TPF

TRANSPORT PARTNERSHIP FORUM

Wednesday 25th January 2006 at 7.30pm

MINUTES

PRESENT: Councillors, D. MALLEY, S. MALLEY, HEATHER (Chair) and SAWDON

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillors ATKINSON

ALSO PRESENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy BROWN</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod BROWN</td>
<td>Norwood Area - Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David CIANFARANI</td>
<td>Lambeth Traffic &amp; Transport Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Nigel HARRIS</td>
<td>Railway Consultancy Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick LESTER</td>
<td>Association of Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip LOY</td>
<td>Lambeth Cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare NEELY</td>
<td>Lambeth Cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian NICHOLLS</td>
<td>Tenants Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul REYNOLDS</td>
<td>Brixton Area Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John STEWART</td>
<td>Lambeth Passenger Transport Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Officers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee PARKER</td>
<td>Environment: Transport &amp; Highways - Head of Transport Planning and Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David WHITE</td>
<td>Environment: Transport &amp; Highways – Transport Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn HAINES</td>
<td>Environment: Transport &amp; Highways – Transport Policy Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. WELCOMES AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everybody to the meeting and introductions were made. The agenda was reordered to accommodate the presenters, officers and members of the public.

2. APOLOGIES

The apologies noted above were given.
3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

4. ROLE OF ALG AND LORRY CONTROL BAN IN LAMBETH
(Item 7 plus PowerPoint presentation)

Nick Lester, Director of Transport, Environment and Planning – Association of Local Government (ALG), outlined the role of the ALG and explained that it represented all 33 London boroughs (32 plus the Corporation of London). It has three main functions: policy development, lobbying on behalf of boroughs and delivering services on behalf of boroughs.

The Transport & Environment Committee (TEC) is the statutory element of the organisation and is obliged to reach voluntary agreement with Transport for London (TfL). The main functions of the TEC are policy development, lobbying and support; appeals; and direct services including parking, Freedom Pass, Taxicard, Consumer Direct and the Lorry Control Ban.

Lorry Control Ban in Lambeth

This initiative stemmed from the Wood Enquiry, which recommended that controls on all HGV's over 18 tonnes should be implemented at night-times and weekends. This was in order to minimise the environmental impact of pollution and noise.

Special routing allowances were established whereby permits can be issued on a case-by-case basis when it can be proven that the alternative routes are more environmentally friendly. However, these routes are closely monitored to ensure they are not misused.

The enforcement of the ban is now managed by ALG as the Police had failed to prioritise the issue. A team of five mobile officers operate a 'white-list' system which involves checking the plates of the lorries against the permit database. Enforcement action is taken against all vehicles without permits or outside their agreed routes.

Enforcement was decriminalised in 2004 and the charges that currently apply are £100 to the driver and £500 to the operator. There is a 50% reduction for early reduction and both drivers and operators have the right to appeal.

The net cost to all boroughs to run the scheme is £250,000 per year. It is accepted that the scheme is generally successful with 80 – 85% rate of compliance.

The initial hostility of the operators towards the scheme has diminished as the projected job losses did not occur and the ALG have worked closely with them to reduce bureaucracy. Operators would, of course, advocate less controls but in London it was agreed that a sensible balance of controls was needed.
The future developments were explained to be:

- The exemption of new type of vehicles, such as battery-only lorries;
- Testing CNG vehicles to establish whether they are appreciably quieter;
- To provide drivers with electronic notification of the correct routes;
- To establish a lower emission zone.

In response to questions, it was clarified that:

- The ALG representative could not answer questions on specific routes but he would confirm that there was adequate enforcement effort on the A202.

- Small operators are more likely to contravene the ban as they have larger overheads and less need to disguise any environmentally damaging activities. Therefore, the sanctions are considered to appropriately set as it is likely they will be largely incurred by smaller operators.

- The ALG has no involvement in planning decisions regarding development controls.

- If routes result in substantially longer journey time, a special routing allowance would be considered. If a choice needs to be made between reducing noise pollution and improving air quality: the former would often be preferred especially if the emissions are not on residential roads.

- Business will choose where to locate their outlets and warehouses by considering a variety of factors and it is unlikely that the Lorry Control Ban will have a significant impact on such decisions.

- Speeding is not within the ALG’s remit.

- There is no uniform trend of night-time lorry usage.

The Chair thanked Nick Lester for his informative presentation.

RESOLVED: That the oral report be received.

5. BACKGROUND/HISTORY/UPDATE - THAMESLINK 2000 RAIL
(Item 8 plus PowerPoint presentation)

Dr Nigel Harris, Managing Director of the Railway Consultancy, updated the Committee about the developments to date regarding Thameslink 2000.

History
Thameslink closed in 1916 and re-opened in 1990 with a new station – St Pauls/City Thameslink, which emerged as a profitable addition. The two core routes were Bedford – Brighton and the Sutton – Wimbledon route.

The original concept was to improve the capacity of the North-South railway
lines through London, to manage the main London stations, to improve services to the South Bank and to improve cross-London travel.

The original recommendations resulted in an improvement in longer-distance services, which failed to provide extra capacity on inner-London (including Lambeth) services.

The Forum were shown a diagram of the recommendations.

At the 2001 Public Enquiry, Railtrack were winning the argument largely as a result of the lack of opposition and viable alternatives until John Prescott, in his capacity as Secretary of State, rejected the following key proposals: Blackfriars Bridge, Borough Market and London Bridge Station.

At the 2005 Public Enquiry, Lambeth took a proactive role in promoting the needs of inner-London boroughs. The Railway Consultancy was commissioned to challenge the inherent bias toward long-distance journeys and to put forward a viable alternative. The Inspector was yet to issue his decision.

The impact that the alternative proposals would have on Lambeth would be greater accessibility for residents and businesses, which would assist the regeneration of the borough and reduce the numbers of cars on the roads.

It was emphasised that the details of the alternative proposals were yet to be finalised and further consultation would be carried out.

The Chair thanked Nigel Harris and invited John Stewart, who had also attended the Public Enquiry, to comment on his experiences.

John Stewart, Chair of the Lambeth Public Transport Group, advised the Committee that the Inspector had listened carefully to the arguments put to him.

He stated that the primary aim of presenting the alternative scheme to the enquiry was to highlight the failures of the original and to present the first viable, intelligent alternative. Therefore, if the Inspector was to accept the original scheme, proper justification would be required.

The Chair expressed his gratitude both to Nigel Harris and John Stewart for presenting Lambeth’s position and to all the transport officers who had worked on the enquiry case. He commented that Lambeth had provided a valuable scrutiny service.

In response to suggestions that the Lambeth proposals favoured certain areas of the borough over others, it was reiterated that the main objective of the exercise was not to develop alternative schemes in detail, but to put forward an example to show that the proposed scheme was flawed. Accordingly if the Inspector decides whether Lambeth’s objections (and others) pose serious enough objections to the scheme for it to be turned down again it will not be for Lambeth to develop the alternative further – rather the main purpose at this juncture was to prevent the original scheme being approved by default.

It was agreed that a summary of the enquiry submission would be circulated to
the Members of the Forum.

**RESOLVED:** That the oral report be received.

5. **MINUTES (29.06.05) and MATTERS ARISING** (Items 4 and 5)

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 28th September 2005 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record of the proceedings.

6. **TRANSPORT UPDATE**
   (report 202/05-06) (All Wards/All Areas) (Item 6)

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

7. **ORAL REPORT ON ISSUES ARISING – TRANSPORT PARTNERSHIP FORUM PRE-MEETING (29.06.05)** (Item 9)

John Stewart, Chair of the Lambeth Public Transport Group, provided a verbal report on issues arising from the pre-meeting with the transport operators:

**Cross-River Tram Update**

There had been progress on this issue as consultants had been appointed to carry out the early technical work. There was to be full public consultation about the proposed routes which were expected to be finalised by 2007.

**LUL**

The LUL consultation regarding later closure of the underground had resulted in agreement that running an extra hour later on Friday and Saturday night was possible but would be at the expense of running an hour later on Saturday and Sunday mornings. This was argued by Lambeth to be unfairly detrimental to low paid shift workers. The latest proposal was for the underground to run 30 minutes later on Friday and Saturday nights and start running an hour later on Saturday morning but start at the current times on Sunday mornings. Lambeth were content with this resolution and a final decision from the Mayor was expected shortly.

**Buses**

The Mayor’s proposal to introduce congestion charging into West London had resulted in a London Buses stakeholder consultation exercise proposing service frequency reductions to the current route 137 service. It is currently proposed to reduce the current frequency of 17 vehicles per hour in the peak hours to 12, which negatively would affect residents and commuters along the Streatham and Clapham stages of the route.

The 159 route master had now been replaced with new buses and the frequency had increased both on route 159 and 2. The frequency of services on routes 68, 468, N68 and the express routes were all scheduled to increase.
The issue with the inaccurate journey-time of the P13 service had been brought to the attention of London Buses.

**Rail**

It was commented that many networks including Thameslink and South East Trains, were losing their franchises at the end of the year so there were few changes to report.

Southern Trains had achieved improvements to both frequency and services but the operators had not provided satisfactory answers regarding the issues of bicycles on trains.

The operators had not provided satisfactory answers regarding the issue of graffiti on both approaches to Herne Hill Station.

In response to questions, it was clarified that:

- The route 68 services would now turn in West Norwood Station therefore, losing the last stop on the route.
- The bins at rail stations would not be returned until the threat level following the July bombings had been reduced.

David White commented that Lambeth officers and Members had been proactive in their protest of the proposed changes to the route 137 bus-service. This included a press release in December 2005, combined with two formal responses sent directly to the Mayor.

**RESOLVED**: That the oral report be received.

8. **DISABILITY ACCESS AT LAMBETH OVERGROUND RAIL STATIONS**

(Item 10)

Dawn Haines, Transport Policy Manager, reported that the SRA report on access for all planned to showcase disability access at selected stations.

The decision regarding which stations had not yet been issued. Officers were asked to keep pushing for a decision which would be reported back to the Forum.

**RESOLVED**: That the oral report be received.

9. **LAMBETH LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (LIP)**

(Item 11)

Dawn Haines, Transport Policy Manager, reported that the comments from TfL on the draft LIP had been incorporated and approved by the Heads of Service. The LIP was approved by the Executive on 16/01/05 and would be submitted to TfL by 27/01/05, which would be the start date of the 100 day process during which TfL can ask further questions. It was expected that the final version would be approved by the Mayor in April 2006.
Lee Parker, Head of Transport Planning and Strategy, commented that the intention remained to keep the document live and engage local residents at special area-based workshops which would be organised separately from the main area committee meetings. The exact date and format of these workshops would be publicised at the area committee meetings but would most probably take place a week later.

Clare Neely, Lambeth Cyclists, reminded the Committee of the need to consider the relationship between local and strategic issues.

**RESOLVED:** That the oral report be received.

### 10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS (Item 12)

Congestion Charging Zone - Western Extension Announcement - North Lambeth Extended Resident Discount Zone Update

Officers were advised that Transport for London (TfL) had passed a recommendation onto the Mayor regarding this issue, and a public announcement pending advising of the decision.

### 11. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting ended at 9.17pm.

---

**Date of Despatch:** 2\(^{nd}\) February 2006  
**Contact for Enquiries:** Caroline Arding 
Tel: (020) 7926 2185  
Fax: (020) 7926 2755  
E-mail: carding@lambeth.gov.uk  
Web: [www.lambeth.gov.uk](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk)
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