

Surface Transport Healthy Streets Portfolio Board

Minutes (Strategy/Business Assurance) – 25 April 2017

Attendees

Attendees	Ben Plowden (Chair)	Alan Bristow	Steve Burton
	Patrick Doig	Nick Fairholme	Alex Williams (items 1-4)
	Michael Bridgeland	Will Norman	Tim Steer
	John Barry	Lilli Matson	Tanya Durlen
	Nigel Hardy	Sam Monck	Ed Preedy
	Emma Osborne	Carl Eddleston	Ben Lyon (Secretariat)
Apologies	Gareth Powell	Peter Blake	Dana Skelley
	Andrea Clarke	Justine Curry	

Decisions and actions

No	Item	Decision	Action/Notes	To Action
1	Agree Agenda	Agreed	<p>The Chair confirmed there was a quorum and agreed the agenda.</p> <p>Two additional items were added on the day to the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Operational Network Evaluator (ii) H10 Bridge (dealt under item 4) 	
2	Actions Log and Minutes	Noted and Discussed	<p>The HSPB reviewed the actions log and confirmed:</p> <p>HSPB-13-1 – Emma confirmed this action is now complete. Actions have been circulated from PIC in March. Action closed.</p> <p>HSPB-13-2 – Tanya confirmed the Terms of Reference are in the pack and she highlighted the changes (role of the meeting, clarification of communication channels with external stakeholders, updated structure for the programmes below this board (will be reviewed with the new sponsorship directorate when this is introduced), membership. Appendices now contain the new governance structure and endorsement process. Action closed.</p> <p>Terms of reference were agreed by the</p>	



		<p>Board.</p> <p>HSPB-13-3 – Tanya confirmed that the June quarterly update is being compiled, in parallel with the template, and the June update will become the template used for future updates to PIC.</p> <p>Alex Williams noted that the Rotherhithe Canary Wharf crossing update will also be going to PIC in June.</p> <p>ACTION: Secretariat to schedule the quarterly updates to PIC and the Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf crossing paper to the relevant HSPB meeting prior to routing on the Surface Forward Planner.</p> <p>The review process and Independent Review of the Garden Bridge was raised and discussed.</p> <p>ACTION: Emma Osborne to circulate the Independent Review of the Garden Bridge project. Post meeting update: Emma circulated the following link to the review by email to Surface Directors – www.london.gov.uk/independent-review-garden-bridge-project.</p> <p>HSPB-13-4 – Tanya confirmed there is an outline proposal which is being discussed with CCTE and City Planning. An update on Non-infrastructure activities will be brought to the HSPB in May. The Secretariat confirmed this has been scheduled on the Surface Forward Planner.</p> <p>HSPB-13-5 – Will Norman confirmed he has confirmed to TEC Committee that the HSPB is an internal meeting and therefore wouldn't be applicable to attend. Given this, a quarterly update meeting is to be arranged, albeit Will needs to confirm who will be attending that meeting. Alan Bristow advised that there is borough representation in the</p>	<p>Ben Lyon</p> <p>Emma Osborne</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------------

			<p>process on any scheme that comes to this borough as it will undergo technical evaluation at RSPG (in which the boroughs attend) to discuss schemes that will have an impact on them.</p> <p>HSPB-13-6 – Tanya confirmed the update will be brought to the next meeting. Action closed.</p> <p>HSPB-13-7 – Sam Monck advised that his team have been working with Surface Finance colleagues and they have been out to see the Mini-Hollands boroughs to discuss. We should hopefully now see an improvement in reporting. He also confirmed that Patrick Doig would be writing to the boroughs where there have been concerns raised in the past 12 months in this area. Action closed.</p> <p>HSPB-13-8 – Sam Monck confirmed this is an action that should be picked up post Transformation.</p> <p>HSPB-13-9 – Patrick confirmed that the table has been updated. Action closed.</p> <p>HSPB-13-10 – it was confirmed this action is now closed and attendees will seek clarification on any financial information they need explaining in further detail. Action closed.</p> <p>HSPB-13-11 and HSPB-13-12 – Lilli confirmed this is closed as this has been followed up through the CS9 alignment workshop. Action closed.</p> <p>HSPB-13-13 – Lilli confirmed that discussions have taken place and that she would find a further meeting with John Barry helpful to discuss this further based on the suggestions he raised at the CS9 workshop.</p> <p>HSPB-13-14 – the mock example has been taken forward and looked at as to how the framework applies. Action</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>closed.</p> <p>HSPB-13-15 – Will confirmed that a meeting has been arranged with LB Southwark for the 2 May 2017. Action closed.</p> <p>HSPB-13-16 – remains open, Jonathan Hanes to come back in June. ACTION: Secretariat to confirm a paper will be brought.</p> <p>HSPB-13-17 – Lilli confirmed this action is closed and has been taken forward appropriately. Action closed.</p> <p>The HSPB reviewed the minutes recorded from 23 March and approved them. ACTION: Secretariat to get Ben Plowden to formally sign and date the minutes.</p>	<p>Ben Lyon</p> <p>Ben Lyon</p>
3	Forward Planner	Noted	<p>The Secretariat provided an overview of the Forward Planner and advised that this is in the process of being updated as papers are now being scheduled and consequently a more detailed overview would be forthcoming at the next meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: Notwithstanding this, the Chair noted the absence of forward planning by the business areas, and requested that the relevant officers work with the Secretariat to populate the forward planner in more detail. The HSPB is to review the Forward Planner at the meeting in May to ensure suitable forward planning by the relevant business area.</p> <p>ACTION: Secretariat to add quarterly financial reviews and Carl Eddleston to provide information on when strategic modelling data will be available so that it can be entered onto the Forward Planner. Wandsworth also needs updating to reflect it is going to the Programme and Investment Committee.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>Ben Lyon</p>

4	Financial Summary	Noted	<p>Patrick Doig took the Board through the financial summary and confirmed that in future written commentary would be provided with them.</p> <p>Patrick advised that the 'gross budget' – i.e. the total of each individual scheme budget – is [REDACTED] and the numbers immediately below cover overprogramming ([REDACTED] – more programmes in the budget than available cash for but on the basis that there will be slippage on some schemes/projects due to unforeseen events). This is something we will however have to keep under close scrutiny as we progress through the 2017/18 financial year. The other row of figures relates to the Value Engineering target and this is the more pressing – i.e. the savings target that the Executive Committee have requested us to make on our projects. Patrick confirmed a substantial amount of savings have already been made, and confirmed, following the reduction of [REDACTED] in bus priority programme at the HSPB (Delivery Assurance) meeting on the 18 April, that this has reduced to [REDACTED] which now needs to be allocated.</p> <p>Patrick confirmed that making the Value Engineering savings target is going to be challenging given that the allocated budgeted project authority for schemes e.g. the LIP corridors, that there is now only [REDACTED] project authority budget left for 2017/18 financial year. Given this, no assumptions can be made that project authority will be granted on schemes that come for approval and that going forwards schemes/projects should undergo the STAR Chamber process to see if any further savings can be secured.</p> <p>Cannot accommodate further cost pressures or delivery accelerations on schemes without making readjustments being made.</p>	
---	-------------------	-------	--	--

			<p>Tables on pages 22-24 – Patrick confirmed this covers everything we know is covered by Healthy Streets portfolio and his team are reviewing the Period 1 forecasts to refresh budgets and validate on figures from the 2016/17 year end. This may result in more risks and/or opportunities arising.</p> <p>ACTION: We need to better understand when the latest/earliest a decision needs to be made before committing resources on schemes, taking into account the financial situation we are addressing, by the Healthy Streets Portfolio, prior to the Business Plan.</p> <p>Schemes at risk in 2017/18 financial year were highlighted and discussed in further detail as follows: (a) Cycle Training; (b) Mini-Hollands; (c) CS10; and (d) a ramp connecting to a bridge into the Olympic Park (not included in the list within the board pack).</p> <p>Mini-Hollands - [REDACTED]</p> <p>Three factors have caused this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historically the boroughs have under spent the amount they have requested each year and therefore we have budgeted a lower amount and now the boroughs are accelerating their delivery 2. (1) is compounded by the boroughs robustness in financial reporting during 2016/17 was questionable – not clear on in year spend 3. One of the Mini-Hollands – in Enfield – wants to accelerate their delivery over and above their original baseline that they informed us on. <p>How we can accommodate in the portfolio and given accounting treatment was discussed – it may be possible to capitalise the scheme in</p>	Patrick Doig
--	--	--	---	--------------

			<p>Enfield given it traverses a section on the TLRN.</p> <p>Sam Monck advised there may be the opportunities to hold back £1.5m in this financial year of the Central London Grid spend to help offset some of the faster delivery rates on the Mini-Hollands.</p> <p>CS10 - [REDACTED] Accelerating money that isn't in this year's Business Plan and is requiring us to spend more money in 2017/18 than budgeted. Nigel Hardy confirmed the cost pressure is to deliver feasibility work of the scheme.</p> <p>Cycle Training - [REDACTED] to deliver the same rate of cycle training as 2016/17 Whilst recognising the pressures the Portfolio is facing, Will Norman made very clear that his ideal outcome is for us restore the cycle training budget to that of previous years. Will requested that we ensure the same volume of child safety training as 2016/17 can be delivered.</p> <p>Ramp connecting one of the Quietways to a bridge into the Olympic Park (not included in the list in the pack) – circa [REDACTED] The Chair confirmed this has only recently come about because the LLDC needs to commission the installation of some wiring and piping into the bridge into which the ramp would lead up to, and LLDC need to know whether they are installing this wiring/piping with or without the ramp. There currently is no agreed design for the ramp and therefore have an unclear cost on the ramp. Consultants have been brought in to work up the costings for the ramp. We have been caught unaware as LLDC have only made TfL aware they are bringing this work forward under the District Heating Plan.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Sam Monck confirmed there is flexibility in Quietways programme, albeit need to slow down the rate of delivery, to incorporate this cost pressure should it need to be absorbed.</p> <p>Michael Bridgeland questioned why we have to take a decision now. The Chair and Sam Monck confirmed that the contractors for the District Heating System need to know whether they are designing the piping going into the existing bridge is with or without a ramp attached to it as they would involve different designs and construction. An inclusive design with the ramp would be the most cost effective in the long-term.</p> <p>Outcomes of Cost pressure discussions:</p> <p>The Board agreed to make provision of a maximum of [REDACTED] in 2017/18 financial year for the ramp connecting one of the Quietways to a bridge in the Olympic Park which would have to come out of the Quietways allocation should this cost materialise this year subject to the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) ACTION: Sam Monck to confirm the timescales – a critical juncture on design only or delivery start date for construction. (b) ACTION: Sam Monck to go back to LLDC and seek a contribution – full or partial. <p>The Board agreed to consider safeguarding the money already committed to the boroughs on existing delivery on Mini-Hollands is provided, but not to accelerated delivery bringing forward spend.</p> <p>The Board agreed to consider safeguarding the cycle training spend to the same rate as the 2016/17 for the current financial year.</p>	<p>Sam Monck</p> <p>Sam Monck</p>
--	--	--	---	-----------------------------------

			<p>ACTION: All to come back to the Healthy Streets Portfolio Board to look at how the cycle training; Mini-Hollands; CS10 and a ramp connecting to a bridge into the Olympic Park cost pressures can be accommodated – i.e. by delaying the delivery rates of other schemes/STAR Chamber Savings.</p> <p>ACTION: A set of lines needs to be pulled together around where we are in terms of funding/ in-year funding for Healthy Streets for projects and programmes for those going out and engaging with the boroughs on schemes. As part of this, it needs to be made clear that budgets are not being cut and we are accommodating the spend we have committed.</p>	<p>Sam Monck</p> <p>Patrick Doig</p>
5	CS9 Alignment	Noted and Discussed	<p>Lilli presented the paper on the CS9 alignment.</p> <p>This update follows on from a workshop which looked at how we deal with some of the issues arising around CS9 – i.e. the potential impacts on buses, and whether alternative alignments might be a better way of delivering the Healthy Streets Outcomes. The workshop was attended by a number of colleagues, including Carl Eddleston (Chief Engineer, Outcomes Management, RSM), Nigel Hardy (Head of Sponsorship, RSM) and John Barry (Head of Network Development, Buses).</p> <p>The workshop looked at information from the Healthy Streets Assessment Framework (this is known as HEX and highlights local issues and local priorities on KSIs and Air Quality for example) and was discussed as far as possible on the strategic issues covering buses, cyclists and walking in the absence of modelling work. It was recognised that whilst detailed</p>	

			<p>modelling is only going to be available in June, there is some early understanding on what the potential impacts would be on buses.</p> <p>A number of detailed issues came up at the workshop. Lilli highlighted the two alignments (depicted in the third slide) were discussed – the blue line (via Hammersmith) is the original CS9 alignment, with the red line covering the alternative routing through Shepherds Bush which would avoid a lot of Kings Street but then wouldn't join into the new Better Junction scheme that is being introduced at Hammersmith Road (at the Hammersmith end). Lilli noted that to make the CS9 blue route work, we need to ensure we get the bus journey times protected on roads that come into and join that new route – e.g. Eden Road. For the CS9 alternative, this would require a completely new approach to be taken about Shepherds Bush, which, as she noted, is also a massively important interchange for buses.</p> <p>Lilli confirmed that in terms of cycling we know these routes are incredibly important as the blue route is in the top one per cent of roads for cycling in London at the moment, and that it has been proposed a number of times since around 2009, and that there is already a Better Junctions route project ready to progress at the Hammersmith Gyratory end of that scheme.</p> <p>Slide 4 – HEX work – comparison against the two schemes. Lilli noted that the HEX work was not as useful as initially thought because some of the way this information presents itself is counterintuitive and didn't provide any stark differences between the two routes. For example: are both routes important in terms of cycling? Yes. Are there relatively high KSIs that could be addressed by these schemes? Yes. Will</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Air Quality be improved? Yes, but this doesn't inform which is the better route for Air Quality improvements. This process has helped inform how we will use the Healthy Streets Appraisal Framework.</p> <p>Lilli highlighted the conclusions reached by the working group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) We need to do something; (b) That we are already doing something at the Hammersmith Gyrotory; (c) Both alignments offer the potential – the existing alignment is a lot more progressed and a lot of the difficulties are known as opposed to unknown, albeit we are pending the detailed modelling back in June; (d) There maybe potential through that to further mitigate some of the delays that we know will impact on buses on that alignment through looking at whether bus lanes can be maintained or whether there was a signalised junction; (e) Recommendation – proposed to progress with designing up the Hammersmith alignment and learn from that as to how we use that information for further scheme reviews. <p>John Barry said he found the workshop helpful, albeit there were limitations of the available data. He cautioned that we still don't know what the impacts are. Whilst John agreed with the approach for CS9 around Hammersmith (as overall it just makes sense and cyclists will go that way anyway) but disagreed with the view that as something radical for CS10 will be required at Shepherds Bush Green that it will lead to a limited amount of additional impacts on buses for CS9 through it. In John's view, we need to adopt a Healthy Streets</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>approach to Shepherd's Bush Green rather than 'it's the CS9 alignment and we will do everything around that to mitigate impacts'. Instead, he championed we make sure the design of the other parts of the CS9 (Hammersmith Road in the east and King Street in the west) have a target of having no NEX delays for bus passengers. Whilst accepting this would likely have a radical set of implications on the design (traffic design and cycle superhighways) that if we don't adopt this approach we will continue to see a repeat of the impact we have already seen on buses with the delivery of the other parts of the segregated Cycle Superhighways.</p> <p>Alan Bristow agreed that keeping CS9 away from Shepherd's Bush is sensible and the Hammersmith alignment should be done. Alan accepted the difficulty with John's proposals is in terms of capacity – who do you allocate it to? He accepted that it is difficult to have a segregated cycle superhighway without impacts on buses. It may be possible to have no effects on buses, but the provision for cyclists would have to be changed e.g. no segregated cycle superhighways. Alan concluded there will inevitably be an impact on buses, and we need to revisit the situation once we have all the data and detailed modelling.</p> <p>ACTION: Given the above, it was agreed to amend the wording on the impact on buses to be 'kept as close to zero as possible.' Steve Burton emphasised that the wording is vital, and we need to get messages out about that we are optimising travel for all users, including buses, to ensure balance.</p> <p>Whilst noting the above, Will Norman made clear we have no significant cycle routes going out West and inevitably we</p>	Lilli Matson
--	--	---	--------------

			<p>need to put some in under the current agenda, and accept there will be impacts on other traffic. Will noted there are other areas of London in which it may be possible to prioritise other types of traffic on a London-wide approach, rather than a single route. The Chair reasoned that it would be extremely difficult to apply the London-wide approach to a bus passenger on a single route, in that if their travel is adversely affected on that route, they may decide to permanently move to another mode of transport and never use that bus route again. This, in turn, could lead to a further decline in bus patronage.</p> <p>Tim Steer said it's important to recognise that CS9 is different to CS10. With CS9 there is a well established expectation regarding the route alignment which has been communicated, whilst for CS10 there is more movability to make changes to the design as it hasn't yet been widely circulated/consulted on.</p> <p>Nigel Hardy made clear that any changes to CS9 – regardless of how minor – would push back consultation this year. It was noted that any changes to the current design would delay the projects. John Barry made clear we have been in this situation time and time again, where there is a design created and then at a later stage we do modelling, find big delays for bus passengers and then say we cannot change the design.</p> <p>Nick Fairholme advised we need to get much better at the buildability/constructability and constraint elements of these designs before we get too far down the line. The buses impacts need to be understood earlier and how these things are complex to build on street. Nick made paramount that the Projects and Programmes Directorate needs to be engaged from</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>the outset on these schemes.</p> <p>Alan Bristow questioned what are we doing for pedestrians, and noted that the schemes we deliver can have impacts for them in terms of traffic light phasing's etc.</p> <p>Alan noted that the only other option would be a departure from segregated Cycle Superhighways in order to improve the impact on buses. But then the question arises as to who makes the decision, and, by when this decision needs to be made. Lilli noted that if this were taken forward this would be a significant departure from where we have been going on cycling and affording cyclists safer cycling routes.</p> <p>Tim Steer pointed out that he does not believe Val Shawcross is yet aware that to deliver the level of cycling interventions proposed that it will lead to a significant loss in bus patronage and revenue. Tim made clear that we have to use Healthy Streets to create a better balance between the various transport modes, and look at what measures may be required to reduce general traffic flows alongside the broader bus patronage recovery plan.</p> <p>Alan Bristow confirmed that some work has been carried out and there has been an improvement in bus speeds. Alan noted that the outcome of this work is we have recovered the tactical situation created by the previous delivery of works.</p> <p>The Board agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The Hammersmith alignment (the blue line on slide three); (b) Modelling will be undertaken to revisit this area and whilst accepting there is very limited scope to make any changes, that a 'go/no go' decision will be made on consulting on the CS9 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>KSI's – this makes it clear there is a pressing need to intervene.</p> <p>Safer Junctions is different to the Better Junctions Programme</p> <p>Safer Junctions is an evidence, research and data led approach, and therefore distinct and different from the Better Junctions Programme. Nigel noted that the Better Junctions programme has enabled us to embedded the lessons that have been learnt in that programme and taken forward in the Safer Junctions Programme which will have its approach reassessed annually. There will also be detailed reporting, which will included finance, targets, benefits and ultimately the outcomes of interventions.</p> <p>Nigel made clear that junctions of differ in size and therefore the types of interventions will differ also, depending on the area and the issue at hand to ensure the most appropriate interventions are delivered.</p> <p>Data set used for Safer Junctions</p> <p>Nigel confirmed the data set used is from 2013-15, and that this is the newest data available. The junctions have been identified from the three year collision rate and are made up of those two standard deviations above what is considered average for a large junction/junction on the TLRN.</p> <p>There are 73 junctions that have been identified, with the majority in Central London because of the generally high number of pedestrians and cyclist and due to us using absolute collision numbers rather than collision rates that involved KSI's. Nigel noted that whilst 21 of these junctions have already had significant alterations made, due to the data running over a three year period that they can still appear on the worst junctions list. Given this, these 21 junction will be monitored to see if a significant reduction has been made in</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>the number of KSI's at these locations.</p> <p>Of the 73 junctions identified, Nigel made clear that 33 of them are currently within the Healthy Streets portfolio, are funded and that work is being carried out. As part of this work, checks will be carried out to ensure they fully encompass the vulnerable road user's perspective.</p> <p>Nigel also confirmed that 19 of the 73 junctions are not currently part of the portfolio, and therefore these make up our potential area for further investigation and new work.</p> <p>There are seven Better Junctions which are also priority sites as part of Safer Junctions programme, and three of which have been built. Those not yet built include such locations as Highbury Corner, Lambeth Bridge North, Rotherhithe Roundabout and Waterloo Eastern Park.</p> <p>ACTION: Need to clarify the way we express Better Junctions and talk about Safer Junctions.</p> <p>Nigel noted that there would be a request in the future to seek project authority to commence works, but at the moment the focus will be on accident type analysis and won't require significant sums of money to be provided for this work to be undertaken. ACTION: this is to be kept under review to identify if a cost pressure is materialising in this area for the HSPB in the 2017/18 financial year for the Safety Studies.</p> <p>Alan Bristow made clear that we are not agreeing on this strategy to feasibility study stage as there is no money in the 2017/18 budget for this type of work. ACTION: Nigel and his team to note this and look at the 19 Safer Junctions identified and consider what work</p>	<p>Nigel Hardy</p> <p>Nigel Hardy</p> <p>Nigel Hardy</p>
--	--	--	--

			needs to be done. Nigel to come back with an update to Healthy Streets Portfolio Board at the appropriate time, which will include findings from 'safer studies'. It was noted that if an issue does materialise with funding, this is to be considered as part of the cost pressure discussions.	
7	Guidance on Developing the Third Local Implementation Plans	Noted and Agreed	<p>Sam Monck noted that a number of comments have been received from the business, but because of the delay in the Mayor's Transport Strategy going out (due to the timing of the General Elections) we are afforded some additional time. ACTION: Sam Monck to circulate the latest version of guidance.</p> <p>Sam made clear this is high-level guidance that signposts to the Mayors Transport Strategy. The guidance is aimed at getting the boroughs to set out their overall transport strategy, and within that their delivery programme. As part of this work, the boroughs should also come back to us with a traffic reduction strategy e.g through planning and parking policies as well as their business plans.</p> <p>Sam confirmed that in May he will be bringing a paper on the Annual Spending Submission Guidance which is focused on how the boroughs intend to deliver with the formula money that we have provided them. The new Liveable Neighbourhoods Guidance will also be brought, which is a programme that effectively replaces major schemes. Both of these have extra conditionality built in – e.g. For Liveable Neighbourhoods the boroughs bid to us for funding and they receive it if they deliver what we want and is done in a staged way.</p> <p>Sam made clear the aim of this guidance is to help provide better</p>	Sam Monck

		<p>control over LIP funding. Michael Bridgeland raised a question about cost control, cost monitoring and value engineering – will guidance be in this document or the other two documents or all three? Sam advised it's referenced in this but the main place will be in the Liveable Neighbourhoods Guidance because those schemes are relatively big in size. The focus is about ensuring we get value for money and we are controlling more on what the money is spent on and will be measured to ensure we get delivery outcomes we want. Michael made clear this is a 'golden opportunity' to ensure the boroughs provide the same level of cost control and governance TfL does on its schemes/projects.</p> <p>Whilst noting this focus will be in the other two documents, ACTION: Sam Monck to make the LIP Guidance more explicitly robust on value engineering and cost control. The document is to be updated and recirculated, with Sam consulting Michael Bridgeland on the wording covering value engineering/cost reduction.</p> <p>Tim Steer questioned how Sam is liaising with London Councils – is anything in this guidance going to be a surprise to them? Sam confirmed there has been a working group pulled together to work with the boroughs to look at making the guidance as light touch as possible. Given this, the guidance we have pulled together may come as a bit of a surprise to them.</p> <p>ACTION: Val Shawcross to be consulted for her view on whether further consultation with the boroughs on the guidance is required, and what approach should be adopted.</p> <p>Alan Bristow also took the opportunity to praise the work of Sam Monck's and Lilli Matson's team in pulling this guidance together.</p>	<p>Sam Monck</p> <p>Sam Monck / Tim Steer</p>
--	--	---	---



8	Operational Network Evaluator (ONE)	Noted	<p>Carl Eddleston presented the paper on ONE to the Board. (N.B. the paper was tabled on the day and was not included in the board pack circulated to attendees.)</p> <p>Buses set two challengers to RSM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) More information about construction for the different schemes across Central London (notoriously difficult to do because the way schemes are delivered and a variety of traffic management in place) (II) Bus speed information so this could be put into their revenue forecasting for their next four to five years. (This still needs work on) <p>The work provided in the presentation highlights what has been done to map out the impacts of construction.</p> <p>Carl confirmed that this information would be brought every quarter to the Healthy Streets (Business Assurance) meeting. ACTION: Secretariat to schedule on the Surface Forward Planner.</p> <p>The work was praised by the board, and Nick Fairholme noted it helps reveal working hours and weekend working in particular – blockade vs incremental working. He noted that the picture will change in the next six or so months with work being delivered on the ground.</p> <p>We need to be more flexible in the way we work and learn from the work at Upper Holloway where we did 7 weeks work in three months through closing the road. Fundamentally think about how we do things. Need to look beyond restricting ourselves to working windows rather than working on Sundays to minimise work duration periods noting the period of noisy</p>	Ben Lyon
---	-------------------------------------	-------	--	----------

			works may take place at weekends.	
9	Matters for escalation to Surface Board / Surface Managing Director	Discussed	No additional issues raised other than those raised during the meeting.	
10	Review of Meeting	Reviewed	No additional issues raised other than those raised during the meeting.	
11	AOB	Discussed	No AOB matters were raised.	

Name of Chair _____

Chair signature _____

Date _____

If you have questions or would like further information about the minutes please contact:

Benjamin Lyon, Healthy Streets Portfolio Board Secretariat. Telephone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

