

Scrutiny Sub-Committee B

Wednesday May 13th 2009

7.00 pm

Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

Membership

Councillor David Hubber (Chair)
Councillor Althea Smith (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Denise Capstick
Councillor Jenny Jones
Councillor Alison McGovern
Councillor Tayo Situ
Councillor Lorraine Zuleta

Reserves

Councillor Anood Al-Samerai
Councillor Paul Bates
Councillor Mark Glover
Councillor Helen Jardine-Brown

INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Access to information

You have the right to request to inspect copies of minutes and reports on this agenda as well as the background documents used in the preparation of these reports.

Babysitting/Carers allowances

If you are a resident of the borough and have paid someone to look after your children, an elderly dependant or a dependant with disabilities so that you could attend this meeting, you may claim an allowance from the council. Please collect a claim form at the meeting.

Access

The council is committed to making its meetings accessible. Further details on building access, translation, provision of signers etc for this meeting are on the council's web site: www.southwark.gov.uk or please contact the person below.

Contact

Cheryl Powell on 020 7525 7291 or email: cheryl.powell@southwark.gov.uk

Members of the committee are summoned to attend this meeting

Annie Shepperd
Chief Executive

Date of despatch: May 1st 2009



Scrutiny Sub-Committee B

Wednesday May 13th 2009
7.00 pm
Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

Order of Business

Item No.	Title	Page No.
PART A - OPEN BUSINESS		
1.	APOLOGIES	
2.	NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT	
	In special circumstances, an item of business may be added to an agenda within five clear working days of the meeting.	
3.	DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS	
	Members to declare any personal interests and dispensation in respect of any item of business to be considered at this meeting.	
4.	MINUTES	1 - 8
	To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the open section of the meeting held on Thursday 26 th March 2009.	
	The minutes of the 21 st January to be circulated to Members of the committee in attendance for consideration and approval.	
5.	BUS SERVICES IN SOUTHWARK - CONSULTATION RESPONSES	9 - 14
	To receive a report based on the responses received from a range of consultees	

6. BUS SERVICES IN SOUTHWARK - EVIDENCE GATHERING

Based on a series of questions provided to witnesses, the committee will receive evidence from:

- Members of the public
- Caroline Pidgeon AM;
- Bus operator(s);
- TfL Officers;
- Southwark Council Officers; and
- Community Council Members

7. WORK PROGRAMME

15

To consider the sub-committee's work programme for 2008/2009

DISCUSSION OF ANY OTHER OPEN ITEMS AS NOTIFIED AT THE START OF THE MEETING.

PART B - CLOSED BUSINESS

DISCUSSION OF ANY OTHER CLOSED ITEMS AS NOTIFIED AT THE START OF THE MEETING AND ACCEPTED BY THE CHAIR AS URGENT.

Date: May 13th 2009



SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE B

MINUTES of the meeting of SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE B held on March 26th 2009 at 7:00PM at the Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

**MEMBERS
PRESENT:**

Councillor David Hubber (Chair)
Councillor Althea Smith (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Denise Capstick
Councillor Jenny Jones
Councillor Lorraine Zuleta

**OTHER MEMBERS
PRESENT:**

**OFFICERS
PRESENT:**

Barbara Selby – Head of Transport Planning
Cheryl Powell – Scrutiny Project Manager

ALSO PRESENT:

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jenny Jones.
Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Denise Capstick

NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS AS URGENT

There were none.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

Minutes

The minutes of the 21st January to be circulated to Members of the committee in attendance for consideration and approval.

1. **BUS SERVICES IN SOUTHWARK**

- 1.1 Councillor Hubber reviewed the background literature received to date and highlighted the following:

Way to Go! - London Council's response:

Key issue: reviewing bus route planning – this review should include examining the option for the way in which services are organised including consideration of the idea of a London-wide “grid system” supported by some key radial and orbital routes.

Councillor Hubber stressed the need for Southwark to respond in a way that highlights the lack of orbital routes in the borough, particularly in the Rotherhithe – Camberwell Green conurbation.

Barbara Selby informed the Committee that Southwark's response to Way to Go suggested that routes should be addressed holistically not route by route as is recommended in the consultation.

- 1.2 **Way to Go! - London Council's response:**

Connect Transport and Planning

We strongly support the Mayor's desire to better connect transport and planning. London Councils believes that London needs better integration between its transport and planning policies.

Councillor Hubber suggested Southwark must ensure Transport for London (TfL) provides bus services that are in line with new developments throughout the borough.

- 1.3 **London Borough of Southwark Local Implementation Plan (LiP)**

Southwark would like to see a service provided within the peninsula to the north of the river, particularly the business area of Canary Wharf. In this regard, the Council is disappointed at TfL's decision to remove the route 395 service, which provided a service from Rotherhithe through the Blackwall Tunnel towards Tower Hamlets.

Councillor Hubber stressed the need for members of the committee to lobby TfL into reconsidering the planning of bus routes throughout the Borough. This should include the shortness of routes, for example, the 199 should logically terminate at Bromley. Instead this route terminates at Catford Bus station. It was noted that the shortness of this route coupled with poor frequency and reliability ought to make this a prime example for review by TfL.

- 1.4 **Analytical Hub statistics**

All Members felt the information provided by the Analytical hub was helpful in showing them which parts of the borough experienced low car ownership.

- 1.5 Councillor Zuleta enquired if any passenger surveys were carried to ascertain passenger perception of reliability and frequency of bus routes

Barbara Selby informed Members of the Committee that this is not statutory function carried out by Southwark Council. TfL carry out random sampling on various buses throughout the Capital. The surveys provide TfL with information about passengers journey experience by asking:

- Where the passenger started their journey
- Where the passenger alighted
- The purpose of the passengers journey

- 1.6 Barbara Selby discussed the Members responses submitted to the Sub-Committee, namely the comments submitted by Councillor Ward in connection with the number 42 route.

This route ends in Sunray Avenue and a proposal has been submitted for an extension past Dulwich Hospital and Lordship Lane. This area is very difficult to clear of other vehicles and would make extending the bus routes more difficult. TfL has discussed extending this route to Goosegreen roundabout as part of their business case. To extend to Sainsbury's this would impose a "2 bus" extension. To extend to Goosegreen roundabout would impose a "1 bus" extension. TfL's Business case allows for only a 1 bus extension. In light of this, Southwark Council have explained that the development in the area through a new hospital, library and housing development will ensure more people will be travelling into the area and the route will eventually pay for itself. Although the 42 route is underperforming TfL don't always extend routes of this nature due to the fact that more pressure to perform well is assumed to correct underperformance and unreliability.

- 1.7 Councillor Hubber thanked Barabara Selby for her input and invited her to the Committee's next meeting in May

RESOLVED: The next meeting on the 13th May 2009 will be an evidence gathering session to assist the committee in its deliberations. Witness package to include:

- Caroline Pidgeon AM;
- Valerie Shawcross AM;
- Bus operator(s);
- TfL Officers;
- Sally Crew;
- Barabara Selby; and
- Community Council Members

2. **THE COMMON LETTINGS POLICY**

- 2.1 The Committee have agreed to carry out pre decision scrutiny as this policy will not be received by the Executive until September 2009.

RESOLVED: That the Scrutiny Manager formulate a timetable for the Scrutiny Sub Committee.

3. WORK PROGRAMME

3.1 The Committee agreed the work programme

RESOLVED: To note the report

The meeting closed at 8.11pm



SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE B

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the meeting of the SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE B held on WEDNESDAY JANUARY 21 2009 at 7.00 P.M. at the Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

PRESENT: Councillor David Hubber (Chair)
Councillor Jenny Jones, Anood Al-Samerai, Alison McGovern (Deputising for Paul Bates).

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT Councillors Dora Dixon-Fyle (Chair of Camberwell Community Council), Ian Wingfield (Vice-Chair of Camberwell Community Council), Sandra Rhule (Brunswick Park Ward), Veronica Ward (South Camberwell Ward)

ALSO PRESENT : Poddy Clark – SE5 Forum
Don and Doreen Phillips – Friends of Camberwell Baths

OFFICER SUPPORT: Stan Dubeck – Neighbourhood Renewal Manager
Debbie Gooch – Legal Services
Shelley Burke – Head of Overview and Scrutiny
Sally Masson – Scrutiny Project Manager

APOLOGIES Councillors Lorraine Zuleta, Althea Smith, Paul Bates

NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMED URGENT

There were none

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none

MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on December 3 2008 be agreed as a correct record

1 CAMBERWELL REGENERATION

- 1.1 The Chair thanked the all of the Community Councillors for their help and support over the course of this review.
- 1.2 It was agreed that the report with some minor amendments proceed to the Executive. The Chair re-iterated the need for an action plan which draws together the various streams of work and the sub-committee felt this should figure in the recommendation which looked at Town Planning.
- 1.3 Members discussed the fact that air monitoring sites have been discontinued. The sub-committee felt that these should be re-instated if there was no adequate reason for stopping them.
- 1.4 It was thought that the report should emphasise that Kings College hospital is land locked and is looking for other sites.
- 1.5 The location of the library is seen as less than ideal in relation to the town centre. It is a key facility and should be linked more closely with the town centre. The sub-committee felt that questions of how to obtain funding was now for O&S to comment on.
- 1.6 Councillors reported that young people felt there was a lack of places to go and that the facilities that are currently in place should be reviewed, updating and expanding them where necessary.
- 1.7 Regarding street drinkers, the partnership board was going to look at provision in the area. The sub-committee wanted to recommended to the PCT and other service providers that moving these services should take place. There is a convergence of Drug and Alcohol treatment services in the borough which may assist with the convenience of delivering treatment but has an adverse impact on the immediate community. It was felt that the Executive Member should formally write to the PCT to recommend that services were relocated.
- 1.8 The committee felt that obtaining a list of where all of the treatments services were located would be very helpful in re-organisation of any change and be a useful tool in monitoring where provision is set up in future.
- 1.9 With regard to transport planning, there was still hope that a tube station may come to Camberwell as an extension to the Bakerloo line. It was discussed that Camberwell is still a poor area and that Councillors should press for more transport to come to the area to add benefit to economic growth.
- 1.10 It was also felt that Camberwell would benefit from being a part of the 'Legible London' Scheme as signage in the borough was felt to be very poor.
- 1.11 The Vauxhall bus interchange was said to be problematic because of the location of the bus stands; far from the railway station and each other making it difficult to locate the appropriate stop.
- 1.12 There was a clustering of buses at the bottom of Denmark Hill which led to traffic congestion and congestion on the pavements. It was thought that TFL should look at reorganising those bus stops which should tie in with the bid for a better transport interchange.

- 1.13 People on the Elmington Estate were increasingly frustrated living close to dwellings which have had significant improvement work, whilst their own properties had not been scheduled for any work.
- 1.14 With regard to creating a hub for creative industries, it was acknowledged that there were problems with the economics of sustaining such projects. That Councillors need to continue to push hard to raise awareness of the potential for businesses in the area. It was thought that a specific building could be designated the purpose of combining modern technology ventures with creative start up businesses. The Council needs to start looking for potential opportunities within the town centre.
- 1.15 Members felt there were inadequate signs in the borough. That the streets are dirty and badly maintained. It was thought that it would not be too difficult or costly to deal with this as a matter of urgency. A dirty, unkempt environment will have an effect on people's general perceptions of the area and could have a demoralising effect.
- 1.16 Street maintenance needs to be ongoing with special attention to the unlawful encroachment onto pavements by businesses. Where the pavements are narrow, actions should be taken to stop shops from using the pavement to display their stock.
- 1.17 Cottage Green and Southampton Way need further examination to ascertain what can be done to improve traffic problems.

2 WORK PLAN

- 2.1 The sub – committee examined the proposal to look at bus service operations in Southwark.
- 2.2 It was noted that TFL have a draft business plan which is due for publication shortly. It was also noted that Southwark have 3 GLA Members and as such, this would be a very good time to look at aspects of the bus service and the borough's transport needs.
- 2.3 It was reported that there is going to be a freeze on the bus service despite Southwark's increasing population.
- 2.4 The Mayor has said that there is no demand for orbital routes.
- 2.5 The sub-committee felt that TFL should be looking to extend the shorter bus routes and increase the frequency in services where significantly major areas can link.
- 2.6 Members felt that significant players should be seconded onto the committee and the Chair and Vice-Chair should invite Caroline Pidgeon and Val Shorecross, to take part at committee, mentioning that there is a suppressed demand for orbital routes.

- 2.7 The sub-committee discussed the possibility of involving the local press in the review and including tenants and residents associations along with the community councils.
- 2.8 Other organisations to be approached include: Transport user groups, Service providers (the commissioners of services), David Brown, Head of Service at the GLA and Peter Hendon. It was also agreed that Boris Johnson should be invited to answer questions from the committee.
- 2.9 It was also agreed that a general view of the services be sought from disabilities groups.
- 2.10 All Councillors to submit their views on transport in Southwark.

RESOLVED:

The Chair and Vice-Chair to write to Caroline Pidgeon and Val Shorecross to take part in the review and attend meetings.

Letters to be drafted to transport user groups, transport commissioners and GLA officers.

The meeting closed at 8pm.

CHAIR:

DATED:

Item No.	Classification: Open	Date: May 13 th 2009	Meeting Name: Scrutiny Sub Committee B
Report title:		Bus Services in Southwark - Public Response Report	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:			

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Potential for regeneration in Camberwell	Southwark Town Hall Peckham Road SE5 8UB	Scrutiny Team
Council Assembly – April 8 th 2009 – Agenda papers	Southwark Town Hall Peckham Road SE5 8UB	Lesley John 020 7525 7228
Motion Submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 3.9 (3) – New Bus Route for Dulwich	Southwark Town Hall Peckham Road SE5 8UB	Lesley John 020 7525 7228

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview and Scrutiny	
Report Author	Cheryl Powell, Scrutiny Project Manager	
Version	V1	
Dated	29 th April 2009	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director for Legal and Democratic Services	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Executive Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional/Community Council/Scrutiny Team		

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be noted.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The committee at its last meeting noted that TfL had a draft business plan due for publication and in consequence, this would be a good time to look at aspects of the bus services and the borough's transport needs.

As part of the review's terms of reference, Members will be investigating

- Short routes and how they can be extended;
- Poorly served areas (i.e. route 42 bus and the possibility of its extension into Village, E Dulwich College and S Camberwell wards);
- (Difficult) Orbital Journeys;
- Links with rail and underground routes; and
- Possibility of learning from the Vauxhall Interchange

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Throughout this stage of the Committee's work, members of the public as well as Elected Members submitted their views and perspectives on a range of bus services in operation within the Borough.

The London Borough of Southwark was asked to submit a response to Transport for London's 2010-2011 Bus Service Spring Review Programme. The routes reviewed by TfL and mentioned by members of the public and Elected Members are noted as routes 78, 343 and 484. The submissions from members of the public are as follows

Routes C10, 47, 188¹

The ward councillors for Riverside, Rotherhithe and Surrey Docks would like to convey to TfL a number of points on the C10, 47 and 188 routes so we'd be grateful if you could include them in the borough's response to the stakeholder consultation on this tranche. I think the bottom line on all of these routes is that the population all along them, including in Lewisham and Greenwich, has increased rapidly over the last 3-4 years so capacity is already an issue in peak hours. Also, with the nature of employment in London being so varied, many more people are starting work early. Currently before 7am the service frequency on all these routes is poor. We would ideally like to see an increased frequency on all these routes in peak time, as well as before 7am. We would also like to see TfL take into account future development in planning route capacity and frequency, rather than reacting to developments. For example, a quick look at the Mayor's housing targets for London boroughs and Southwark's planning documents should be enough to realise that our three wards will need more buses up front over the next five years. The increased population is also an issue for the night bus versions of these services.

¹ Part of the TfL 2010-2011 Bus Service Review Programme

Route P5

P5 bus route through my ward is very unreliable and people want more at peak times

Route 12

To go to the heart of the matter, the fundamental problem with the bus services is that each individual bus is on its own putative timetable. The result of this is most of the operational problems that people complain about. If I talk about route 12 it is only because I am most familiar with it. I know that nearly all routes have the same problem. Traffic conditions mean that buses catch up with each other. It is not unusual for five 12's to go up Barry Road in less than five minutes. After a suitable break all five buses come down the road together because they are all trying to catch up with their timetable. The theory of individual timetables is of course that the bus will be in a certain place when the driver's shift finishes. This frequently doesn't happen and so the journeys have to be shortened, giving rise to another of the commonest complaints. At a time when many driver's shifts are finishing it is possible e.g. to stand at the Town Hall stop while three or four 12s are only going as far as Peckham. Occasionally the opposite is true and a particular bus will be on a go-slow because the driver is early and sits for several minutes at each bus stop regardless of whether anyone wants to get on or off – another source of extreme frustration. Recently there have been recorded messages telling passengers that the bus is being held at this stop to even out the running. A few days ago this happened on a bus during the morning rush hour and the driver very quickly moved on rather than be lynched by the passengers on their way to work! This arrangement gives rise then to three of the commonest complaints i.e. bunching followed by a long delay, short journeys and dawdling. Shifts just have to be more flexible – perhaps shorter but with more scope for alteration according to circumstances.

Route P12

Two complaints about this service really - one is the frequency, particularly around school drop off and collection times as the bus serves the very popular St Francis Cabrini Primary School and many local parents prefer to take the bus than to drive, but find the P12 service unreliable and overcrowded. The second complaint is speeding on Ivydale Road -something we have taken up repeatedly with TfL but with no success. I hope that the proposed pinch points for Ivydale Road will resolve this.

Route 42

A proposed re routing to pass Dulwich Hospital and terminate at Sainsbury. Dog Kennel Hill has been sitting with TfL for some time. Sainsbury's has the empty bus stand for the 42 which needs a proper place to terminate with facilities.

The sub-committee should take evidence from Barbara Selby and/or Village ward Councillors about the efforts to get the route 42 bus extended further into Village, East Dulwich and South Camberwell wards. The generally poor bus services in Village and College wards should also be addressed.

Residents in the centre of Nunhead (around Evelina Road) would like to have links from the centre to New Cross in the east and to Dulwich Hospital in the west. It is particularly noted that now Dulwich Hospital is the centre for so many health services the hospital really needs better transport links.

Extending the 42 bus service to East Dulwich Sainsburys

The 42 – very infrequent and often crowded – need to increase frequency both weekdays and weekends.

Route 78²

The 78 route is extremely important as one of only two routes serving the central shopping area (Evelina Road) of Nunhead. It is also highly valued by residents living in the Dundas Road area as it is the only bus coming into that residential area. There are a very large number of elderly and disabled people living in that area as there are a number of sheltered housing units as well as social rented housing purpose built for disabled people. There would be an enormous outcry if the route ceased to serve these residential streets. That said there are significant problems with the route. A particular problem for Nunhead residents is that vehicles are frequently turned around at Peckham Rye and therefore Nunhead residents do not receive the full advertised service frequency - this is clearly picked up in the % kms operated performance stats. The route also suffers from chronic overcrowding in the core section of the route which makes it difficult for residents trying to come home to Nunhead when they are often unable to board the first bus in peak hours. This could be alleviated by providing additional capacity either on the 78 or an alternative route in the core area serving Peckham, Bermondsey and the City. I also note that the vehicles used on this route are very old and are not the greatest capacity single deckers. I would like to see more modern buses on the route and the use of the slightly longer single deckers would also help reduce the overcrowding. There has been a suggestion from some residents that 78 could be extended to New Cross (i.e. continuing up St Mary's Rd, turning right on Queens Rd then down to New Cross). Residents have complained that none of the services through Nunhead provides a quick link up to Queens Rd or New Cross where they can access high frequency rail services and Sainsbury's at New Cross. That said I would not support this proposal if it meant that the 78 ceased to serve the St Mary's Road / Dundas Road area.

The number 78 used to run from Dulwich Plough to Shoreditch but for some years now has run from Nunhead and has been changed to a single decker because of passing under a low bridge – at least that is the explanation given. This service is chronically overcrowded most of the time including in the middle of the morning and afternoon. Sometimes it is like a Japanese train - almost requiring someone on the pavement to push the passengers in. We have made this a campaign issue in Focuses – the route runs along Grange Road – in response to complaints as well as my own experience and the frequency has in theory been increased, although no-one I have spoken to has noticed any difference. If they can't put double deckers on the route, the only answer is to increase the frequency. After about 6 in the evening you have to be prepared to wait 20 minutes and be thankful if it is any fewer.

Admittedly the fact that it goes over Tower Bridge sometimes creates difficulties resulting on occasions a large proportion of the buses being in the same part of the route. This is about the only issue in the ward which in my experience comes anywhere near housing issues. Many people in the newer housing work in the City and this is their obvious route to work.

Route 171

The current 171 bus route could make a short diversion so that it travels north along Southampton Way OR Peckham Hill Street. If the former route is chosen, it could follow the 343 route as far as Wells Way, but then turn left down Albany Rd and right onto the Walworth Road, re-joining its old route. This way we would finally have a

² As footnote 1

means of public transport direct into Central London (the 343, 63 and 363 do not go direct into Central London, the 363 terminates at Elephant & Castle). The number 12 bus would continue to get people from Peckham to Camberwell Green and the Elephant, so there are already other routes covering this short deviation to the existing route. Another option would be for the 171 to go down Peckham Hill Street and turn left along St George's Way (flanking the south side of Burgess Park). It could then re-join the Walworth Rd in the same way (via Wells Way and Albany Rd). It is incredible that no buses currently service St George's Way which is a very long street and has a high density of population. It would pass the bottom of Chandler Way and still be of huge benefit to all our members. This seems like a minimal change that would make a maximum difference to many people's lives.

Route 343³

This bus provides a vital link - this time for people living in the south of Nunhead. That said residents do complaint that the buses frequently speed down Ivydale Road and when these double decker hit the speed bumps it is extremely noisy. On one occasion a 343 crashed into a parked car and residents fear that someone will be hurt. I hope that the proposed pinch points for Ivydale Road will resolve this.

I get a fair few complaints about this service, in terms of timetabling and the bunching of services, poor adherence to safety issues on the part of drivers who seem to think it acceptable to drive at break-neck speeds and a lack of understanding on the part of TfL as to when to timetable services to meet the busiest periods. There seems a surplus of 343s at quiet times and wholly insufficient services at peak hours.

Route 434

Access to Sainsbury's on Dog Kennel Hill is a long walk from bus stops on the hill into the shop if people have mobility problems. I have proposed that the 434 which goes from Camberwell and down to Goose Green and is a small bus goes into Sainsbury's so that more people can get into the store from the top of the hill. Presently only the P13 is using the bus stop provided by the store and this bus does not cover the top of the hill from Camberwell.

Route 484⁴

Nunhead residents have repeatedly asked for this route to actually go into Dog Kennel Hill East Dulwich and use the new bus stand.

General Comments

Another major problem is the culture of drivers. For about 70% of them, I would say, their main aspiration is to avoid a confrontation with anyone at all costs. The only exception generally is with people who are trying to avoid paying when in extremis they will switch the engine off and basically let the other passengers deal with the offender. One or two recent examples will illustrate. Recently on a 78 there were for a short period 7 prams on board. Three were in the space allocated for them or wheelchairs, three were blocking the aisle and one was blocking the door – a situation which was drastically unsatisfactory and indeed dangerous. The last 4 should not have been allowed on. People were climbing over seats to get off. Throughout the driver just gazed straight in front of him as if nothing was happening.

³ As footnote 1

⁴ As footnote 1

Often far too many prams are let on presumably because the drivers don't want a confrontation with the parent pushing the pram. Interestingly, in my experience female drivers are more strict with mothers and prams! Again recently late at night a young couple got on a 12 and immediately plonked their feet on the seats in front of them and started swigging wine from a screw top bottle, passing it between them. This was quite close to the driver who could not have failed to see what was going on. Any moment I expected him to say 'Please take your feet off the seats and put the alcohol away.' A hope which turned out to be vain. On another occasion on a packed bus an older couple were drinking while standing right next to the driver and the front door. They were pouring beer from a large bottle into a plastic cup. The woman was so drunk she could hardly stand up. Once again the driver looked steadfastly in front of him. Do drivers get any guidelines on letting obviously and seriously drunk people on their bus? There are some heroic drivers who do try to control anti-social or dangerous behaviour on their bus but they are few and far between. The tactic of switching the engine off is almost always successful and is only available to the driver. The majority however behave as if their job is to drive a vehicle round a fixed route as if it were empty and have, if possible, nothing to do with those intruders – the passengers. I could say a lot more on this topic but that should suffice.

A constant source of frustration is diversions. Often the first you know about it is when the bus actually turns off its usual route. There is no indication of where the diversion is going to go, how long it will be and no consistency about whether the bus is going to stop during the diversion and how often. Some drivers get very shirty when asked these very understandable questions by passengers – as if they ought to know. Some buses now have this new announcement system which will suddenly say: "This bus is on diversion. Please listen for further announcements." On no occasion have I ever heard any further announcement despite the fact that on many buses now there is a microphone enabling the driver to talk to the passengers without turning round and shouting. Most drivers seem to have a pathological aversion to using it and it obviously hasn't formed part of their training. All drivers should be trained in the use of the microphone – both when to use it and how. On the rare occasions when they do, they sound like prison camp guards e.g. "This bus is now only going to Trafalgar Square. Get off if you want Oxford Circus" Recently I was on a 149 to Liverpool Street and after the stop before the station the driver suddenly turned left and didn't stop again for at least 10 minutes. When he did I had no idea where I was – presumably somewhere in the middle of Hackney. He obviously thought everyone knew there were road works outside the station. This happens in Southwark too. The other day I was on a bus which took one of the frequent diversions around Rye Lane – OK for me because I'm used to it but very confusing for several of the other passengers. Again the driver showed no concern about them.

Scrutiny work programmes 2008/09

<p align="center">Sub-committee A (Ch John Friary, V-Ch Bob Skelly)</p>	<p align="center">Sub-Committee B (Ch David Hubber, V-Ch Althea Smith)</p>	<p align="center">Sub-Committee C (Ch Toby Eckersley, V-Ch Anood Al-Samerai)</p>
<p>Burgess Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how it should look and be used to maximum benefit of the community in future, and how this can be funded/supported - to review the current status of plans for improvements to Burgess Park, in the light of the suspension of the Burgess Park Development Trust initiative; to review how the future of the Park should fit with the regeneration of surrounding residential areas <p>[Long review]</p>	<p>Regeneration and future of Camberwell</p> <p>[Long review]</p>	<p>Freedom Passes 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to scrutinise and review council's handling of the renewal process for freedom passes in 2008, including the delays in completion of the renewal cycle, the provision of information to freedom pass holders and the treatment of those seeking to renew their passes <p>[2 meetings]</p>
<p>Peckham Rye Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - review of the provision and management of sports facilities <p>[One meeting+]</p>	<p>Bus services in Southwark Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to clarify processes for influencing bus services <p>[2 meetings]</p>	<p>Planning enforcement practices and outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in town centres, using Peckham as a case study using issues raised at Nunhead & Peckham Rye Community Council - expectations gap between ward members and enforcement team <p>[Long review]</p>
<p>Southwark's Enterprise and Employment Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to review implementation and effectiveness over the past two years <p>[Short review – depending on officer work already being underway]</p>	<p>Common lettings policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to look at how the lettings policies of RSLs and the Council differ and whether it might be desirable and possible to move towards adopting common policies - possibly to make reference to council responsibility towards non-resident leaseholders and their tenants <p>[One-off roundtable discussion to assess feasibility and focus of more in depth work]</p>	<p>Population and migration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - looking at how Southwark's population is counted; why our calculations differ so much from the government's figures; to examine the effect on our finances and policies of differing population estimates <p>[2 meetings]</p>

DISTRIBUTION LIST**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2008/09****COMMITTEE:** SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE B**NOTE:** Please notify amendments to Scrutiny Team (0207 525 7102)

<u>OPEN</u>	<u>COPIES</u>	<u>OPEN</u>	<u>COPIES</u>
<u>MEMBERS/RESERVES</u>		Libraries	3
Councillor David Hubber (Chair)	1	Local Studies Library	1
Councillor Althea Smith (Vice-Chair)	1	Press	2
Councillor Paul Bates	1	Scrutiny Team SPARES	10
Councillor Denise Capstick	1	Debbi Gooch, Legal Services	1
Councillor Jenny Jones	1	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	1
Councillor Tayo Situ	1	Jim Fitzgerald, Liberal Democrat Political Assistant	1
Councillor Lorraine Zuleta	1	John Bibby, Labour Political Assistant	1
Councillor Anood Al-Samerai [Reserve]	1		
Councillor Mark Glover [Reserve]	1	<u>EXTERNAL</u>	
Councillor Helen Jardine-Brown [Reserve]	1	Jeremy Leach, Living Streets	1
Councillor Alison McGovern [Reserve]	1	Michelle Baharier Project Director of Cooltan Arts	1
<u>OTHER MEMBERS</u>			
Councillor Fiona Colley	1	<u>TRADE UNIONS</u>	
Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle	1	Roy Fielding, GMB/APEX	1
Councillor Ian Wingfield	1	Mick Young, TGWU/ACTS	1
		Euan Cameron, Unison	1
<u>DEPARTMENTAL OFFICERS</u>			
Stan Dubeck, Neighbourhood Renewal Manager		TOTAL HARD COPY DISTRIBUTION	47
Camberwell	1		
Barbara Selby, Head of Transport Planning	1		
Rachel Bannerman, Cleaner, Greener Safer	1		
Michael Carnuccio, Senior Policy Officer for Planning and Regeneration	1		
Jane Bailey, Assistant Director 11-19 Youth Services	1		
Tim Clee, Leisure & Wellbeing	1		
Maurice Soden, Regeneration Initiatives Manager, Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	1		
Fiona Cliffe, Investment Strategy Manager, Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	1		

HARD COPIES OF THIS AGENDA ARE AVAILABLE ON REQUEST FROM THE SCRUTINY TEAM Tel: 0207 525 7102