

Pedal power: the cycle hire scheme and cycle superhighways

November 2010



Copyright

**Greater London Authority
November 2010**

Published by
Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA
www.london.gov.uk

enquiries 020 7983 4100
minicom 020 7983 4458

ISBN: 978-1-84781-410-4

This publication is printed on recycled paper

Transport Committee Members

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Valerie Shawcross, Chair | Labour |
| Caroline Pidgeon, Deputy Chair | Liberal Democrat |
| Victoria Borwick | Conservative |
| James Cleverly | Conservative |
| Jenny Jones | Green |
| Joanne McCartney | Labour |
| Steve O'Connell | Conservative |
| Murad Qureshi | Labour |
| Richard Tracey | Conservative |

At its meeting on 9 September 2010, the Committee agreed to undertake a review into the initial impact of the cycle hire scheme and cycle superhighways with the following terms of reference:

- To examine the initial impact of the cycle hire scheme and cycle superhighways including any issues arising from their early implementation and consider the solutions proposed; and
- To assess the potential for, and issues to address, in any further roll out or expansion of the schemes.

The Committee welcomes feedback on its report. For further information, contact Laura Warren in the Scrutiny Team by: letter c/o of City Hall, More London, SE1 2AA; email: laura.warren@london.gov.uk; or telephone: 020 7983 6545. For press enquiries, contact Dana Gavin by telephone: 020 7983 4603 or email: dana.gavin@london.gov.uk

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Chair’s foreword | 6 |
| Executive summary | 7 |
| Introduction | 10 |
| An overview of the schemes: their targets and costs | 11 |
| Initial issues for the cycle hire scheme | 18 |
| Initial issues for the cycle superhighways | 27 |
| Conclusion | 35 |
| Appendix 1 – details of this review | 36 |
| Appendix 2 – orders and translations | 41 |
| Appendix 3 – principles of scrutiny | 42 |

Chair's foreword

The cycle hire scheme and cycle superhighways are major additions to London's transport network. The Transport Committee supports their development. It wants to see them result in more cycling in London.



It is early days for these schemes but our review into their initial impact has revealed some issues. This report sets out, in detail, the matters which users of the schemes and organisations have raised so they may inform the future development of these schemes. It also sets out overall targets and costs for each scheme to provide a basis on which to judge their success in the longer-term.

We have found great enthusiasm for the cycle hire scheme but there remain questions about how it is being funded. It is not clear exactly how much sponsorship Barclays has provided for a scheme which has now been running for four months. The Mayor has plans to expand the scheme eastwards and potentially beyond. Many want to see its expansion across the whole of London, particularly to areas where public transport is limited. The Mayor and Transport for London (TfL) will need to make clear how any plans for expansion will be funded and the rationale for the areas that will be covered.

The cycle superhighways do not appear as popular with new cyclists as the cycle hire scheme. Users of the pilot cycle superhighways have told us that they do not feel safer using these routes and they are not always respected by other road users. There are clearly lessons to be learned from the design and development of the pilot cycle superhighways. These should be applied before the roll out of the future cycle superhighways to ensure these are safer and attract many more new cyclists.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who has contributed to this review. We look forward to receiving a response from the Mayor and TfL to the matters we raise in this report.

Valerie Shawcross AM, Chair, Transport Committee

Executive summary

The Mayor's flagship schemes to encourage cycling in London are highly visible to everybody travelling around the capital. The distinctive hire bikes and docking stations represent a new piece of transport infrastructure in central London. The forthcoming roll-out of the cycle hire scheme for casual users is keenly awaited. Similarly, swathes of cyclists on the bright blue lanes on key arterial routes into the centre are becoming a common sight.

The Committee supports these initiatives. Both schemes are new and perhaps inevitably there have been teething problems and criticisms of some aspects. Our aim in this report is to highlight what is working well and, where we see the potential for improvement, to respond to these criticisms and make constructive suggestions to Transport for London (TfL) and the Mayor. In doing so, we have drawn on the first large-scale survey of users and the views of a number of organisations.

We found great enthusiasm for the cycle hire scheme. Over 20 per cent of respondents to our survey had started cycling as a result of the scheme and over 80 per cent thought it good value for money. One comment received, representative of the views of many, described it as "a very significant enhancement to life in London".

While clearly value for money for users, there remain questions over how the scheme is being funded and the return on TfL's initial investment. The amount of sponsorship that Barclays has provided to date is unclear. It may have provided less than anticipated since its agreement with TfL is conditional on certain performance indicators being met but the scheme has not rolled out as planned. Furthermore, delays in the implementation of the scheme and the roll-out to casual users have affected operating costs and revenue from charges.

These delays have costs. TfL reports that the annual operating cost of the scheme will be £18 million which it expects to be met from charges and sponsorship. To date in 2010/11, TfL has received only £1.9 million of income from charges largely because the roll out to casual users was delayed by six months and has missed the summer months. TfL now expects the scheme to be self-financing in two to three years and for the income to start contributing to its £79 million set up costs by 2017/18.

The roll-out to casual users of the cycle hire scheme planned for 3 December will also determine the extent to which the scheme will meet its original objectives. Current users are making on average 15,000 trips per day compared with the eventual aim of 40,000. Our survey found less than one per cent of journeys are replacing those previously made by car; TfL's planning assumptions were for a five per cent shift from car to bike.

TfL and Serco, the private contractor running the cycle hire scheme, have made some welcome changes in response to initial teething problems. Our report seeks further action depending, in some cases, on the extent to which the roll-out to casual users provides its own solutions. Specifically, we ask TfL and the Mayor to address:

- The lack of bikes and available docking points in certain areas, particularly at peak periods.
- Problems with registration, charges and poor customer service from Serco's customer service centre. Half of the respondents to our survey had had to contact the call centre to report problems and one third rated the experience poor or very poor.

The rationale for decisions about expanding the cycle hire scheme geographically is unclear. Inevitably, people in many parts of London want the scheme to be made available in their areas. The existing scheme is limited in its geographical reach, largely benefiting inner London. Yet many have highlighted that the greatest potential for growth in cycling is in outer London. TfL has highlighted some logistical issues to expanding the scheme. It suggests "bolt on" areas in large employment centres are more feasible than the London-wide expansion of the cycle hire scheme along the lines of the Paris model to which the Mayor has aspired.

We have found far less enthusiasm from new cyclists for the cycle superhighways. The cycle superhighways will have to deliver a significant increase in cycling if they are to justify the £166 million investment. The Mayor's ambition is for the planned 12 cycle superhighways to generate 120,000 *additional* cycle trips per day. The two pilot cycle superhighways are attracting 5,000 cyclists per day

and only one per cent of respondents to our survey had started cycling specifically as a result.¹

There is a need to learn lessons from the pilot cycle superhighways and apply these before the roll-out of the future cycle superhighways. It is hoped that the cycle superhighways will help create the potential for a critical mass which will eventually encourage others to get on their bikes and help realise the Mayor's ambition for a cycling revolution in the capital. Our work suggests there are some issues which need to be addressed to ensure this happens:

- 60 per cent of respondents did not feel safer using the cycle superhighways and two-thirds did not feel they were respected by other road users. Greater consistency in the measures along the route would help this situation, such as a uniform width, improvements to junctions and 20 mph speed limits on busy sections.
- Development of future cycle superhighways should include detailed consultation with cycling organisations and London Boroughs and build on evaluations of the pilots to date.

The cycle hire scheme and cycle superhighways have already had a large impact on the capital. We recognise it is very early days. Our report aims to contribute to the planning on how they develop further. Their success will determine the extent to which the Mayor's ambitions for cycling in London are realised.

¹ The Committee's survey was self-selecting so it is not representative of all users. However, it did provide a way of gathering lots of views from interested people about both schemes.

Introduction

In summer 2010, the Mayor launched two major schemes to increase cycling in London. On 19 July, two of the 12 cycle superhighways were unveiled. These blue cycle lanes are intended to provide safer routes for commuters to cycle from inner and outer London to the city. On 29 July, the cycle hire scheme began. A self-service public bicycle sharing scheme operating in zone one, it is intended to provide an alternative mode of transport for short journeys.

The Transport Committee welcomes these schemes and the recent announcement that the cycle hire scheme will be available to casual users from 3 December. It recognises the huge potential to increase cycling in London and the important role these schemes have to play in making this happen. The Committee wants them to be successful. With such large-scale projects, there are inevitably some issues. These schemes are still very much in their infancy. The Committee remains supportive as they are developed.

The Transport Committee undertook a short review to assess the initial impact of the schemes. It explored issues which had emerged and the possible solutions, with a view to informing the future development of the schemes. Recently, the Mayor and TfL announced that the cycle hire scheme will be expanded to east London by 2012 and all 12 cycle superhighways will be installed, as planned, by 2015.

This review provided the first opportunity for users of both schemes to share their views publicly. Around 1,300 people responded to the Committee's online survey. This was completed on a self-selecting basis and as such is not representative of all users but it did provide a way of gathering lots of users' views. Other people, along with organisations, provided written submissions. This review also included a public meeting on 12 October 2010 where the Committee discussed the schemes in detail. Further information about the stages in the review can be found at Appendix 1 of this report.

The remainder of the report summarises the information and views gathered by the Committee. Where appropriate, it highlights issues that the Committee would like the Mayor and TfL to respond to or address to help improve the operation of these schemes. The first section provides an overview of the schemes' initial progress against the Mayor's targets and their costs. The subsequent sections set out the specific issues which have arisen in relation to each scheme and some possible solutions.

An overview of the schemes: their targets and costs

The cycle hire scheme and cycle superhighways are central to the Mayor's plan for a "cycling revolution" in London. The Transport Strategy sets out a target to increase cycling trips by 400 per cent by 2026²; the equivalent of 1.5 million cycling trips per day. When launching the cycle hire scheme, the Mayor was more ambitious. He said: "In 1904, 20 per cent of journeys were made by bicycle in London. I want to see a figure like that again."³

Although it is too early to draw definitive conclusions about the impact of these schemes, it is possible to make some initial observations. These should be placed alongside the schemes' overall targets and costs. This can help to inform their future development and provide a basis against which to judge their success in future years.

Is the cycle hire scheme meeting its targets?

The Mayor wants the cycle hire scheme to generate 40,000 additional cycle trips per day by offering an alternative to the car and public transport.⁴

To date, the scheme has attracted over 100,000 registered members who are making, on average, 15,000 trips per day.⁵ The average number of trips for weekdays is higher at 21,000-24,000.⁶ Although this is just over half the target of 40,000 daily trips, the scheme has not yet rolled out to casual users. TfL reports that by March 2011 it expects an average of 27,000 trips per day and to reach the target of 40,000 trips per day in future years.⁷

The Committee's survey revealed great enthusiasm for this scheme. Around one-fifth of respondents had started cycling as a result of the cycle hire scheme. Over 80 per cent thought it represented good value for money. The following comment is typical.

"Overall, I love the scheme and it has improved my quality of life tremendously. I feel fitter and happier and "empowered" by having another way to make journeys...The scheme is a very significant enhancement to life in London."

² Mayor's Transport Strategy, p187

³ <http://www.lcc.org.uk/index.asp?PageID=1963>

⁴ 'Cycling Revolution', Mayor and TfL, p.12

⁵ Written response from TfL, 23 November 2010

⁶ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p3

⁷ Written response from TfL, 23 November 2010

The survey respondents reported some change in their travel behaviour. Over half used the hire bikes instead of different modes. Around one-fifth reported using the hire bikes instead of just the Tube, eight per cent instead of just the bus and seven per cent instead of just walking. Less than one per cent reported using the bikes instead of the car. TfL originally anticipated a modal shift of five per cent from cars. It also predicted the largest shift would be from walking (34 per cent) with some shift from buses (32 per cent) and the Tube (20 per cent).⁸

The cost of the cycle hire scheme

There remain questions about the cost and funding arrangements for the cycle hire scheme. The Committee has obtained further information from TfL which is set out at Appendix 1 of this report. This shows the cycle hire scheme's capital and operational costs: the total capital cost for phase one of the scheme is expected to be £79 million and the annual operating cost is anticipated to be £18 million.⁹

Charges and sponsorship income from the scheme goes to TfL. This income is planned to cover operational costs.¹⁰ The timing of the break-even point has been affected by the scheme not being rolled out as planned. Phase one of the scheme was originally scheduled for May 2010.¹¹ This was to have enabled members and casual users to use 6,000 bikes at 400 docking stations with over 10,000 docking points. It was anticipated that they would make 30,000 trips per day in year one rising to 40,000 trips per day each year thereafter.

The scheme will be available to casual users from early December rather than May as planned. While this delay has enabled TfL and Serco to iron out some of the teething problems it has reduced the revenue because of the smaller than anticipated number of journeys. Registered users are making, on average, 15,000 trips per day. TfL expects the number of trips to rise to an average 27,000 trips per day by March 2011 once the scheme is rolled out to casual users.

TfL and Serco are still working towards installing the target infrastructure for phase one of the scheme. TfL told us that there are 5,000 available bikes at 344 docking stations with around 8,180

⁸ TfL's original business case for the cycle hire scheme??

⁹ Written submission from TfL, 23 November 2010

¹⁰ Written submission from TfL, 23 November 2010

¹¹ TFL Investment Programme 2009, p 93

docking points. These figures are between 14 per cent and 18 per cent less than had been planned for phase one of the scheme.

The absence of casual users has reduced income from charges and the absence of all the planned infrastructure has resulted in higher operational costs. For example, Serco has had to supply additional staff and vehicles to help with the redistribution of bikes in popular locations. It has also supplied more call centre staff. It is not clear whether these additional costs have been met by Serco or whether TfL is providing financial support. When the Committee asked for this information, TfL reported that operating costs for the cycle hire scheme, including for the call centre and redistribution, were commercially confidential.¹²

In October, David Brown, the Managing Director of Surface Transport at TfL, told the Committee that, in theory, the limited roll-out to date had affected revenue. He said TfL assumed casual users would hire the bikes for longer than 30 minutes at a time so they would be a bigger revenue generator. However, TfL now expects to break even on operating costs within two to three years. Moreover, “by the end of the business plan, income from charges and the sponsorship deal with Barclays would contribute to the capital cost.”¹³

Since then, TfL has reported that, in the first four months of the scheme, it has achieved £1.9 million of income from charges. This is just 10 per cent of the amount it expects to generate from charges by March 2011 (£18.7 million).¹⁴ It is, therefore, expecting to generate the majority of the income this year in the next four months following the roll-out to casual users. However, this coincides with the winter period when demand is expected to fall and therefore these income expectations seem optimistic.¹⁵

TfL has not revealed how much income from sponsorship it has received to date. It is possible that it has received less than anticipated because the scheme has not rolled out as planned. The agreement with Barclays provides for £25 million of funding over a five year period (equating to £5 million per year) providing TfL meets key performance indicators such as the number of trips generated through the scheme.¹⁶ The Mayor has also reported that there are

¹² Written response from TfL, October 2010, p.16

¹³ Transcript of 12 October 2010 meeting, pages 8-9

¹⁴ Written response from TfL, 23 November 2010

¹⁵ As reported on site visit to Serco's operations centre, Islington on 22 November 2010

¹⁶ Written response from TfL, 23 November 2010

other measures of success in the agreement with Barclays including the number of docking stations installed and the number of bikes in circulation.¹⁷

In the past, the Mayor has reported that Barclays would provide up to £23.8 million of sponsorship by 2014/15. Of this, £10.8 million would be used for phase one of the cycle hire scheme and the rest would be spent on future intensification /expansion of the scheme.¹⁸ TfL has also indicated that the deal with Barclays will cover the cycle superhighways.¹⁹ However, the information provided to the Committee does not indicate what amount of sponsorship funding has been allocated to the cycle superhighways.

TfL has reported that the cost of the proposed expansion of the scheme eastwards is £45 million over a six year period. This includes £30 million of funding for implementation and £15 million for operational costs.²⁰ This proposed expansion will provide for 2,000 more bikes and 4,200 more docking points.

TfL told the Committee that in developing the scheme, it would need to be “more imaginative” about funding. For example, if businesses wanted docking stations located outside their buildings, they could pay for them.²¹ It remains to be seen if other sources of funding, apart from Barclays, have been secured to offset the cost. It is also unclear what number of additional cycle trips the expansion is expected to generate. This information should be published so it is possible to assess the full costs and benefits of expanding the scheme.

The costs and funding arrangements for the cycle hire scheme remain opaque. TfL has not told the Committee how much Barclays has paid to date for its branding of the scheme. The argument that all details of the relationships between TfL and Serco and Barclays are confidential is not a compelling one. The details of these deals determine how much of the costs of the scheme have to be met from farepayers at a time of huge pressure on TfL’s finances. It is in the public interest for these details to be made available to the Committee. This would be in line with the Mayor’s commitment to transparency about public expenditure.

¹⁷ MQT 3565/2010, 17 November 2010

¹⁸ MQT 2152/2010 and 2179/2010

¹⁹ TfL press release 315

²⁰ Written submission from TfL, 23 November 2010

²¹ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, page 27

The Mayor and TfL should publish the amount of sponsorship obtained to date from Barclays and the conditions to be met for future sponsorship. The Mayor and TfL should also set out clearly how the expansion of the scheme eastwards will be paid for and the number of additional cycle trips it is expected to generate.

Are the cycle superhighways meeting their targets?

The Mayor wants the 12 cycle superhighways to generate up to 120,000 additional trips per day by providing commuters with a quicker, safer way to get to work from inner and outer London.²²

In the first few months, TfL has reported a 25 per cent increase in cycle trips on the two pilot cycle superhighways (Merton to the City – CS7 and Barking to Tower Gateway – CS3). These are being used by 5,000 cyclists per day.²³ TfL believes that it is reasonable to conclude, at this stage, that this increase is not due to cyclists diverting from parallel routes.²⁴

The Committee's survey revealed far less enthusiasm from new cyclists for the cycle superhighways compared to the hire scheme. Only one per cent of respondents had started cycling specifically because of the cycle superhighways. Around one-third used the two pilot routes occasionally and one-third used them several times a week.

TfL has reported that its initial research shows some behaviour change as a result of the cycle superhighways. Of its survey of 257 people who cycled on the routes recently, 16-24 per cent had shifted from another mode. There was a 26 per cent increase in the number of people cycling three times a week.²⁵

TfL told the Committee that its business case for the cycle superhighways is not only about encouraging modal shift and increasing the number of cyclists. It is also about improving journey times and the smoothness of journeys for existing cyclists.²⁶

The costs of the cycle superhighways

²² 'Cycling Revolution', Mayor and TfL, p.12

²³ TfL's written submission, 5 October 2010

²⁴ TfL's written submission, 5 October 2010

²⁵ Managing Director's report to TfL's Surface Transport Panel, 9 November 2010

²⁶ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p4

The 12 cycle superhighways are expected to cost £166 million.²⁷ This includes around £23 million for the two pilot cycle superhighways. Most of the money for the pilot routes (£12.47 million) has been spent on the highways improvements e.g. painting blue cycle lanes, installing advance stop lines and modifying junctions. This budget also covered the additional “soft” measures which are part of the scheme. It included: £1.41million for cycle parking; £1.46million for cycle training, maintenance and safety; and £1.44 million for route promotion.²⁸

The majority of the cost of the cycle superhighways is being met by TfL. As highlighted in the previous section on the cycle hire scheme, TfL has reported that some Barclays sponsorship would be used for the cycle superhighways. The Committee has sought clarification from TfL on the amount to be covered by sponsorship but it has not given details. The information TfL has provided on the costs of the cycle superhighways is set out at Appendix 1.

Greater clarity on costs and performance of these schemes

In future, the Mayor and TfL should provide more detailed information about the cost and performance of these schemes so Londoners know what they are getting for their money. TfL has already released data about the cycle hire scheme to assist in the creation of ‘apps’ for mobile phones which give more information to users of the scheme.²⁹ This is welcome. TfL could now build on this openness by releasing further information about the costs and performance of the schemes.

There are various pieces of information which TfL could publish immediately. This includes: the ‘raw data’ from its Ipsos Mori survey of users of the cycle hire scheme³⁰ and its survey of users of the cycle superhighways; its contract with Serco for the operation of the cycle hire scheme³¹; and its agreement with Barclays for sponsoring both schemes. The publication of such information would be in line with the Government’s commitment to publish details of all contracts over £25,000.

²⁷ Written submission from TfL, 23 November 2010

²⁸ TfL’s written submission, October 2010

²⁹ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 30

³⁰ TfL Commissioner’s report, TfL Board, 4 November 2010, p.18

³¹ Although its contract with Serco may be deemed commercially confidential, TfL has previously released contracts with organisations contracted to deliver services. For example, in 2003, after the Assembly called for its release, TfL published the contract with Capita for administering the Congestion Charging Zone.

The publication of more information about the costs and performance of the cycle hire scheme and cycle superhighways chimes with the Government's desire for greater disclosure on public sector spending. It will enable Londoners to understand what is being spent on these schemes and what is being delivered for this money.

Initial issues for the cycle hire scheme

The cycle hire scheme is very popular. Inevitably with a new scheme there have been some problems. Users highlighted a number of issues in their survey responses. This section provides more details. The Committee asks the Mayor and TfL to provide a response on these matters by March 2011.

A lack of bikes and available docking points in some areas

There has been a lack of bikes and available docking points in certain areas, particularly at peak periods. The Committee's survey revealed this was a particular problem in Covent Garden, Holborn, Kennington, Westminster and Waterloo. One respondent commented: "There is a shocking lack of available docking points in Vauxhall and Kennington. Twice I had to cycle further than I had to travel from where I picked the bike up. Once I was told to take the bike home. Not fun to carry up 4 flights of stairs. I was charged £50...and told to wait 5 days for a refund."

In response, TfL has worked with Serco to establish an improved bike redistribution programme. Staff have been deployed at busy docking stations to help users return or obtain bikes.³² New redistribution processes have been introduced.³³ Serco has doubled its total number of redistribution staff and vehicles.

In turn, this has led to questions about the environmental impact of the scheme. It was originally expected that only electric vehicles would be used for redistribution. Serco is now using 14 electrically powered vehicles, 10 Focus/Mondeo vehicles and, on a temporary basis, three 7.5 ton lorries and four Sprinter vans. It also uses 10 Nissan vans for on-street maintenance.³⁴ It has told the Committee that it is undertaking a fleet review in light of the different redistribution requirements.³⁵

TfL has reiterated that, as originally planned, it is not seeking to meet all the potential demand at rail stations. Although it has recently

³² MQT question: 2903/2010; 15/09/2010

³³ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 14

³⁴ Written submission from Serco, 11 November 2010 and transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 15 and 31

³⁵ As reported on site visit to Serco's operations centre, Islington on 22 November 2010

worked with Network Rail to increase the number of docking points at Waterloo station, it does not plan any further increases thereafter. TfL has suggested that it could never meet the demand at rail stations. It estimated this would require the space of 24 football pitches to park all the hire bikes required.³⁶ Serco has suggested that alternative options could be explored. For example, the introduction of a cheap all day bike rental scheme at stations similar to the CyclePoint scheme at Leeds station.³⁷

The introduction of the planned 400 docking stations should improve availability. Serco has stated that it believes the completion of these further docking stations will help address redistribution.³⁸ The London Cycling Campaign reported to the Committee that the functionality of the scheme depends on the full complement of 400 docking stations being completed.³⁹

However, the full scheme may not be in place until March 2011. In October, Serco reported that 70-80 docking stations were still subject to planning permission, under construction or constrained by other factors. It anticipated “progressively adding” docking stations so 10,000 docking points and 6,000 bikes would be available by March.⁴⁰

TfL will need to work closely with London Boroughs to progress the installation of all the planned docking stations. The London Borough of Islington reported on problems with the installation of docking stations in its area. It said it had a “long list of snagging issues” to be resolved before it would sign off the docking stations. It had now agreed with TfL that it could do the majority of work on any future docking stations.⁴¹ The current number of docking stations per London Borough and in the Royal Parks is shown in the table below.⁴²

| London Borough/Royal Parks | Number of docking stations |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Camden | 37 |
| City of London | 28 |
| Hackney | 13 |
| Islington | 29 |
| Kensington and Chelsea | 46 |
| Lambeth | 21 |
| Royal Parks | 11 |

³⁶ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 25

³⁷ As reported on site visit to Serco’s operations centre, Islington on 22 November 2010

³⁸ Serco’s written response, 5 October 2010

³⁹ London Cycling Campaign’s written submission, October 2010

⁴⁰ Serco’s written response, 5 October 2010

⁴¹ London Borough of Islington’s written submission, October 2010

⁴² Information from TfL provided on 24 November 2010

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| Southwark | 31 |
| Tower Hamlets | 13 |
| Westminster | 119 |

TfL has said it is learning lessons about the installation of docking stations. For the future expansion it is seeking different ways of working with London Boroughs to secure sites for docking stations.⁴³ The future expansion will require an additional 4,200 docking points, including 1,500 within the current area.

The roll-out to casual users may also help with the redistribution of bikes. Amongst others, the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea⁴⁴ has stressed the importance of extending the scheme to casual users for this purpose. The London Cycling Campaign has reported that for better efficiency this 'natural' re-distribution is preferable to reliance on Serco staff. In Paris, the Velib scheme gives additional free hire time to users so they take the bikes to destinations where they are in short supply. The London Cycling Campaign suggests a similar incentive scheme should be considered for London.⁴⁵

The Committee welcomes the efforts being made by TfL, Serco and London Boroughs to deliver the planned 400 docking stations, 10,000 docking points and 6,000 bikes. This is crucial to the success of the current scheme. If this installation, combined with the roll-out to casual users, does not address the problems of a lack of bikes and available docking points in certain areas, the Mayor and TfL will need to take other action. This could include providing an incentive of additional free hire time so users assist with the redistribution of bikes.

Problems with registration, charging and poor customer service

In the first few months of the scheme, some users experienced problems with the registration process. Some users were also overcharged. One respondent to the Committee's survey commented: "The registration process was awful. Being of Irish heritage I have an apostrophe in my name. The system could not cope with this. It took three weeks to be able to register."

⁴³ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 11

⁴⁴ Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea's written submission, October 2010

⁴⁵ London Cycling Campaign's written submission, October 2010

Serco has reported that systems errors have now been addressed and its staff retrained. There were two billing glitches in August but there have not been any since.⁴⁶ In October, David Brown of TfL reported that, in light of the initial teething issues, TfL wanted to get the experience right for those customers registering as members. It therefore delayed the roll-out to casual users but was now “getting everything ready so we will be ready for casual users and the experience will be good.”⁴⁷

Although improvements have been made, there remains an outstanding issue for members wanting multiple membership keys. The current arrangement means members are charged for all keys held when only one key is used. One respondent to the Committee’s survey commented: “I have two keys and get charged the £1 daily access fee for both keys even if I only use one key to unlock a bike for myself. This is unfair, and a sneaky way of generating revenue!” Another stated: “My partner registered me for a key on her account. Nowhere was it made clear that this meant that both keys would be charged every time she used hers. This is clearly a nonsense... This stupidity had turned me from a supporter of the scheme to a vocal detractor.”

Serco has acknowledged that this is an issue. It reported that it had made refunds where appropriate. It also now advises customers that if they want multiple keys to have separate memberships in separate names. It accepted this arrangement was not ideal. It told the Committee steps are being taken to change this part of the system.⁴⁸

A more pressing issue for the roll-out to casual users is to ensure a better service from Serco’s customer call centre. The Committee’s survey revealed many people had received a poor service. Half the respondents reported having to contact the call centre to report a problem. Of these, more than one-third rated the experience poor or very poor. The following comments are typical.

“Fortunately I’ve only ever been overcharged very small amounts but it has been a titanic battle to get anybody to respond substantively to me and one of my overcharges has never been resolved....”

⁴⁶ Serco’s written response, 5 October 2010

⁴⁷ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 6

⁴⁸ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 18

“Switching from weekly to annual access was extremely difficult. It took several attempts over two weeks.”

“I seem to have problems undocking the bikes. I'm not sure if this is a problem with my account or an issue with the docking station. There have been long waits when I have then contacted the call centre.”

Serco told the Committee that there had been problems with the call centre. In the first few months it was overwhelmed by demand. In August, there was on average 2,300 calls per day and the average call waiting time was 79 seconds⁴⁹. Subsequently, though, the centre had been reviewed and the number of staff increased.⁵⁰ By October, the average number of calls per day had reduced to 1,000 and the average call waiting time was 13 seconds.⁵¹ TfL recently reported the call centre's service levels had improved; all its key performance indicators had been met since 19 September 2010.⁵²

Whilst some improvements have been made, people contacting the call centre whilst using the bikes may still experience delays. One respondent to the Committee's survey commented “on phoning the help desk there is a good minute of pre-amble and then options. If I'm out on a bike and have a problem I simply want to speak to someone. They could do with two numbers – one for people out on bikes and one for general enquiries.” Serco reported to the Committee that it would look at how to improve the responses provided to people who call when using the bikes. TfL also reported that this “was a very valid point which we need to find a way round.”⁵³

TfL and Serco have taken steps to address problems with registration, charging and a poor response from the customer call centre. More could be done to build on these improvements. They could: change the charges for members so they can have multiple keys but only get charged for each key used; and develop a process whereby users reporting problems whilst using the bikes obtain a quicker response from the call centre.

Concerns about the safety of users of the scheme

⁴⁹ Written submission from Serco, 11 November 2010

⁵⁰ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 17

⁵¹ Written submission from Serco, 11 November 2010

⁵² TfL Commissioner's report, TfL Board, 4 November 2010, p18

⁵³ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 20

TfL and Serco have told the Committee that there have been around nine minor road incidents involving users of the cycle hire scheme.⁵⁴ This is very few in the context of more than one million journeys on the cycle hire bikes.

Some people have expressed concern that the number of road incidents could increase with the roll-out to casual users. These may include visitors to London who are unfamiliar with its streets. In September, the Mayor himself raised safety as an issue. He reported seeing terrifying things being done on the bikes. He said that “only last night I saw a girl completely dead to the world wobbling into traffic...anything could have happened.”⁵⁵ Organisations such as the road safety campaign group Brake⁵⁶ and the head injuries charity Headway have argued for the provision of cycle helmets.⁵⁷

There is considerable debate over the merits of cyclists using cycle helmets to increase their safety. In April 2010, TfL decided not to introduce cycle helmets as part of the scheme. Instead it seeks to promote safety through the provision of cycle training in the nine boroughs where the scheme operates and through the scheme’s code of conduct. It has also placed stickers on the handlebars of each bike warning users not to ride to the left of large vehicles. TfL reported that this was an important message to convey. The majority of cyclists who died on London’s roads last year had done whilst undertaking or riding inside a left-turning vehicle.⁵⁸

The Committee welcomes the steps which the Mayor and TfL has taken to improve the safety of users of the cycle hire scheme. It asks the Mayor and TfL to keep these measures under review. They should consider what further action could be taken if the roll-out to casual users results in an increase in the number of road incidents involving users of the scheme.

Expansion of the cycle hire scheme

There is clearly huge potential to expand the scheme. Many organisations have expressed support for intensification of the scheme within its existing area. Some organisations have argued for a wider

⁵⁴ As reported on site visit to Serco’s operations centre, Islington on 22 November 2010

⁵⁵ Tom Edwards, BBC blog, 22 September 2010

⁵⁶ Daily Telegraph: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/wirecopy/8020258/Boris-bike-scheme-urged-to-include-helmets-after-two-riders-injured.html>, 23 September 2010

⁵⁷ Written submission to the Committee, October 2010

⁵⁸ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 23

extension of the scheme to other parts of outer London. They draw a parallel with Paris' Velib scheme which has around 24,000 bikes at 1,750 sites.⁵⁹ The Mayor has also mentioned the Velib scheme. He said he wanted to overtake it, and that a London hire bike was a Rolls Royce compared to the Parisian "deux chevaux" [Citroen 2CV].⁶⁰

The Mayor has already announced that the scheme will be expanded eastward by 2012 but the rationale for this expansion is not clear. The proposal provides for an additional 2,000 bikes and 4,200 docking points, of which 1,500 will be in the existing area.⁶¹ It is not apparent how lessons are being learned from the current scheme and applied, including in relation to the location of more docking points in the existing area.

It is important that the development of this scheme is placed within the context of encouraging cycling across the whole of London. The Mayor and TfL should be ensuring there is a balanced development of cycling. They need to consider all the parts of the capital, including areas of outer London, which could benefit from this scheme. They should also consult on any plans for expansion. The Mayor has said that any expansion would be informed by lessons learned from the current scheme's operation.⁶² He has also indicated that he would consult Londoners and local communities.⁶³

The Mayor has reported that one of the basic premises of the scheme is that a dense network of docking stations needs to be in place throughout the cycle hire zone, as users rely on the expectation that there will be a docking station close to their desired origin/destination. Therefore, areas with no Tube stations could not be incorporated in isolation to the rest of the network but rather the entire area would need to be covered by cycle hire.⁶⁴ Whilst there might be potential for separate hire schemes in parts of outer London such as Croydon, Serco has highlighted that it could be confusing for users if any such schemes were not linked to the current scheme.⁶⁵

TfL has also advised of some constraints to expansion. It stated that the only real way to expand the scheme was to have bolt-on areas, particularly large employment centres. In extending the scheme it was

⁵⁹ Campaign for Better transport London Group Newsletter, September 2010

⁶⁰ <http://www.lcc.org.uk/index.asp?PageID=1963>

⁶¹ TfL press release 347, 10 November 2010

⁶² MQT 2897, 15 September 2010

⁶³ MQT 3194/2010, 13 October 2010

⁶⁴ MQT 2904/2010, 15 September 2010

⁶⁵ As reported on site visit to Serco's operations centre, Islington on 22 November 2010

necessary to intensify the current scheme; for every extra docking point put outside the central area, there should be a corresponding one inside. TfL said that, at this stage, cost was the main inhibitor to greater expansion.⁶⁶

There should be lessons learned from the current cycle hire scheme and applied before any expansion to other parts of London. In developing the scheme, the Mayor and TfL should give further consideration to the parts of London that could benefit from this scheme.

Further improvements to the scheme

Many organisations have made suggestions for other improvements to the cycle hire scheme. A frequent suggestion is linking the scheme to Oystercard.⁶⁷ This seems unlikely to happen. TfL has said that it would be expensive. It would also be out of step with its move to introduce contactless payment systems.⁶⁸

Some people have suggestions for how to encourage greater use of the scheme. The London Borough of Southwark⁶⁹ and the London Cycling Campaign⁷⁰ suggest introducing multi-use corporate membership accounts for businesses. This would accord with the Mayor and TfL's existing smarter travel initiatives which seek to encourage more people to cycle and walk to work. Wheels for Wellbeing suggests expanding the scheme to include trikes for hire by disabled people and others who may not be very confident on two wheels. It reports that the Mayor has said he would consider including trikes. If introduced, this could make this scheme a "world leader".⁷¹ Serco has reported that the introduction of trikes could be difficult as it reduces the space for the other bikes in docking stations.⁷²

There may be scope to realise improvements through some more simple actions. The London Cycling Campaign wants TfL to provide more information about the hire scheme on its online journey planner. It could show the nearest docking stations to the traveller's stated

⁶⁶ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 24

⁶⁷ London Cycling Campaign's written submission, October 2010

⁶⁸ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 29

⁶⁹ London Borough of Southwark's written submission, September 2010

⁷⁰ London Cycling Campaign's written submission, October 2010

⁷¹ Wheels for Wellbeing's written submission, September 2010

⁷² Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 30

destination.⁷³ This might encourage greater use of the scheme by people who might not otherwise consider using it.

The Committee asks the Mayor and TfL to consider the scope for further improvements to the cycle hire scheme to maximise its benefits. These may include: introducing corporate membership; providing trikes for people with reduced mobility; and providing more details on TfL's Journey Planner.

Next steps

The Committee welcomes the introduction of the cycle hire scheme. This is a popular initiative which has generated much enthusiasm for cycling. The Committee has identified a number of issues which it would like to see addressed to ensure it operates successfully. It would like the Mayor and TfL to provide a response on these matters.

Recommendation 1

By March 2011 the Mayor and TfL should report back to the Committee on all the issues raised in this report in relation to the cycle hire scheme. Their report to the Committee should include:

- a) An update on the impact of roll-out to casual users and increased numbers of docking stations and docking points in resolving problems with a lack of bikes and available docking points at popular locations;**
- b) The performance of Serco's customer call centre since September 2010 and any measures taken to improve the customer service provided to users of the scheme;**
- c) The number of incidents involving road users of the scheme and any actions taken to enhance their safety;**
- d) The lessons learned from the current scheme which are being applied to the expansion to east London by 2012 and other proposals for expansion of the scheme to other parts of London; and**
- e) Any other changes made to improve the impact of the cycle hire scheme.**

⁷³ London Cycling Campaign's written submission, October 2010

Initial issues for the cycle superhighways

The cycle superhighways have received a mixed reception. Many cyclists have highlighted concerns about their safety when using the pilot routes. Some have reported that many other road users such as car drivers ignore the blue cycle lanes.

This section provides more details of the issues which have been raised. The Committee asks the Mayor and TfL to provide a response on all these matters by March 2011.

The safety of cycle superhighways

Although the cycle superhighways are designed to provide safer cycling routes, it is not clear the pilot routes are achieving this. More than half of respondents to the Committee's survey did not feel any safer using the cycle superhighways to alternative routes. Two-thirds of respondents to the Committee's survey felt that the cycle superhighways were not respected by other road users.

The Committee's review shows users of the cycle superhighways are experiencing various problems. In some places the blue cycle lanes are too narrow, occupied by other vehicles, disappear at busy junctions or are covered by parked vehicles. The following comments are typical.

"The superhighways are not wide enough, stop abruptly at junctions and are extremely badly positioned on roads."

"I found the experience rather scary being sent from one side of the road to the other. I will not be doing it again."

"Just when you need them [cycle superhighways] - at major junctions, roundabouts and so on - they vanish. A novice cyclist, persuaded to venture out by the superhighways, is left high and dry just when they need most help."

The London Cycling Campaign has highlighted the inconsistency of measures along the cycle superhighway routes. Whilst in some places there are full advance stop lines of 5 metres depth and mandatory cycle lanes of 2 metres width, elsewhere there are just narrow 'ghost' lanes (sections of blue paint without any legal status). However, it is most concerned that there are virtually no measures to reduce motor traffic volumes or speeds. Without such measures, it believes the cycle superhighways are bound to fall short of their potential; increased usage may only be drawn from existing cyclists. It suggests

all one-way sections on the cycle superhighways be made two-way for cyclists and the bulk of the funding be spent on improving junctions and gyratories.⁷⁴

Other organisations have made similar points about the need to improve the measures on cycle superhighways.⁷⁵ The London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group has highlighted the importance of prioritising cyclists at junctions and getting rid of car parking over the cycle superhighways. Gina Harkell, the Vice-Chair of the Group, suggested it would be really nice if one of the cycle superhighways was "a truly dedicated route for cyclists such as those found in Holland, Germany and Denmark."⁷⁶

Many people want more measures on the cycle superhighways which reduce motor traffic, traffic speeds and/or provide better segregation amongst road users. Respondents to the Committee survey have commented on other vehicles frequently driving on the cycle superhighways. One said "[the cycle superhighways] need to be physically segregated from other traffic. There are too many lorries drifting into the cycle lanes despite the blue paint." Sustrans has highlighted that the greatest barrier to Londoners cycling, or cycling more, is fear of traffic yet the cycle superhighways generally follow busy arterial roads and provide no or minimal segregation from traffic. It therefore concludes that in their current form the cycle superhighways have limited scope to facilitate an uptake in cycling, particularly by new cyclists.⁷⁷

One option is more 20mph speed limits. The Mayor has said that TfL will consider installing 20mph speed limits on specific parts of the cycle superhighways such as Southwark Bridge Road.⁷⁸ The Committee has previously explored the potential for 20mph speed limits in London Boroughs as set out in its report *Braking Point: 20mph speed limits in London* (March 2009). Some London Boroughs including Hackney have expressed support for the introduction of 20mph speed limits where the cycle superhighways pass along busy streets.⁷⁹

TfL has acknowledged that the cycle superhighways should be about addressing major barriers for cyclists such as dangerous junctions.⁸⁰

⁷⁴ London Cycling Campaign's written submission, October 2010

⁷⁵ City of Westminster's written submission, October 2010

⁷⁶ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 44

⁷⁷ Sustrans' written submission, September 2010

⁷⁸ MQT1448/2010

⁷⁹ London Borough of Hackney's written submission, October 2010

⁸⁰ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 35

David Brown of TfL said “we must not shy away from [these barriers] and, if we do, then we have missed an opportunity.”⁸¹ He also reported that consistency was important. He said “we are trying to make it consistent so you hit that cycling superhighway and you have a clear idea as to...what you’re doing and what to expect.”⁸²

TfL has reported on lessons learned from the pilot cycle superhighways. These are largely about ensuring the features of the cycle superhighways are put in place more quickly.⁸³ They include allowing more time to implement traffic orders to ensure more mandatory cycle lanes and considering suspension of parking and loading during peak hours on some parts of the routes. TfL also reported that road user behaviour studies were now underway on the pilot routes. The results of these studies would inform the measures on other cycle superhighways.⁸⁴

TfL is also taking steps to improve other road users’ response to the cycle superhighways. It has trialed 34 “Trixi mirrors” (convex road safety mirrors) to improve the visibility of cyclists at traffic lights.⁸⁵ Over the summer the Metropolitan Police Service’s Cycle Task Force ran a six week operation targeted at improving the behaviour of car drivers and cyclists on the pilot cycle superhighways.⁸⁶ TfL has worked with the freight industry to help reduce deliveries at peak times along the cycle superhighways where possible. It is also working with bus operators to provide cycle awareness training and information to bus drivers.⁸⁷

The Committee would like to see a greater consistency in the features on future cycle superhighway routes so they are safer for cyclists. The Mayor and TfL could establish a minimum level of features which should be introduced. This could include:

- **all the blue cycle lanes will be 2 metres wide and mandatory;**
 - **all the advance stop lines will be 5 metres deep;**
 - **all parts of the routes which are one-way will be made two-way for cyclists;**
 - **all junctions on each route will be improved;**
 - **20 mph speed limits will be introduced for all busy sections;**
- and**

⁸¹ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 37

⁸² Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 39

⁸³ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 32

⁸⁴ TfL written submission, October 2010

⁸⁵ TfL’s written submission, 4 October 2010

⁸⁶ TfL Press Release - More officers take to two wheels as specialist police cycling squad expands

⁸⁷ Cycling Revolution, Mayor and TfL, page 36

- **there will be an MPS Cycle Task Force enforcement campaign for each cycle superhighway when launched.**

Building on the experience of the pilot cycle superhighways

The first two cycle superhighways are only pilots but TfL has already started work on the next two cycle superhighways (Bow to Aldgate - CS2 and Wandsworth to Westminster - CS8).⁸⁸ The London Borough of Southwark and Lewisham Cyclists⁸⁹ have expressed concern that work is proceeding on these routes without the pilots being fully evaluated.⁹⁰

Some organisations argue that there are issues on the pilot routes which need to be resolved. The London Cycling Campaign has reported on highly problematic sections such as the contraflow cycle lane on the wrong side of Horseferry Road, E14 and Cable Street⁹¹ on CS3. It believes there should be a further round of improvements to the pilot routes.⁹² The London Borough of Tower Hamlets has also expressed concerns about the routing of CS3, having received complaints about cyclists' behaviour on narrow back streets.⁹³

Respondents to the Committee's survey reported their concerns about specific sections of the pilot cycle superhighways. Many mentioned Cable Street and the section around Elephant & Castle. One commented: "CS3 is very badly designed on narrow streets. Cars don't give right of way at advanced stop lines and stop where they usually would when turning a road. I've had a few near misses and seen a few near misses and one bad accident because of this. For this reason I don't use it."

TfL told the Committee that it was sometimes "between a rock and a hard place" in terms of the highway options for the pilot routes. If it proved that it had chosen any measures incorrectly or that the traffic was not doing what was anticipated, it could revisit these routes. David Brown of TfL said "if there is something that we have got to look at again we will look at it again. I do not have any problems about that."⁹⁴

⁸⁸ TfL press release 304, 30 September 2010

⁸⁹ Lewisham Cyclists' written submission, October 2010

⁹⁰ London Borough of Southwark's written submission, September 2010

⁹¹ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 37

⁹² London Cycling Campaign's written submission, October 2010

⁹³ London Borough of Tower Hamlets' written submission, September 2010

⁹⁴ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 38

Some of the problems with the pilot routes might have been avoided if TfL had consulted more thoroughly. Many organisations have criticised its approach to developing the cycle superhighways. The London Cycling Campaign described it as rushed and frequently unresponsive. It wants more time for the development of future cycle superhighways and suggests a more comprehensive four-stage consultation and design process.⁹⁵

TfL needs to engage fully with London Boroughs about the routes of cycle superhighways. Gina Harkell of the London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group commented that London Boroughs felt local knowledge was not being used as well as it could be in determining the routing of the cycle superhighways. She said: "what we are seeing is wider and bluer London Cycle Network plus routes and some of the opportunities are not being taken to make them really, really safe."⁹⁶ The London Boroughs of Southwark⁹⁷ and Merton⁹⁸ have commented on a lack of engagement from TfL. They wanted more time provided to develop better routes. London Councils has highlighted TfL's commitment in the City Charter to work with London Boroughs to learn lessons from the pilot routes before implementing future cycle superhighways.⁹⁹

TfL has provided details of its multi-stage approach to developing the cycle superhighways. It has also told the Committee that it had learned lessons about consulting London Boroughs on the routes. It reported that at the same time as considering local opinion it also needed to consider its own analysis of where there was most demand for cycling.¹⁰⁰ TfL had to be pragmatic and practical. It needed to deliver the cycle superhighways in good time, at reasonable cost, whilst balancing the needs of all road users. It would never satisfy everybody.¹⁰¹

The Committee welcomes TfL's steps to improve its consultation with relevant organisations, especially London Boroughs, on the routes of the cycle superhighways. Local opinion is only one of a range of factors that TfL needs to take into account when developing the routes. Yet greater involvement of people who know the areas through which the

⁹⁵ London Cycling Campaign's written submission, October 2010

⁹⁶ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 33

⁹⁷ London Borough of Southwark's written submission, October 2010

⁹⁸ Boroughs Cycling Officers Group's written submission, October 2010

⁹⁹ Report to London Councils' TEC, 14 October 2010

¹⁰⁰ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 35

¹⁰¹ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 36

cycle superhighways run could help to deliver safer routes which are used by more cyclists. There should also be scope to revisit the pilot cycle superhighway routes and make changes where there are major problems for cyclists.

More additional “soft” measures such as cycle parking

Many organisations have been positive about the additional “soft” measures which are part of the cycle superhighways scheme. The London Borough of Southwark reported that a lasting legacy from the cycle superhighways will be the funding for cycle parking on housing estates along CS7 and for promotional events.¹⁰² The London Borough of Tower Hamlets commented that the additional marketing and awareness-raising activities seem to have increased use of CS3.¹⁰³ The London Borough of Merton suggested there should be more training and led-cycle rides to encourage new cyclists.¹⁰⁴

The provision of more cycle parking is important. One-third of respondents to the Committee’s survey rated the availability of cycle parking spaces as bad or very bad. This reinforces the findings of the Committee’s report, *Stand and Deliver: cycle parking in London* (June 2009). It highlighted the need for more cycle parking on-street and in new developments. One respondent to the Committee’s survey commented: “I cycle to work along the Barclays cycle superhighway to work in the Barclays building in Canary Wharf where there is not enough cycle parking! Oh, the irony.”

TfL is seeking to deliver 66,000 new cycle parking spaces by 2012.¹⁰⁵ This is welcome but it may not be enough. The advent of the cycle superhighways and other initiatives to promote cycling may see the demand for cycle parking grow. It will be important to ensure any new cycle parking is located in the right places. London Councils has expressed concern that once all the cycle superhighways are completed there could be very significant numbers of cyclists arriving in the same parts of London at the same time. It wants TfL to ensure there is more cycle parking where cycle superhighways terminate.¹⁰⁶

The additional “soft” measures which are part of the cycle superhighways scheme, particularly the provision of cycle parking, are important. There is insufficient cycle parking in

¹⁰² London Borough of Southwark’s written submission, September 2010

¹⁰³ London Borough of Tower Hamlets’ written submission, September 2010

¹⁰⁴ Boroughs Cycling Officers Group’s written submission, October 2010

¹⁰⁵ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 41

¹⁰⁶ London Councils’ written submission, October 2010

London. The Committee urges the Mayor and TfL to do more to increase the amount of cycle parking delivered through the scheme. This needs to be located in areas of greatest demand including where cycle superhighways terminate.

Developing the cycle superhighways

The Committee has received suggestions for developing the cycle superhighways. These include extending their length, integrating them with other roads and cycle routes and building new cycle superhighways.

Many would like to see the cycle superhighways integrated in central London. The City of Westminster has commented that they should “join up across the centre and not merely leave cyclists on the periphery.”¹⁰⁷ Gina Harkell of the London Borough Cycling Officers’ Group described the routes not meeting up in central London as a big failure.¹⁰⁸ The London Cycling Campaign has suggested this matter could be addressed by introducing a ‘Bike Grid’. This would involve some minor highway intervention measures on 6-8 central London roads to improve journeys made by bikes.¹⁰⁹ TfL has reported that it has not linked the cycle superhighways in the centre because of the huge dispersal from the routes. It could, though, look at the London Cycling Campaign’s proposal for a ‘Bike Grid’.¹¹⁰

The Committee would like to hear from the Mayor and TfL on any further steps that could be taken to develop the cycle superhighways. They should explore the scope to develop a ‘Bike Grid’ which could join together the cycle superhighways in central London by providing improved conditions for cyclists on some central London roads.

Next steps

The Committee wants the cycle superhighways to deliver an increase in cycling. They should be used by more Londoners who have never cycled before. The Committee has identified a number of issues which it would like to see addressed to ensure this happens. It would like the Mayor and TfL to provide a response on these matters.

¹⁰⁷ City of Westminster’s written response, October 2010

¹⁰⁸ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p 33

¹⁰⁹ London Cycling Campaign’s written submission, October 2010

¹¹⁰ Transcript of Transport Committee meeting on 12 October 2010, p..

Recommendation 2

By March 2011 the Mayor and TfL should report back to the Committee on all the issues it has raised in this report in relation to the cycle superhighways. Their report should include:

- a) The action taken to ensure a greater level of consistency in the highway features introduced on the cycle superhighways which benefit cyclists;**
- b) Their plans to increase all road users' understanding and awareness of the cycle superhighways;**
- c) The changes which have been, or may be, made to improve problematic sections on the existing pilot cycle superhighway routes;**
- d) How London Boroughs and other relevant organisations including the London Cycling Campaign have been involved in the development of the routes of the future cycle superhighways;**
- e) The potential to increase the amount of cycle parking delivered through the scheme; and**
- f) Any proposals to develop the cycle superhighways further including by joining them up in central London through the creation of a 'Bike Grid'.**

Conclusion

The Committee welcomes the introduction of the cycle hire scheme and cycle superhighways. These schemes have an important role to play in increasing cycling in London. They are central to the Mayor's aspiration for a "cycling revolution."

The Committee's review has highlighted great enthusiasm for the cycle hire scheme. This initiative has captured people's imagination and generated great interest in cycling. The Committee has found some issues in relation to the early implementation of the scheme which, if addressed, could help improve its operation and build on its initial popularity.

By contrast, the Committee has found far less enthusiasm from new cyclists for the cycle superhighways. Many are concerned about safety and a lack of respect from other road users when using the cycle superhighways. There is clearly a need to learn lessons from the pilot routes before the roll-out of more cycle superhighways. There is a need to modify the approach to developing the future routes and to improve their features to ensure they are much safer and more attractive for new cyclists. This report has set out a number of issues in relation to the cycle superhighways which the Committee would like to see addressed.

The Committee looks forward to receiving a response from the Mayor and TfL to the matters raised in this report by 1 March 2011. It will continue to monitor the impact of the cycle hire scheme and cycle superhighways. It will also undertake more detailed scrutiny of the Mayor's cycling policies and programmes in due course. The Committee welcomes receiving any responses and feedback to this report by 1 March 2011.

Appendix 1 – details of this review

The Committee provided an opportunity for users of the cycle hire scheme and cycle superhighways to complete an online survey between September and October 2010. This was completed by 1,297 people. Three-quarters of respondents were male (76 per cent) and almost half (42 per cent) were 30-39 years old. The majority had their own bike (84 per cent). Around two-thirds (762) had registered for the cycle hire scheme; just over half (701) had used the superhighways. The 'raw' data from the survey is being published alongside this report as well as a summary of the main survey findings.

The Committee has received over 100 written submissions from members of the public and various organisations. The organisations included: TfL, Serco, London Cycling Campaign, London Borough Officers' Cycling Group, London Councils, London Boroughs of Southwark, Tower Hamlets, Hounslow, Islington, Wandsworth, Havering and Hackney, Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea, City of Westminster, Sustrans and Wheels for Wellbeing.

The Committee held a meeting on 12 October 2010 when it heard from, and questioned, representatives of TfL, Serco, the London Cycling Campaign and the London Borough Cycling Officers Group. Following this meeting, the Committee wrote to TfL seeking further information, including on costs and funding for the schemes. TfL's response is set out overleaf.

The Committee undertook a site visit to Serco's operations centre for the cycle hire scheme on 22 November 2010.

TfL's response on costs and funding of the schemes, 23 November 2010

Dear Val

Transport Committee meeting on 12 October

Thank you for your letter, which I received on 25 October. You requested some additional information which I have provided below:

The amount of funding provided to Boroughs for cycle training relating to the Cycle Hire scheme and the number of people who have so far participated in this training.

Funding for cycle training in support of the Cycle Hire and Cycle Superhighways schemes is provided either direct to the relevant Boroughs, or to businesses via the workplace measures programme. The funding available to Boroughs totals £802,940 and to businesses £581,000. The funding is intended to provide 17,500 hours of training, of which 1,362 hours have been completed to date. Many more are scheduled for completion over the next few months.

What contribution the cycle hire scheme and superhighways are expected to make to the Mayor's target for 5 per cent of all journeys to be undertaken by bike by 2025 and what else is expected to contribute.

To achieve the Mayor's target TfL is taking a targeted approach to unlock the cycling potential in London and to focus investment in the areas where it will have most effect. The Superhighways are one element designed to realise this potential, along with Cycle Hire (design to cater for short trips in central London) and Biking Boroughs (to encourage trips of less than 8km contained within inner and outer London to be made by bike rather than car). TfL plans for the Cycle Hire scheme to deliver 40,000 trips per day (once the scheme has been fully rolled out to casual users) and the Superhighways 120,000 trips per day once all routes have been introduced by 2015.

The TfL Cycling Programme includes a number of additional projects and initiatives to encourage more people to cycle. These include:

- Cycle Parking, Cycle Security Plan & Cycle Task Force – which we expect will lead to reduced bicycle theft, increased confidence in bike security measures and improved perception of bike security.

- Implementation of the Cycle Safety Action Plan, Cycle Safety Campaign, Cycle/HGV Safety Campaign, London Freight Driver Training– we expect these will yield improved safety considerations for cyclists, increased awareness of safety by cyclists, reduced casualty rate among cyclists, improved perception of safety.
- Cycle Training, Cycle Wayfinding initiatives – both contributing to improving cycling confidence.
- Infrastructure projects (Cycle paths on the Transport for London Road Network, the Greenways¹¹¹ programme, Olympic Cycle Routes) – which contribute to improved perception of the convenience of cycling and improved perception of the predictability and reliability of journey times).
- Cycling promotion and marketing (e.g. Catch-up with a bicycle¹¹²) – which are key to improving the image of cycling and raising its profile within London, as well as increasing the number of new cyclists.

Details of any action TfL has taken or will take to improve the telephone helpline so users of the cycle hire scheme who call whilst using the cycles get quicker responses.

In the first 26 days after opening, Serco’s Cycle Hire contact centre had received over 58,000 calls, averaging around 2,200 calls per day. This far exceeded the volume anticipated. We worked closely with Serco to ensure additional staff were recruited, to drive down call waiting times. Whilst TfL will continue to monitor Serco’s performance in this regard, we are assured of their progress: average call answering times in October were around 16 seconds, as compared to 79 seconds in August.

A list of boroughs which TfL has been in contact with about possible expansion of the cycle hire scheme.

TfL engaged with the following boroughs about the future of the scheme, both in terms of intensifying the existing zone and expanding the scheme.

- City of London
- City of Westminster
- London Borough of Camden

¹¹¹ These are cycle routes running through parks, forests, waterways and quiet residential streets and are intended to enable new cyclists to build confidence.

¹¹² This campaign showcases cyclists experiences, including testimonials from Edith Bowman and Dermot O’Leary. See <http://cyclestories.tfl.gov.uk/> for more details.

- London Borough of Hackney
- London Borough of Islington
- Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
- London Borough of Lambeth
- London Borough of Southwark
- London Borough of Tower Hamlets
- The Royal Parks

TfL announced on 10 November that the Cycle Hire scheme would be extended from Olympia in the west to Bow in the east. Residents living in Bethnal Green, Bow, Canary Wharf, Mile End and Poplar will have access to docking stations.

You included a number of questions in the appendix to your letter, including the total capital cost for Cycle Hire and the annual operational cost for Phase 1 of the scheme. The total implementation cost for Phase 1 of the Barclays Cycle Hire scheme is expected to be £79 million. Annual operating costs are currently around £18m per annum. These costs are offset by sponsorship funding from Barclays of £25m over five years, and by revenue from membership fees and hire charges, which are expected to amount to around £18.7m in 2011/12, once the scheme has been fully rolled out to casual users. It is on this basis that TfL believes the scheme will break even 'within three years'. As requested we have also updated the tables included in your appendix, and these are attached.

Finally you requested a breakdown of expenditure on the expansion of the Cycle Hire scheme, which you suggested was more than £100m. This is incorrect; the scheme is expected to require £45m of funding, over a six year period. The scheme is required to require around £30m of funding to implement with operational costs over a six year period amounting to around £15m.

I look forward to the Committee's report,

David Brown
Managing Director – Surface Transport

| Cycle Hire Scheme – phase 1 | Original estimates | Actual to date | Expected at end of March 2011 | Assumptions for each remaining year of the contract with Serco phase 1 |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| TfL's expenditure on the scheme | £73m - £54.1m total project cost plus £23m for internal costs of which £10m for staff. | £46.3m | £79m (phase 1 only) | Operating costs are expected to amount to £18m for the remainder of the contract |
| Income from fares | £119.4m over 7 years - £13m in one year; £18m p.a. thereafter. | £1.9m | £18.7m | £18.7m |
| Income from sponsorship | £8.1m over 7 years | - | - | - |
| Demand | 30,000 journeys/day in year one; 40,000 journeys p/day p.a. thereafter. | 15,178 journeys/day | 27,000 journeys/day | 40,000 journeys p/day p.a. |
| Docking Stations | 400 | 344 | 400 | 400 |
| Bicycles | 6,000 | 5,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Docking points | 10,200 | 8,182 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Schemes in operation | Member & Casual | Member | Member & Casual (by end of 2010) | Member & Casual |

| Cycle Superhighways | Estimated | Actual to date | Expected at end of March 2011 | Expected upon completion of all 12 Superhighways in 2015 |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Expenditure on Pilots | £23m | £14.72m | £20.89m* | £20.89m |
| Expenditure on the Remaining Routes | £145m | £2.33m | £15.48m** | £145m |
| Funding from Barclay' sponsorship | - | - | - | - |

* Contracts have not yet been closed

** Subject to programming

TfL's sponsorship agreement with Barclays provides £25m of funding over a five year period (equating to £5m each year), providing TfL meets Key Performance Indicators, such as the number of trips generated through the cycle hire scheme.

Appendix 2 – orders and translations

How to order

For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact Laura Warren, Scrutiny Manager, on 020 7983 6545 or email: laura.warren@london.gov.uk

See it for free on our website

You can also view a copy of the report on the GLA website: <http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports>

Large print, braille or translations

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print or braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call us on: 020 7983 4100 or email: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Chinese

如您需要这份文件的简介的翻译本，请电话联系我们或按上面所提供的邮寄地址或 Email 与我们联系。

Vietnamese

Nếu ông (bà) muốn nội dung văn bản này được dịch sang tiếng Việt, xin vui lòng liên hệ với chúng tôi bằng điện thoại, thư hoặc thư điện tử theo địa chỉ ở trên.

Greek

Εάν επιθυμείτε περίληψη αυτού του κειμένου στην γλώσσα σας, παρακαλώ καλέστε τον αριθμό ή επικοινωνήστε μαζί μας στην ανωτέρω ταχυδρομική ή την ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση.

Turkish

Bu belgenin kendi dilinize çevrilmiş bir özetini okumak isterseniz, lütfen yukarıdaki telefon numarasını arayın, veya posta ya da e-posta adresi aracılığıyla bizimle temasa geçin.

Punjabi

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਇਸ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਦਾ ਸੰਖੇਪ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਲੈਣਾ ਚਾਹੋ, ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਸ ਨੰਬਰ 'ਤੇ ਫੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਉਪਰ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਡਾਕ ਜਾਂ ਈਮੇਲ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ।

Hindi

यदि आपको इस दस्तावेज़ का सारांश अपनी भाषा में चाहिए तो उपर दिये हुए नंबर पर फोन करें या उपर दिये गये डाक पते या ई मेल पते पर हम से संपर्क करें।

Bengali

আপনি যদি এই দলিলের একটা সারাংশ নিজের ভাষায় পেতে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে ফো করবেন অথবা উল্লেখিত ডাক ঠিকানায় বা ই-মেইল ঠিকানায় আমাদের সাথে যোগাযোগ করবেন।

Urdu

اگر آپ کو اس دستاویز کا خلاصہ اپنی زبان میں درکار ہو تو، براہ کرم نمبر پر فون کریں یا مذکورہ بالا ڈاک کے پتے یا ای میل پتے پر ہم سے رابطہ کریں۔

Arabic

الحرص على ملخص هذا المستند بلغة تفضل، فراجع الاتصال برقم الهاتف أو الاتصال على العنوان البريدي أو العادي أو عنوان البريد الإلكتروني أعلاه.

Gujarati

જો તમારે આ દસ્તાવેજનો સાર તમારી ભાષામાં જોડતો હોય તો ઉપર આપેલ નંબર પર ફોન કરો અથવા ઉપર આપેલ ટપાલ અથવા ઈ-મેઇલ સરનામા પર અમારો સંપર્ક કરો.

Appendix 3 – principles of scrutiny

An aim for action

An Assembly scrutiny is not an end in itself. It aims for action to achieve improvement.

Independence

An Assembly scrutiny is conducted with objectivity; nothing should be done that could impair the independence of the process.

Holding the Mayor to account

The Assembly rigorously examines all aspects of the Mayor's strategies.

Inclusiveness

An Assembly scrutiny consults widely, having regard to issues of timeliness and cost.

Constructiveness

The Assembly conducts its reviews and investigations in a positive manner, recognising the need to work with stakeholders and the Mayor to achieve improvement.

Value for money

When conducting a scrutiny the Assembly is conscious of the need to spend public money effectively.

Greater London Authority

City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA

www.london.gov.uk

Enquiries 020 7983 4100
Minicom 020 7983 4458