



PUBLIC TRANSPORT LIAISON COMMITTEE

Date: MONDAY, 26 FEBRUARY 2018 at 7.00 pm

**Committee Room 4
Civic Suite
Lewisham Town Hall
London SE6 4RU**

**Enquiries to: sarah.assibey@lewisham.gov.uk
Telephone: 0208 3148975 (direct line)**

MEMBERS

Councillor Suzannah Clarke	L
Councillor Liam Curran	L
Councillor Alan Smith	L

Members are summoned to attend this meeting

**Janet Senior
Acting Chief Executive
Lewisham Town Hall
Catford
London SE6 4RU
Date: 16 February 2018**



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

ORDER OF BUSINESS – PART 1 AGENDA

Item No		Page No.s
1.	Minutes	1 - 4
2.	Declarations of Interest	5 - 8
3.	Questions Relating to Bus Issues	9 - 10
4.	Questions Regarding Rail Issues	11



Lewisham



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

The public are welcome to attend our committee meetings, however occasionally committees may have to consider some business in private. Copies of reports can be made available in additional formats on request.

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC TRANSPORT LIAISON COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday 12 September 2017 at 7pm

Present: Cllrs Liam Curran (Chair), Suzannah Clarke, Joyce Jacca, Paul Bell, Roy Kennedy, James-J Walsh, Simon Moss (Transport Policy and Development Manager), Sarah Assibey (Committee Support Officer)

Also Present: Michael Abrahams (Forest Hill Society), Barry Milton (Sydenham Society), Geoffrey Thurley (Ladywell Society), Michael Woodhead (Cinderella Line Campaign), Richard Holland (Downham Assembly), Conrad Bunyen (Borough Engagement Manager, Stagecoach), Neil Benson (TfL), Larry Heyman (GTP/Great Northern)

1. Minutes

The minutes of the last meeting be amended to include a question from Geoffrey Thurley regarding the mitigation of noise from Catford Station due to the cutting down of trees

2. Declarations of Interest

None Declared.

3. Questions Regarding Rail Issues and Responses

The committee discussed the questions and responses regarding rail issues. The following points and actions were made:

- 3.1. In response to the answer provided by TfL to question 1, Michael Abrahams stated that no timescale has been provided by TfL regarding the works of the Overground system on the Crystal Palace route. He added that they had informed that some work was to be carried out in 2018 as part of the restricting of train timetables, however, from the response it does not appear that the changes will take place within the timescale of the next year if funding is yet to be secured

Action >> For TfL to confirm when the plans to increase the number of services will take place, if at all.

- 3.2. Neil Benson, explained that whilst there are no plans for a specific review of any changes in demand of night buses, if it becomes apparent that there is continuous demand for an increase of night buses then TfL would look to implement this. Members voiced concerns that it is easy to get stuck at London Bridge and other London hub stations where there are not a lot of options via train or bus to reach home at early hours of the morning.

Action>> for the Committee to write to TfL to take this action further

- 3.3. Councillor Walsh, on behalf of Councillor Kennedy questioned under what forum and mechanisms was the decision to proceed with the work on the Bakerloo line (Phase 1 and 2) *and* which parts of the GLA and TfL as well as senior staff and politician has taken up the position for it to go ahead.

Simon Moss added that the overall cost (to take the extension further) and the politics around Bromley, of which the borough is not very supportive of the decision, may have been determining factors which pushed this decision, adding that the question should perhaps be restated to the GLA.

Michael Abrahams asked if LBL has an official position in terms of potentially wanting to see it go beyond Lewisham. If so, LBL should advocate for the extension to go further.

Councillor Walsh agreed that the advocating should happen sooner rather than later, when the works become official. It should be argued that Lewisham is a key area for development and need the infrastructure to support the development size as well as the existing buildings and housing. Commuters are doubling but transport is not developing to match the numbers of people. Councillor Bell added that not having the extension is a lost opportunity and the committee should ask the Mayor to intervene as this is the centre of civic life.

Action>> the question will be restated to GLA in a formal letter and the endorsing of the extension should be communicated with Bromley also.

- 3.4. Barry Milton pointed out that there have been a vast amount of complaints from Croydon Council, Heads and Deputy Heads of schools whose pupils travel to school in the south of Croydon, due to the severe cuts to the Thameslink/Southern services. The times of the current trains are enabling children to arrive to school late-the cut is very major from the borough to Croydon. This a direct route which plenty of people find completely necessary to use

Larry Heyman responded that the responses to the consultation of Phase 1 and 2 are currently being reviewed. These should be cascaded to the committee. Thameslink empathise that the changes to the timetable greatly impact the usage of Southern and Southeastern. They level of usage will be assessed as it is of course one of the drivers for the timetable, and it will be taken into consideration. If the usage is thin, that would mark support for a reduction of services.

Michael Abrahams asked if there would be a higher ticket charge as under the new timetable, commuters in Lewisham would have to travel to London Bridge then catch a train toward Brighton just to get to Gatwick or further. Typically, they could travel through Norwood Junction, but this would no longer be possible during morning peak hours. Larry Heyman stated that is it is a point to point journey, the likelihood is that commuters would not be charged more, as if the ticket shows a specific route that is no longer available, it would need to be revisited.

Norwood Junction has very narrow steps, no lifts and with these changes, more people will be using the station to transit to connecting trains- it is in great need of improvement, Barry Milton argued. He continued that the infrastructure outlined in the response for GTR cannot possibly go ahead with the new timetable changes.

Larry Heyman stated that the Strategic Train Planning team at GTR had added that late evening trains are still under negotiation with Network Rail and will be subject to further consultation once Network Rail's aspirations to engineering access are understood.

Action >> The Committee suggested that a meeting is held with the Strategic Planning Team representative with Councillors to give the Chair, other members and potentially members from the Amenities Society an opportunity to meet and discuss this further to receive more explanation of the proposed timetable and consultation.

- 3.5. Regarding the current temporary Thameslink services via Penge East, the response from Thameslink says that this service is due to end in 2018 because it is temporary. Larry Heyman stated that these services were not included in the service specification that was outlined in the 2012 for the original Thameslink/Southern/Great Northern franchise bid, nor were they included on the subsequent revision issued by the DfT in 2013- both of which were circulated to all London boroughs.

Over the Christmas period, the infrastructure work at London Bridge is going to be completed which means the routes through London Bridge will be available. There are 300 drivers who need to be trained on route knowledge so the Bedford train through London Bridge will begin after the New Year. Until the May 2018 timetable change, trains will still be timetabled to run through Herne Hill and Tulse Hill but as drivers complete their training, some trains will be running through London Bridge so that those drivers who have had the training can maintain that by May 2018 the trains running from Croydon and Brighton will start coming through London Bridge.

4. Question Regarding Bus Issues and Responses

The committee discussed the questions and responses regarding bus issues. The following points and actions were made:

- 4.1. In regards to the written answer provided by TfL, Neil Benson added that the usage of bus 176 are under review, still awaiting the data has been received for September when schools are back in session to get more accurate results.
- 4.2. Suzannah Clarke responded to the answers and suggestions provided by TfL stating that the need to use more than one bus from Grove Park to Blackheath is a concern for many local residents, as the two towns are close enough to have to only catch one bus to reach either side. The transport infrastructure is not at its best in that area. She clarified that the areas that are most inconvenienced are Downham and Whitefoot areas as opposed to Grove Park

town centre where there is the bus 202 which goes directly into Blackheath. She asked if there is a possibility that these transport links will become available to which Neil Benson responded that in the short term, it would not be possible. However, long term, once funding becomes available and the route is justified based on the level of demand then it is a greater possibility. The demand is calculated looking at nearby routes and oyster data looking at people who are interchanging at particular points in their journey.

5. Whitefoot and Downham Bus Update

The regularity of the bus 225 these areas was discussed by the Committee as well as the update report provided by TfL.

Complaints were raised that during peak hours of the day and late at night the bus can come as late as half an hour which is often raised as a complaint by local residents.

Neil Benson responded that some infrequencies are caused by incomplete journeys. The incomplete journeys are necessary to allow frequency of the bus route, which is understandably inconvenient for those travelling beyond those areas. He agreed to pass on these issues to the operator to see what can be done. The routes will be looked at independently of this extension to see how they can be made more reliable.

RESOLVED the report was noted.

The meeting finished at 8.25p.m

Agenda Item 2

PUBLIC TRANSPORT LIAISON COMMITTEE		
Report Title	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
Key Decision		Item No. 2
Ward		
Contributors	Chief Executive	
Class	Part 1	Date: 12 September 2017

Members are asked to declare any personal interest they have in any item on the agenda.

1 Personal interests

There are three types of personal interest referred to in the Council's Member Code of Conduct :-

- (1) Disclosable pecuniary interests
- (2) Other registerable interests
- (3) Non-registerable interests

2 Disclosable pecuniary interests are defined by regulation as:-

- (a) Employment, trade, profession or vocation of a relevant person* for profit or gain
- (b) Sponsorship –payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than by the Council) within the 12 months prior to giving notice for inclusion in the register in respect of expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member or towards your election expenses (including payment or financial benefit from a Trade Union).
- (c) Undischarged contracts between a relevant person* (or a firm in which they are a partner or a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest) and the Council for goods, services or works.
- (d) Beneficial interests in land in the borough.
- (e) Licence to occupy land in the borough for one month or more.
- (f) Corporate tenancies – any tenancy, where to the member's knowledge, the Council is landlord and the tenant is a firm in which the relevant person* is a

partner, a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest.

- (g) Beneficial interest in securities of a body where:-
- (a) that body to the member's knowledge has a place of business or land in the borough; and
 - (b) either
 - (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that body; or
 - (ii) if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the relevant person* has a beneficial interest exceeds 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that class.

*A relevant person is the member, their spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom they live as spouse or civil partner.

(3) Other registerable interests

The Lewisham Member Code of Conduct requires members also to register the following interests:-

- (a) Membership or position of control or management in a body to which you were appointed or nominated by the Council
- (b) Any body exercising functions of a public nature or directed to charitable purposes, or whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy, including any political party
- (c) Any person from whom you have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25

(4) Non registerable interests

Occasions may arise when a matter under consideration would or would be likely to affect the wellbeing of a member, their family, friend or close associate more than it would affect the wellbeing of those in the local area generally, but which is not required to be registered in the Register of Members' Interests (for example a matter concerning the closure of a school at which a Member's child attends).

(5) Declaration and Impact of interest on members' participation

- (a) Where a member has any registerable interest in a matter and they are present at a meeting at which that matter is to be discussed, they must declare the nature of the interest at the earliest opportunity and in any

event before the matter is considered. The declaration will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. If the matter is a disclosable pecuniary interest the member must take no part in consideration of the matter and withdraw from the room before it is considered. They must not seek improperly to influence the decision in any way. **Failure to declare such an interest which has not already been entered in the Register of Members' Interests, or participation where such an interest exists, is liable to prosecution and on conviction carries a fine of up to £5000**

- (b) Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest they must still declare the nature of the interest to the meeting at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered, but they may stay in the room, participate in consideration of the matter and vote on it unless paragraph (c) below applies.
- (c) Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest, the member must consider whether a reasonable member of the public in possession of the facts would think that their interest is so significant that it would be likely to impair the member's judgement of the public interest. If so, the member must withdraw and take no part in consideration of the matter nor seek to influence the outcome improperly.
- (d) If a non-registerable interest arises which affects the wellbeing of a member, their, family, friend or close associate more than it would affect those in the local area generally, then the provisions relating to the declarations of interest and withdrawal apply as if it were a registerable interest.
- (e) Decisions relating to declarations of interests are for the member's personal judgement, though in cases of doubt they may wish to seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer.

(6) Sensitive information

There are special provisions relating to sensitive interests. These are interests the disclosure of which would be likely to expose the member to risk of violence or intimidation where the Monitoring Officer has agreed that such interest need not be registered. Members with such an interest are referred to the Code and advised to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance.

(7) Exempt categories

There are exemptions to these provisions allowing members to participate in decisions notwithstanding interests that would otherwise prevent them doing so. These include:-

- (a) Housing – holding a tenancy or lease with the Council unless the matter relates to your particular tenancy or lease; (subject to arrears exception)
- (b) School meals, school transport and travelling expenses; if you are a parent or guardian of a child in full time education, or a school governor unless the matter relates particularly to the school your child attends or of which you are a governor;
- (c) Statutory sick pay; if you are in receipt
- (d) Allowances, payment or indemnity for members
- (e) Ceremonial honours for members
- (f) Setting Council Tax or precept (subject to arrears exception)

PUBLIC TRANSPORT LIAISON COMMITTEE		
Report Title	Questions Regarding Bus Issues	
Key Decision	No	Item No 4
Ward	All	
Contributors		
Class	Part 1	Date: 26 February 2018

1. Summary

This report informs members of the questions put forward ahead of the meeting to be addressed either in writing or in person.

Question regarding bus issues.

1. How often have they been used in Lewisham? How many people have been arrested or charged as a result of the saliva evidence obtained? Is this a reasonable deterrent? Why do other passengers have to get off the bus and wait for another one when the driver uses the spit kit? This can involve them in additional time in the cold as happened to passengers on the 181 bus at around 9 a.m. On Saturday morning, 10 February 2018. **(Cllr Jeffrey)**

2. 1. The recent trial of one way access to Brockley station has led to long queues and complaints from constituents. Can we have an update from TFL of their assessment of this trial and whether they propose to implement the changes permanently.

2. Over more than a decade the voluntary group Brockley Cross Action Group (BXAG) have led on improvements to Brockley Common (the garden around Brockley station), which benefits commuters and make the station more attractive. However, the group continues to struggle to get full and adequate responses form TFL and Network rail on questions they raise with them. They have two principal ongoing issues:
 - a) They would like to install bins in the garden, and have them emptied by TFL cleaning contractors. This area is not cleaned by street sweepers because it is on Network Rail land leased to TFL, but TFL have so far refused to take responsibility for litter here. The gardens are now blighted regularly with litter and it is only because of the actions of the volunteers and a

sympathetic Environment team at Lewisham Council that the garden is not a permanent dumping ground. Can BXAG have a response to their request please? Can TFL commit to installing bins and emptying them on this area of land which they are responsible for?

II. There is an on-going problem of anti-social behaviour in one section of the common to the back of the station and near the railway tracks where street drinkers congregate. While the BXAG have no objection to this in principle, the area is littered with beer cans, drug paraphernalia and human faeces, which they understandably do object too. BXAG have tried to find out who is responsible for this section of the common, but there is some contention between Network Rail and TFL over whether this section of the land is leased or not. Can TFL and Network rail provide the details of their leasing agreement, in particular a map, so that one or the other of the groups takes responsibility for this problem? **(Cllr McGeevor)**

PUBLIC TRANSPORT LIAISON COMMITTEE		
Report Title	Questions Regarding Rail Issues	
Key Decision	No	Item No 3
Ward	All	
Contributors		
Class	Part 1	Date: 26 February 2018

1. Summary

This report informs members of the questions put forward ahead of the meeting to be addressed either in writing or in person.

Question regarding rail issues.

1. Will the Council please publish the Council's response to any railway consultations since our last meeting and any responses received? Also please provide the dates of any known consultations in the pipeline? (Cllr Hall)
2. Update on the Catford Loop trains, especially the new timetable? (Cllr Barnham)
3. With all trains now stopping at London Bridge, Ladywell residents are finding it difficult to board trains at Ladywell during the morning peak. What is being done to alleviate this problem? Under previous timetables, some peak Charing Cross trains were fast from Ladywell to Waterloo East. Is consideration being given to reintroduce these to the timetable? (Geoffrey Thurley, Ladywell Society)