

# **Transport *for* London**

Minutes of a meeting of the Board  
held on Tuesday 19 November 2002, commencing at 10.30 a.m.  
in The Chamber, City Hall, the Queen's Walk, London

---

**Present:** Ken Livingstone (Chair)  
**Board Members:** David Begg (Items 71 – 78.1)  
Bob Crow (Items 71 – 77)  
Stephen Glaister  
Noël Harwerth  
Kirsten Hearn  
Mike Hodgkinson  
Oli Jackson  
Susan Kramer  
Paul Moore (Items 75.6 onwards)  
Murziline Parchment  
David Quarmby  
Tony West  
Dave Wetzel (Vice Chair)

**In attendance:**

**Special Advisors** Bryan Heiser  
Lynn Sloman

**TfL Officers:** Robert Kiley  
Maggie Bellis  
Barry Broe  
Ian Brown  
Valerie Chapman  
Peter Hendy  
Derek Turner  
Jay Walder  
Tom Amenta  
Martin Stuckey

**Others:** Bridget Rosewell (LDA)  
Tony Winterbottom (LDA)  
Nicky Gavron (Deputy Mayor)

**Secretary:** Maureen Nolan

---

## **71/02 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Oli Jackson (for part of the meeting).

## **72/02 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2002 were **agreed** as a true record.

## 73/02 **MATTERS ARISING**

There were no matters arising.

## 74/02 **COMMISSIONER'S REPORT**

It was noted that an informal Board Members' briefing had recently been held on Borough Relationships. In addition to the regular meetings to be held between the Commissioner and the Chief Executives and officials in the Boroughs on a six monthly basis, it was suggested that Board Members might be provided with an opportunity to meet members of Borough Councils to assist in building relationships. It was **agreed** that the proposal would be considered and a report on possible solutions would be made at a future Board meeting.

The Commissioner's Report was **noted**.

## 75/02 **TfL's PROPOSED BUSINESS PLAN 2003/04 to 2008/09**

The Managing Director, Finance and Planning gave a presentation supporting the written report on the TfL proposed Business Plan 2003/04-2008/09 (the Plan). It was **noted** that the Business Plan had taken account of the discussions held at the Panel meetings in early November and also at the Finance Committee on 14 November.

The following highlights from the Plan were outlined:

### 75.1 Buses:

- Improvements in the bus network in terms of quality of service and capacity had led to a significant growth in ridership;
- A significant increase in capacity had been achieved to meet demand and operated kilometres will increase by 20% over the period covered by the Plan;
- Cashless operations should be achieved by 2008 and a cashless zone in Central London will be introduced as an intermediate step;
- The bus funding gap will not be sustainable over the period covered by the Plan. Bus network costs in 2008/09 will be approximately equal to TfL's total net expenditure in 2002/03;
- Following extensive discussion at the Panel meetings and the Finance Committee in early November, Board Members will be invited to participate in a comprehensive study of bus costs and revenues.

### 75.2 Bus Priority and Transport Policing:

- 2 pilot routes had been added to existing corridors to combine high level priority and enforcement;
- The Transport Policing Initiative had been increased by an additional 223 police officers and 200 community support officers and civilian staff;
- In recognition of the fact that London was now a 24 hour, seven day a week city, police enforcement 24 hours a day, seven days a week on existing corridors would be provided;

- An additional 100 British Transport Police officers had been dedicated to these initiatives.

#### 75.3 Maintenance and Roadworks Co-ordination

- The Walking and Cycling Task Force was a key feature of the Plan. A steady rise in funding, consistent with the Task Force recommendations had been reflected in the Plan;
- Street Management, in consultation with the Boroughs, had undertaken an assessment of the condition of London's principal roads, which had revealed a larger backlog of structural maintenance than previously estimated. It was recognised that further refinement was required in order to co-ordinate the work and that detailed traffic impact analysis should form part of the process, together with appropriate mitigation measures. It was **agreed** that a co-ordinated detailed plan of work would be submitted to the Board in February 2003;
- The Streets Works Task Force will be fully operational by the beginning of 2003/04.

#### 75.4 National Rail

- Discussion at the Rail Panel and the Finance Committee in early November focused on whether TfL should include more support for National Rail. Overall, the Business Plan supported the projected capacity increases of between 40-50% by 2016;
- Provision had been made in the Plan for funding for interchanges and new Brixton Station for the East London Line extension, and for Smartcard readers and gate modification at National Rail stations throughout London.

#### 75.5 Funding Gap

- It was noted that TfL was in an uncertain position with regard to LUL and that the Budget did not include LUL;
- The funding gap for 2003/04 and 2004/05 was estimated to be under £100m each year and would form a reasonable basis for the Mayor's discussion of precept with the Assembly;
- The funding gap for 2005/06 onwards was estimated to be substantial and would rise to £632m by 2008/09. The projected gap stemmed primarily from a rising bus network subsidy and the costs of major projects in support of the London Plan. In addition, the potential decrease in the level of Transport Grant from 2005/06 onwards exacerbates the funding gap;
- The Chair emphasised the need for Government to recognise the underinvestment in transport over the previous 20 years and the fact that a significant increase in funding would be required for the Budget from 2005/06 onwards. It was noted that the SRA was in a similar position.

#### 75.6 Next steps

- It was noted that the draft budget would be submitted to the GLA on 22 November and would form part of the Mayor's budget consultation due to take place in December 2002 or January 2003;
- Cost subsidies and roadworks co-ordination were due to be discussed during the February meetings cycle;

- It was anticipated that the Assembly would approve the Mayor's budget on 12 February 2003 and the final Budget would be put to the TfL Board in March for approval.

75.7 The Managing Director, Finance and Planning was thanked for a clear explanation of the Plan. During discussion, the following points were **noted**:

- The issue of fares and potential areas of funding required to generate secondary levels, such as workplace parking, had been discussed at the Board Members' Awayday in September. It was noted that the secondary legislation necessary for enforcement did not exist. It was considered that this might be a more appropriate tool to apply in outer London. A clear need for a broad discussion on fares was recognised and it was noted that a briefing for Board Members on fares was due to be held on 5 December;
- Concern was expressed that the grant from Government was projected to fall at the inception of the income stream from Congestion Charging. A request was made from some Board Members for a list of the choices that TfL might have to make, specifically: the projects that might have to be cut in order to fill the funding gap; and a costed specification of potential other sources of funding;
- It was agreed that TfL should undertake quick wins which had been identified and the Commissioner agreed to report back to the Board in February. Board Members will be notified prior to the final agreement of the Budget.

75.8 The Board **approved** the TfL draft Budget and Business Plan 2004/04 – 2008/09, for submission to the GLA on 22 November 2002.

75.9 It was **noted** that the final 2003/04 Budget would be presented to the TfL Board for approval in March 2003, following the outcome of the GLA budget process.

## 76/02 **2<sup>nd</sup> QUARTER FINANCE REPORT**

Jay Walder gave a presentation supporting and updating his written Finance and Performance Report to cover the second quarter of 2002/03 ended 30 September 2002.

Key financial issues were highlighted, including:

- The latest forecast of £1,089m for the full year was £12m (1%) higher than TfL's grant and precept funding. The forecast overspend comprised: programmes carried forward into future years (£95m); overspends and items added to the programme (£79m); and cost saving and efficiencies (£27m).

The report was **noted**.

## 77/02 **THAMES GATEWAY BRIDGE**

77.1 Barry Broe gave a presentation outlining progress on the Thames Gateway Bridge (TGB) project and the proposed programme to take the project to the stage where an application for powers can be submitted.

77.2 The following points were **noted**:

- Analysis based on regeneration studies show that the TGB would increase the employment potential for the area by 15-20%. The TGB alone is not a sufficient condition for this growth, but without the TGB, this growth is unlikely to occur;
- A toll structure had been proposed of £1 for those who live or work in parts of the immediate boroughs. Rates would be doubled for non-residents and free for public transport users, and those walking or cycling;
- Negotiations were continuing with Government to gain commitment to a Hybrid Bill approach;
- The proposed revenues for TGB would not be adequate to support the construction costs of the bridge and a viable financing plan had been proposed;
- The stakeholder consultation should be completed by Spring 2003. It was anticipated that the submission of powers application would be made in November 2003 and the bridge would be opened in 2010;
- Independent market research conducted in October 2002 indicated that 80% of East Londoners supported TGB.

77.3 Various Board Members expressed the following concerns:

- The consultation period of 8 weeks was not considered to be sufficiently long and a request for a more extensive consultation period was made;
- The benefit/cost ratio was not persuasive and the cost analysis presented did not make a convincing case for building the bridge;
- The application of tolls would remove the ability to pursue other projects, for example trams, and this would be an opportunity cost to TfL.

77.4 Requests were made by various Board Members for:

- The consideration for presentation of alternative options, and other issues not addressed, for assessment during the consultation phase. Possible alternative options included: a smaller scale bridge; an alternative location with an examination of alternatives; and an analysis of the number of lanes on the bridge;
- The commissioning of a health impact assessment;
- A traffic study of the area.

77.5 Several Board Members supported the TGB and considered that the bridge was essential for regeneration of the Thamesmead area. Some Board Members expressed the view that deprivation in the area related to a lack of skills, not transport and it would be a better option to provide skills. It was recognised that more work needed to be undertaken and the cost/benefit case needed to be refined. The package relied entirely on tolls and road-based movements for funding.

77.6 The Chair stated that he had asked Paul Moore to take a leading role in the consultations in 2003. In light of Board Members' concerns regarding the short consultation period, the Chair suggested that TfL should consider whether and how the consultation period could commence at an earlier date.

77.7 The Vice Chair suggested an amendment to the proposed resolution, but the Chair refused the proposed amendment.

77.8 The Chair proposed that the Board noted the status of the project and agreed the programme as outlined in the Board paper. The matter was put to the vote and carried by 6 votes for the motion and 5 votes against the motion. The Chair used his second, or casting, vote.

The Board **noted** the status of the project and **agreed** the programme, as outlined in the Board paper.

## 78/02 SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

78.1 David Quarmby introduced a report of the meeting of the Committee held on 4 November 2002 and also a report on reducing casualties in London involving motorcycle and scooter riders (P2Ws).

It was noted that there was no pattern to motorcycle accidents and that the risks faced by motorcycle riders mostly comprised road user behaviour.

78.2 During discussion, the following points were **noted**:

- Analysis of fatalities of P2W users indicated that the accidents were not attributable to speeding or disobeying traffic laws, but the fact that the riders were not visible;
- There was no hard evidence that P2W users were disregarding traffic laws more than other drivers, but the Committee had expressed concern over the reduction in the level of police available to enforce traffic regulations;
- It was recognised that the training of vulnerable road users (including pedestrians and cyclists) was paramount. Some pilot routes involving P2W users in bus routes were being established, although it was noted that since the bus network was fragmented, the accident rate might not be affected.

The report was **noted**.

## 79/02 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 1.10 p.m.

---

Chair

---

Date