

Scrutiny Review of Sustainable Transport Minutes of the Meeting Held 21st January 2010

Present: Cllrs Beacham, Mallett (Chair), Santry & Weber

In attendance: Chris Barker, Martin Bradford, Paul Bumstead, Bryony Clifford, Adam Coffman, Joan, Hancox, Tajinder Kaur Nijjar, Tony Kennedy, Demos Kettenis, Richard Pout, Duncan Stroud.

1. Apologies for absence:

Sue Penny

2. Declarations of interest.

Cllr Mallett declared an interest as a member of the London Cycling Campaign and Cllr Beacham declared an interest as an employee of London Underground Ltd.

3. Late items of urgent business

The chair agreed that Richard Pout from the Barking Gospel Oak Line Users Group would make a short submission to the panel (item 9).

4. Minutes of the last meeting

15th December meeting

4.1 It was noted that Paul Bumstead was in attendance at this meeting.

4.2 In 5.7 it was noted that this should read 'the the length of time that pay and display bays operate was extended'.

4.3 Minutes of the 15th December were agreed.

12th January

4.4 In attendance Paul Bumstead not 'Bumpstead'.

4.5 In section 4.4 on Taxicards and Companion Badges, the panel agreed that there should be some additional promotion of these to ensure appropriate take up in the community.

Agreed: That promotion of Taxicards & Companion Badges be undertaken through the Council and its partners among elderly and disabled residents.

4.6 In section 5.5, the paragraph should read more generally to the effect that parking restrictions may have an impact on local businesses.

4.7 There was an amendment to the text of the panel agreement which should read:

Agreed: That further work be carried out to establish whether the introduction of CPZ had impacted on modal shift.

5. NHS Haringey

5.1 Duncan Stroud, Associate Director of Communications, Engagement & Marketing gave a presentation to the panel in the work that local NHS service were doing to promote physical activity and possible opportunities to promote sustainable transport in Haringey.

The following is a summary of the main points of this discussion and subsequent panel discussion.

- 5.2 The panel heard that whilst keeping physical active was important to maintaining overall well being, there were high levels of physical inactivity among the population. It was recommended that individuals undertake 5 periods of physical activity each week, yet only half of the population do this. In Haringey, data from NHS London (Go London) would suggest that 48.4% of residents within the borough are inactive. It is estimated that the lack of exercise in the local population has been estimated to cost local NHS services between £3-4million annually through the treatment of diseases which may could otherwise be prevented through physical activity.
- 5.3 NHS Haringey deliver a number of projects to improve physical activity in the local population including a programme of health walks around the borough. Other initiatives which help improve physical activity include Community Matrons, the Expert Patient Programme and Community Health Trainers. Most importantly however, NHS Haringey were developing a physical activity pack for local GPs to help encourage exercise referrals (information/ awareness).
- 5.4 NHS Haringey is in the process of developing a green travel plan which is in the process of being promoted to staff. NHS Haringey have a pool of bikes for staff use, are part of the cycle to work scheme, have set up a bicycle users group and have a bike mileage allowance of 20p per mile. The panel noted that car parking charges have been introduced at the St Ann's Hospital site, though it was not clear if this applied to staff. NHS Haringey, alongside all London PCTs has signed up to the Mayors pledge to become a cycling organisation.
- 5.5 The panel noted that at the new Hornsey Hospital site has a large car park and very few spaces for cycle parking (n=5) which did not encourage sustainable transport usage. It was not known if car parking charges had also been set at this NHS Haringey site. Car parking charges at NHS sites were noted to be a sensitive issue but would provide further information on what transport facilities are provided at sites.

Agreed: NHS Haringey to provide further information and parking on NHS sites.

- 5.6 The panel wanted to know more about how the physical activity incentive scheme in primary care would work. It was noted that the scheme was still being developed, but it was anticipated that this would deliver a pack to GPs to help their referrals for physical exercise (i.e. information about services). It was not clear if there was a financial incentive for GPs to participate or refer through this scheme. The panel noted that travel advice could also be included as part of the pack being developed for GPs and include walking and cycling routes.

Agreed: the GP physical activity resource for further collaborative work between NHS Haringey and the Council in developing the GP resource pack.

6. Sustainable Transport Service – School Travel Plan

- 6.1 A presentation was given to the panel from the Tajinder Kaur Nijjar from the Schools Travel Planning team. The following provides a summary of the presentation and subsequent panel discussion.

- 6.2 The panel noted that the aim of developing the school travel plan (STP) was to reduce the number of car trips to and from the school, remove barriers to sustainable transport, promote active travel and develop community responses to transport / traffic problems in the school location. Plans are developed through a process of consultation for individual schools and are reviewed each year. On the third year, the travel plan is rewritten (with consultation) to refresh.
- 6.3 The panel heard that STP in Haringey had a significant impact on car usage to schools, where there was a 21% reduction in car usage amongst staff and 7% reduction amongst pupils. More pupils now cycled (+4%) and walked to school (+1%). More staff now walked to school (+11%) or got the bus (+6%).
- 6.4 The panel hear that the STP was funded (£340k per annum) and monitored through Transport for London. It was noted to have contributed to the following outcomes at local schools:
- Less cars and congestion around the school site
 - Healthier, more active pupils, families and staff
 - Less pollution around school
 - Safer walking and cycling routes around the school
 - Improved school grounds with provision for bicycle storage
 - A more accessible school site
 - Small grants for annually updating the STP
- 6.5 The panel heard that due to financial pressures there was a need to refocus the work of the STP team. It was with concern that the panel heard that dedicated cycle training would no longer be provided, but that there would be training programme focused on teachers (12 in this initial year). Whilst the panel heard that there was some advantages to this latter scheme (embed within the school curriculum) it was also noted its success would depend on teachers remaining in Haringey and on full and proper accreditation.
- Agreed:** that the panel would like further clarification on the budget allocation for school cycle training and details of planned provision for 2010/2011.
- 6.6 The panel noted that STPs had been a very successful development in Haringey and were keen that momentum for this project did not falter. In this context, the panel were keen to hear how STPs would be renewed and refreshed to ensure that they continued to perform well in encouraging active transport and help deliver modal shift. The panel heard that there was not as much funding in the smarter travel block of funding within the STP budget, this would require the programme to focus its work on those schools where there was a high car usage and to concentrate on the delivery of universal initiatives such as theatre in education group and walk on Wednesday.
- Sustainable Transport Service - Joan Hancox**
- 6.7 Joan Hancox, the Head of the Sustainable Transport Service submitted the department's report to the panel and presented some of the key issues within it. The following is a summary of the key issues from the presentation and subsequent panel discussion.
- 6.8 The panel heard that the sustainable transport service faced a number of key challenges in particular, reducing journeys by car, managing increasing transport demand due to population and employment growth, reducing accidents and reducing carbon emissions.

These were all significant challenges for the department and would need coordinated action on behalf of the council as a whole.

- 6.9 The panel noted that there were a number of funding sources for the department including grants from TfL and income from council capital receipts and receipts from section 106 allocations. It was noted that the budget for 2010/2011 was likely to be very similar to the current budget, but that alongside all other public sector services, there would likely to be severe pressures on the budget in 2011/2012. The panel noted that whilst the revenue budget was in excess of £10m per annum, there was actually little flexibility in this budget once fixed overheads had been taken in to account.
- 6.10 One of the main items of expenditure is the maintenance of highways and footways. Given the recent spell of cold weather and the impact that this would have on local highways, it was anticipated that this budget would also come under pressure this year. It was noted that the annual road condition survey is undertaken in December each year, and this data is used to inform priorities for road repair/ renewal in the forthcoming year. This is a fixed budget, so this will be a process of prioritising need.
- 6.11 The panel heard that the department monitors repairs made to the road surface made by utility companies. This is inspected by council officers. There is a 12 month warranty of all work undertaken, so if potholes develop or the work is known to be faulty, this can be rectified at no expense to the council. The council has a number of mechanisms through which potholes are reported including through the website. It was noted that there are a team of 4 inspectors undertaking this work who are under pressure from the recent bad weather, so the department would encourage Members to identify and report potholes to the service.
- 6.12 The panel noted that road repair and maintenance was of importance to all road users, but particularly bike users as potholes were the main source of claims against for injury (as opposed to car collisions). It was noted that the council had signed up to the permit scheme, where utilities would have to buy permits to dig up roads in Haringey, and be subject to penalties for overrun or poor quality replacement. This may improve the pothole situation.
- 6.13 The panel heard that there were a number of new schemes which had begun this year which will help to improve sustainable transport in Haringey. These included
- DIY Streets
 - Biking Borough status
 - Muswell Hill Low Carbon Zone
 - Workplace and Residential Travel Plans
- 6.14 A number of key issues for the transport department were highlighted to the panel over the next 12 months:
- Funding uncertainty on revenue budget from 2011/12
 - Development of Haringey's Transport Strategy (LIP2) – this would be developed during 2010.
 - Delivery of Greenest Borough Strategy – ensure that transport requirements were delivered.
 - Delivery of integrated transport schemes including behaviour change work
- 6.15 The panel were keen to ensure, that in these times of economic uncertainty that every effort would be to focus work on where it would have the most impact i.e. those sections of the community most likely to change travel behaviour. It therefore hoped that the

department would make most use of new geo-segmentation technology as demonstrated through MOSAIC. It was reported to the panel that this technology was in use within the Council and it hoped to capitalise this in targeting sustainable transport initiatives.

Agreed: That MOSAIC and other geo-segmentation technologies be used to help target sustainable transport initiatives in Haringey.

7. Report back from visits to Sutton & Peterborough City Council

7.1 The panel visited London Borough of Sutton (November 2009) and Peterborough City Council (December 2009) to understand how programmes of sustainable transport had been developed in these authorities. The following provides a summary of the main issues to arise from the visits.

7.2 There were a number of similarities in the approaches to developing sustainable transport within these two authorities. Firstly, and most importantly, these boroughs had both received significant and dedicated funding from Department of Transport or Transport for London (£3.2m in Peterborough and £5m in Sutton). Other similarities in the approaches of these authorities were that both:

- had clear and transparent objectives (modal shift) which was communicated to residents
- adopted a non intrusive but positive approach to encouraging people to change their behaviour
- offered a balanced programme of initiatives
- were supported by a multi-agency stakeholder board
- adopted programme wide branding of all transport/ travel initiatives.

7.3 There were also a number of similarities in the activities of both sustainable transport programmes. These included:

- Research travel needs – with effective targeting
- Improve level and quality of travel information
- Travel planning central to programmes
- Schools → Workplace → Individual
- Inexpensive approach to individual travel planning
- Influence land use and planning
- Social marketing (travel awareness)
- Pilot new interventions i.e. GP referral for cycling

7.4 It was also possible to identify a number of key learning points which were evident in both sustainable travel programmes visited. These were summarised as:

- The need to adopt a programme delivery approach: planning targeting and monitoring sustainable travel initiatives
- Utilise partnerships – identify shared policy objectives
- Use free advertising to get message across
- Refresh and reapply initiatives on a periodic basis
- Move towards an integrated approach to transport planning – holistic area based solutions to traffic problems (rather than piecemeal or just cycling etc).
- Lock in the benefits of modal shift – i.e. traffic calming measures

7.5 A number of innovative schemes were highlighted from the visits:

- Discount cards for local shopping via sustainable transport - incentive scheme

- Cycle courier service
- Solar studs to mark out cycle ways and walk ways
- Travel packs with estate agents
- Experiment – innovate – but evaluate

7.6 Members of the panel also wished to highlight key learning from the visits was the need to develop travel plans for areas where there are known traffic problems (akin to area based solutions). This could be applied to local areas such as the Arena Shopping Centre at Harringay overland rail station. where there are serious traffic problems at the junction with Green Lanes. The panel noted that the area was gridlocked, especially at weekends and work would need to be done to look at how people access retail businesses, the parking policy on site and other transport options to the site.

8. Audit of partner provision of sustainable transport

8.1 A brief presentation was given to the panel on the findings from the audit of sustainable transport provision among key local partners (attached). The aims of the survey was to find out what local partners are doing to promote sustainable transport, to identify shared priorities or objectives and Identify ways in which partners can work together in Haringey to promote sustainable transport.

8.2 In total, the survey heard back from 9 local partners including NHS Trusts, police service, fire service, housing authorities and colleges of further and higher education. Responses covered almost 4,000 employees, underlining the potential influence that work with these organisations may have in reducing car journeys and associated traffic congestion/ pollution.

8.3 Of these partners, 5 had a carbon reduction strategy, 5 had a sustainable transport strategy and 6 had a staff travel plan Work with Local Authorities. This would suggest that partners are at different stages of developing sustainable transport initiatives within their organisations and that there was scope to work with partners to help develop this body of work further.

8.4 The presentation also highlighted how partners support their staff in taking sustainable transport options. Here it was recorded that the provision of home-working facilities, bike loans, shower facilities and cycle parking were among the most common sustainable transport provisions at partner sites. Possible opportunities for partners to share learning were identified for developing car pools, car sharing and bike mileage allowances were identified (as few had undertaken these).

8.5 The development of green fuel technology was highlighted to be a key development point from the survey. Partners operated over 250 vehicles of which a very small proportion were equipped with some element of green fuel technology. It was noted that a small number of partners were beginning to think about how GFT can be incorporated in to commissioning of contractor (vehicles).

8.6 The panel heard that sustainability and sustainable transport are firmly on the agenda of partners and many had received specialist support in helping to develop transport plans. It was also clear that partners would like further support in developing sustainable transport plans and there may be opportunities in relation to developing transport strategies and travel plans. It was evident that there was potential to share

learning across the partnership and to learn from initiatives developed in 'pioneer' services e.g. staff travel plans, working with contractors.

Agreed: The panel agreed that there should be a number of developmental recommendations arising from this audit.

9. Barking to Gospel Oak Users Group (Richard Pout)

9.1 Richard Pout, from Barking Gospel Oak Line Users Group provided evidence to the panel (attached) about issues pertaining to the sue of this rail line in the borough, and other rail services more generally. The following provides a highlight of the presentation and subsequent panel discussion.

9.2 It was noted that individual boroughs will find it difficult to influence train services and operations for rail services. It was noted that the borough, alongside other north London boroughs, should aim to influence service provision on the London Overground Barking to Gospel Oak line, Great Northern Service between Moorgate and Welwyn and National Express to Enfield & Cheshunt from Liverpool Street.

9.3 For instance, the electrification of the Barking Gospel Oak line and future service capacity on this service is an area where cooperation may be beneficial (i.e. just two coach diesels at present). The passenger facilities at this line could also be improved on both the Barking Gospel Oak line and Moorgate Welwyn line to include more passenger shelters, lighting and passenger information. In respect of the Enfield line it was suggested that there should be a more frequent service (every 10 mins. to Edmonton Green), 15 minutes to Enfield & Cheshunt at peak periods.

9.4 It was also noted that there were poor cycling facilities at many of the stations on the above lines which should be addressed. It was emphasised to the panel that it was not about developing train services in isolation, but to integrate these with other public transport / sustainable transport connections (i.e. buses, cycles)

9.5 It was also suggested that the London boroughs through which these railway lines pass through may wish to jointly lobby for greater access at stations for those people with mobility problems. It was noted that disabled access along with other passenger services, was undeveloped at many of the stations on these lines.

10. Review process

10.1 The review completion process was presented to members of the panel. This indicated that there would be one final meeting to form conclusions and agree recommendations (this to be held in early February). A briefing paper would be provided for the next meeting to outline the evidence the panel has heard and areas where the panel may wish to develop recommendations.

10.2 It was noted that the completed report would formally be presented to Cabinet in May or June and a response issued after (usually 6-8 weeks). The service would be required to provide a follow up report on the implementation of recommendations 12-18 months after this date.

11. Summary and conclusions

- 11.1 The panel were invited to highlight any key findings or conclusions that had thus far been drawn from the evidence presented within the review. A number of the key areas highlighted here included:
- The evidence presented by Joanne McCartney (GLA) in respect of the provision of cycle parking was felt to be very persuasive and clearly identified the actions that we need to take as a council to encourage greater uptake.
 - Walking was felt to be central to all travel and transport plans as most journeys started and ended on foot (to some degree). It was therefore felt that maintenance of the boroughs footpaths should be a priority and that there should be a sound system of identifying and reporting repairs.
 - Similarly, it was felt that there should be a harmonisation of reporting systems for road and footways maintained by Home for Haringey and Haringey Council (or others).
 - It was felt that the review should develop a range of recommendations which supported both hard and soft measures in promoting sustainable transport. Members of the panel felt that there was also a balance to be struck between new tough measures (i.e. new parking restrictions) and evolutionary measures (incremental growth of CPZ).
 - Areas identified for possible consideration for recommendations were the extension of parking restrictions to weekends and the maintenance of bus lane priorities also at weekends.
 - The panel felt that a lot had been learnt from other boroughs, particularly about the need to research your local population needs and to target interventions on those people most likely to change their behaviour. It was hoped that the council would utilise new technologies available to help in this process such as MOSAIC.
 - The panel agreed that travel planning offered real benefits, whether this be in the work place, at school or on a personal level. The panel had heard considerable evidence about the effectiveness of such processes and the hierarchy of travel planning (school, work, personal).
 - The panel were keen to develop personal travel planning and identified the need to learn from planned pilots (Muswell Hill low emission zone). It was also felt that there were opportunities to develop more personal travel planning/ sustainable transport with partners (i.e. outreach units). It was also noted that these were not necessarily resource intensive, as other boroughs had been creative in financing similar initiatives.
 - Parking policy and CPZ's in particular were identified as particularly problematic issues. There was a perception among the panel that the availability of plentiful and cheap parking was central to many of the traffic congestion problems within the borough. There was agreement that this needs to be addressed, but once again, there was a need to strike balance in the approach: should CPZ be allowed to develop incrementally across the borough as more and more communities agree to their installation or, should there be a more proactive response i.e. designating all areas around railway stations to be CPZ? This was acknowledged to be a very

sensitive issue within the community which ultimately required community consent to proceed.

- There was some agreement among the panel of the need to address 20mph zones across the borough. These were felt to be a positive development, but the authority would need to consider how this would be enforced if implemented. It was again noted that borough wide 20 mph zones had been developed in neighbouring boroughs.
- The panel acknowledged that as an individual borough, it would be difficult to address a significant amount of traffic that passed through the borough on radial routes in and out of London. This underlined the need to work in partnership with other neighbouring boroughs and of course TfL, to identify ways in which great use of sustainable travel methods beyond the borough boundaries.
- In the context of the above, it was also felt that the focus of sustainable travel initiatives should be on those journeys internal to the borough. This should be on promoting local sustainable communities and shopping centres (to minimise journeys) and encouraging sustainable travel to these sites.
- The panel also felt that the review had highlighted a number of opportunities to work more with partners within the borough and through the Haringey Strategic Partnership. The panel felt that there were a number of shared policy objectives for both the council and health partners that offered a number of development routes (promoting cycling and walking). Indeed, it was felt the health benefits of developing sustainable transport could be promoted further within local projects.
- It was acknowledged that the Greenest Borough Strategy identified the need for the council to lead by example in sustainability issues, and the panel also felt that this was the case for developing sustainable transport. It was noted that the council was already doing some good work, but there were opportunities - as lead partner in the HSP – to develop this further i.e. staff travel, electric cars, car sharing, oyster cards within departments and pool bike and cars.

12. Date of next meeting

12.1 11th February 2010.