropriate, meet the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Board and the Chief Executive of London TravelWatch to discuss the Board's draft budget submission.
- A.6 Further to the meeting referred to in paragraph A.5 above, the London TravelWatch Board, with the approval of the London TravelWatch Chief Executive as Accounting Officer, will, in line with the deadlines set out in the Mayor's budget guidance, present a final budget submission to Transport Committee.
- A.7 Transport Committee will formally consider London TravelWatch's proposed budget and business plan and will recommend the budget to the Mayor, with or without any amendments that it considers appropriate, for inclusion in the Assembly's budget submission, in line with the deadlines set by the Mayor.



## Appendix B

### Performance management framework

- B.1 This Memorandum of Understanding is based on the principle that the Transport Committee should be informed of how London TravelWatch spends the grant that it receives from the London Assembly
- B.2 London TravelWatch's Board should set strategic objectives and performance targets for its activities and maintain appropriate internal mechanisms to monitor progress towards achieving these objectives.
- B.3 Twice a year London TravelWatch should produce a more strategic report for the Transport Committee demonstrating how it has met its key business plan objectives and the outcomes it has achieved for transport users as a result of its work.
- B.4 The performance reports should also summarise the volume and type of casework activity handled by London TravelWatch during the period and include a short overview setting out the main issues raised by the public.
- B.5 The performance reports should include management accounts for the preceding six or twelve months as appropriate.
- B.6 The end of year performance report should also include corporate health information as set out in the following table. The targets set will normally be the same as those adopted by the GLA for its own staff.

PI no.	Indicator	Target	Frequency to report
1	The number of working days / shifts lost to sickness absence per staff member	6	Annual
2	% of employees that are women	52%	Annual
3	% of employees from ethnic minority backgrounds	29%	Annual
4	% of employees declaring that they meet the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 definition and / or have declared themselves disabled	13%	Annual

This page is intentionally left blank

# Subject: Transport Committee Work Programme

**Report to: Transport Committee**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 9 January 2014**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

1.1 This report sets out the work programme for 2013/14.

## 2. Recommendation

2.1 **That the Committee notes its work programme, as set out in this report.**

## 3. Background

3.1 The Committee receives a report monitoring the progress of its work programme at each meeting.

## 4. Issues for Consideration

4.1 The table below sets out the scheduled dates of the Committee's meetings in 2013/14 and lists the main topic proposed for each meeting at this stage. The topics for future meetings are subject to change as the Committee develops proposals for its work. The work programme also provides for the Committee to respond to any matters that arise at short notice.

<b>Transport Committee meeting date</b>	<b>Proposed topic</b>
Wednesday 5 February 2014	Crossrail and future rail issues
Wednesday 12 March 2014	Q&A session with Commissioner of TfL

### **Topics identified for the work programme**

4.2 The following paragraphs provide further details of the main topics that Members have expressed interest in exploring in 2013/14. Further work will now be undertaken on these topics to develop detailed proposals for the Committee's work. It is possible that the proposed timings of topics at meetings may change in light of this work. The Committee has a rolling work programme so it is always possible for some topics to be explored in subsequent years.

### **Crossrail 2**

- 4.3 The Committee used its meeting in May to discuss Crossrail 2 in order to gather information for a response to TfL's consultation on Crossrail 2. The Committee published its response on Crossrail 2 in July 2013 and received a response from TfL on 27 September 2013.

### **Bus services including further event in early 2014**

- 4.4 The Committee used its meetings in June and July to gather views and information for its investigation into bus services in London and published its report setting out its findings and recommendations on 28 October. The Committee also published its response to TfL's consultation on the cashless operation of bus services in October 2013.
- 4.5 At its last meeting, the Committee agreed to hold an event in early 2014 to pursue its findings and recommendations on improving bus services in London. Detailed arrangements for this event are now being made in consultation with Party Group Lead Members.

### **The Mayor's Vision 2020/future transport priorities for London**

- 4.6 The Committee used its September meeting to discuss the future transport priorities and policies outlined in recent Mayoral/TfL publications. The relevant publications include the Mayor's Vision 2020 document (June 2013), the Mayor's Roads Task Force report and TfL's response to it (July 2013), the Road Safety Action Plan for London 2020 (June 2013) and the Mayor's Vision for Cycling (March 2013).

### **TfL value for money issues**

- 4.7 The Committee discussed TfL value for money issues at its meeting in October. This included discussion about: assessing the value for money of TfL's operational activities; finding efficiencies in highways maintenance; and the next phase of TfL's efficiency programme including potential staff reductions including at Tube station ticket offices.

### **TfL/Borough liaison**

- 4.8 The Committee used its meeting in November to explore issues relating to liaison between TfL and the London Boroughs on transport matters in the capital. This included discussion about Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding with representatives of London Councils and TfL.

### **Cycling in London including the cycle hire scheme and the Mayor's cycling vision**

- 4.9 The Committee used its last meeting to discuss cycling in London. This drew on findings from the Committee's online survey of cyclists which attracted over 6,000 responses. The Committee will produce detailed findings from the survey. A site visit to Aldgate East junction on Cycle Superhighway 2 will be arranged by officers.

### **Pedestrian safety**

- 4.10 At its last meeting, the Committee agreed to explore pedestrian safety at this meeting. This is the subject of a separate item on the agenda for this meeting.

### **Crossrail**

- 4.11 The Committee is due to check on progress with the Crossrail project at its meeting in February 2014. This would provide for the Committee to follow up its past work on Crossrail including its report and recommendations in February 2010 and its subsequent progress checks at meetings in February 2011 and 2012, and March 2013.

### **Rail issues including the future of London Overground and HS2**

- 4.12 It is proposed that the Committee also explores rail issues at its meeting in February 2014. This could include exploring the future of London Overground and the Mayor and TfL's progress in obtaining control of further inner suburban rail services in London.
- 4.13 The Committee may also wish to respond to any relevant rail consultations throughout the year. The Committee responded to the High Speed 2 (HS2) Phase One Design Refinement consultation and to Network Rail's current four market study consultations in July 2013.
- 4.14 A site visit to the reconstruction work at London Bridge station is being arranged by officers.

### **Question and answer session with TfL**

- 4.15 It is proposed that the Committee use its meeting in March 2014 for a question and answer session with the Commissioner of TfL. These sessions can provide an opportunity to explore a range of transport issues, TfL Board and committee discussions and decisions, and follow up topics which the Committee has covered in its past reports and recommendations.

### **Other possible topics**

- 4.16 Members have suggested a range of other possible topics. These include: further work on airport capacity following the Airports Commission's interim report (December 2013); progress with the electrification of the Gospel Oak to Barking line; and TfL's use of bailiffs. These topics will be kept under review along with other transport issues in the event that the Committee wishes to make any changes to its work programme.
- 4.17 In November 2013, the Transport and Environment Committees sent a joint letter to the Airports Commission restating their support for the establishment of an independent aviation noise regulator and improvements to surface public transport access at airports.

### **Responses to recent Transport Committee work**

- 4.18 This section of the work programme provides details of any responses due from the Mayor, TfL and/or others to Committee work.

<b>Transport Committee work</b>	<b>Details of responses due (if appropriate)</b>
Report on bus services in London (October)	The Committee has made nine recommendations to the Mayor and TfL and requested an initial response to these by 13 December 2013

- 4.19 On 13 December, Shashi Verma, Director of Customer Experience at TfL wrote to the Chair following up the Committee's 2011 report, *The Future of Ticketing*. The letter is attached at **Appendix 1**.

## **5. Legal Implications**

- 5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

## **6. Financial Implications**

- 6.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

---

**List of appendices to this report:**

Appendix 1: Letter from TfL re contactless payment

**Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

List of Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: Laura Warren, Scrutiny Manager  
Telephone: 020 7983 6545  
Email: [laura.warren@london.gov.uk](mailto:laura.warren@london.gov.uk)



# Transport for London

Our ref: 20131213

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM  
Chair, Transport Committee  
London Assembly  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
London  
SE1 2AA

**Transport for London**  
Customer Experience

Windsor House  
42-50 Victoria Street  
London  
SW1H 0TL

[www.tfl.gov.uk](http://www.tfl.gov.uk)

13 December 2013

Dear Val

## **First anniversary of contactless payment on buses**

I promised to write to you with an update to the recommendations in the Committee's "The Future of Ticketing" report based on the experience from contactless payment card (CPC) acceptance on buses.

Since we successfully launched CPC acceptance on buses on 13 December 2012, more than 6.5 million journeys have now been made using an American Express, MasterCard or Visa Europe contactless payment card.

I am pleased to say that usage continues to rise strongly and now an average of 33,000 bus journeys a day are paid for using the debit, credit or charge cards. Further information and data on CPC usage can be found on our website at [www.tfl.gov.uk/transparency](http://www.tfl.gov.uk/transparency).

There have been no technical issues since the system launched. Customers appear to be willing and comfortable in using a CPC to pay for bus fares, and no security concerns have been detected either by us, our contractors, or the Payments Industry as a consequence of this facility. The steady growth in usage – around 1,300 new cards every day – suggests that customers are comfortable with the technology.

Before CPCs were introduced on buses, we launched a customer information campaign to advise customers to keep their card (Oyster or bank card) separate when presenting it to the card reader. This campaign has continued since the launch through a range of channels including messages at bus stops, on the real-time information displays and via emails to customers. Since launch refunds requests for the incorrect card being charged have averaged less than three per day, out of

around 4 million daily bus journeys paid for on Oyster. Other issuers are also promoting contactless payment and customer feedback on social media has been particularly welcoming of this new payment method. No issues regarding CPC acceptance have been reported back to us by bus operating staff.

As you know, acceptance on the Tube, London Overground, DLR and Trams will launch early next year, when London will become the first city in the world to fully integrate contactless payments cards into the fares system. A controlled pilot will take place over the next few months to test the system on these modes, including additional customer messages, to rectify any operational issues before the full launch. My teams continue to work closely with the payments industry to prepare for the next phases.

I hope this is helpful and please do let me know if you have any questions.

*Shashi Kant Verma*

**Shashi Verma**  
**Director of Customer Experience**