
London Borough of Hackney
Skills, Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission
Municipal Year 2022/23
Date of Meeting Monday 21 November 2022

Minutes of the proceedings of
the Skills, Economy and
Growth Scrutiny Commission
held at Hackney Town Hall,
Mare Street, London E8 1EA

Chair	Councillor Polly Billington
Councillors in Attendance	Cllr Clare Potter (Vice-Chair), Cllr Gilbert Smyth, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Fliss Premru, Cllr Jessica Webb and Cllr Joe Walker
Apologies:	Cllr Steve Race
Officers In Attendance	Sonia Khan (Head of Policy and Strategic Delivery), Tyler Linton (Group Engineer Sustainable Transport and Engagement) and Dominic West (Lead Officer for Public Transport)
Other People in Attendance	Dylan Beeson (Transport for London), Geoff Hobbs (Transport for London), Alex Smith (London TravelWatch), Claire Walters (Bus Users UK) and Councillor Yvonne Maxwell (Mayoral Advisor for Older People and Carers)
Members of the Public	
Officer Contact:	Tracey Anderson ☎ 020 8356 3312 ✉ tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk

Councillor Polly Billington in the Chair

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
 - 1.1. The Chair opened the meeting with general housekeeping information.
 - 1.2. Apologies for absence from Cllr Race.
 - 1.3. Councillors virtually in attendance:
 - Cllr Lynch
 - 1.4. Guest / Officers virtually in attendance:
 - London TravelWatch - Alex Smith, Head of Campaigns.

2 Urgent Items / Order of Business

2.1 The order of the items was as per the agenda.

3 Declarations of Interest

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4 Changes to Transport for London Bus Network and the London Borough of Hackney

4.1 The Chair opened this item with the following introduction:

4.1.1 Transport for London (TfL) proposed new changes to London's bus network. Over the last 5 years there have been changes to London's bus network which has resulted in bus routes in Hackney being removed and other bus routes being re-routed to alternative destinations.

4.1.2 When there are planned changes to the buses like Transport for London (TfL) is currently planning, it is important to us to we understand what impact they may have on everyone. In addition, many people with disabilities in Hackney rely on the buses for their independence, as a fully accessible and affordable form of public transportation.

4.1.3 With the bus network being a critical part of the public transport system in Hackney. This discussion will consider the bus network in Hackney in light of the proposed changes by TfL to London's bus services.

4.1.4 This discussion is to ensure TfL have explored all avenues to mitigate any negative socio-economic, connectivity, and frequency impacts to Hackney borough's residents, businesses and workers. The Commission wants to have a better understanding about the information used to inform their proposals and is keen to ensure the challenges facing residents are fully understood by TfL.

4.1.5 This item is also informed by information from residents, Councillors and community organizations giving their views and experiences of London's bus service in Hackney.

4.1.6 The Chair advised the Commission is aware the consultation closed early September and that TfL are still in the decision-making process following the consultation. Therefore, TfL will not be able to confirm the outcome of the consultation and the decision.

4.1.7 The Chair welcomed to the meeting from Transport for London Geoff Hobbs, Director of Public Transport Service Planning and Dylan Beeson, Community Partnerships Specialist Local Communities & Partnerships.

4.2 The Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL commenced his presentation and made the following main points:

4.2.1 Recapped on the information requested from the Scrutiny Commission.

- The challenges facing the London Bus Network.
 - Central London Bus Review (some caveats in relation to the information that can be shared)
 - TfL's Equalities Assessment in relation to the proposals
 - TfL Bus Action Plan and how Hackney can help.
- 4.2.2 In relation to the challenges the first challenge is the recovery of the bus network after the pandemic and restoring the level of demand to pre pandemic level. Slide 3 showed the network at the end of September 22 compared to the equivalent day back in 2019 prior to the pandemic. The officer pointed out it was a mixed pattern and that outer London boroughs had higher restoration rates. Some inner London boroughs like Westminster had reached 78%, Kensington and Chelsea at 70% and Hackney was 83% of previous demand levels.
- 4.2.3 In addition, the changes to travel patterns, technology (like this meeting being hybrid) and have reduced the need to travel. There has also been changes to other areas of the transport network providing such as Hackney's overground, Victoria line improvements, Leabridge station etc.
- 4.2.4 Over the medium term there are challenges around bus speeds. TFL are trying to maintain the competitive advantage of the buses relative to all other modes of transport.
- 4.2.5 The next challenge in relation to the above is the consequence of subsidy. Slide 4 showed the cost of running the bus network in relation to the revenue generated from fares and the graphic compared 2019/20 to 2021/22. This showed that the fares revenue had reduced significantly due to the reasons mentioned above. But most notably the costs have remained the same.
- 4.2.6 The Director highlighted that the amount of subsidy needed for the bus network is approximately £1 billion compared to £700 million before the pandemic. Therefore, in conclusion revenue and budgets are a big challenge.
- 4.2.7 The central London bus review (CLBR) being undertaken was demonstrated as a graphic on slide 5. The officer highlighted the changes in the network relevant to Hackney relate to the following: the CLBR proposed changes based around the
- Caledonian Rd corridor (routes 349, 254, 259, 279);
 - Commercial St (routes 242, 15, 135);
 - Essex Rd (4, 56, 236, 476);
 - Euston Rd (24, 88, 205, 214);
 - Fleet St (11, 26, 211, 507)
 - Holloway Rd (271, 21, 234, 263);
 - Isle of Dogs (D7, 100, 135, 277, D3, D8); London Bridge (78, 43, 47, 343, 388).
- 4.2.8 The Director pointed out undertaking the review TfL are proposing changes that will result in the least possible damage to the network.
- 4.2.9 There are 675 routes in London with all different frequencies and vehicles. After considering many options TfL decided on changes to central London

because demand on this section of the network was the most suppressed post pandemic. In addition TfL has been experiencing a fall in the level of demand since 2014.

- 4.2.10 The key areas of changes for Hackney were pointed out to be Old Street and Kingsland Road.
- 4.2.11 The Director from TfL pointed out London has very high frequencies in aggregate, and these would remain even if the proposals go ahead unaltered.
- 4.2.12 In relation to the equalities impact assessment carried out by TfL and the information this provided about the bus network. The Director highlighted the reason they are confident the review considered the routes that would have the least impact is because it should impact the people with protected characteristics the least (as outlined by the Equalities Act). For example, of the routes affected by the proposals in Hackney 4% show disabled users compared to 14% for London residents. 6% are younger people compared to 32% for London. 12% of the passengers make up the Hackney routes compared to 11% of Londoners. *Full details about all the characteristics are available in the report on the website and in the agenda.*
- 4.2.13 In essence the EIA has not identified any adverse impact on people with protected characteristics.
- 4.2.14 In response to the question about if the EqIA takes into the consideration the cumulative impact over the last 5 years. TfL's response was no. The Director explained if they did this over 5 years, they would need to explain the rationale for selecting 5 years as opposed to 7 or 3 etc. The evaluation is based on the current service versus the future. TfL does not look back. If TfL looked back they would need to take into consideration other impacts such as other changes to public transport.
- 4.2.15 In response to the question about the hopper fare for journeys that take longer. The impact of the proposals will increase 0.2% of trips. This is a small impact. In relation to Hackney it was pointed out that little of this would occur in Hackney.
- The average length of a ride is 2.1 miles.
 - Average bus speeds in the AM peak in LB Hackney this financial year is 7.4 mph.
 - That means an average journey within Hackney is taking 17 minutes on a bus.
 - LB Hackney is about 4 miles long.
 - This suggests most bus journeys within Hackney will remain within the hopper cut off time.
- 4.2.16 TfL highlighted the bus action plan outlined all their plans related to safety, security and the customer experience. Considering the impact of the bus network on the environment, connections and journey times. The Director explained there are areas they can work together (Hackney and TfL) and one such area is journey times. TfL highlighted when journey times get worse, they lose passengers. It is fairly axiomatic. Potentially this also impacts on trips from sustainable modes such as walking, cycling and public transport to the car

etc. Therefore, TfL are keen to work with LBH to protect the competitive advantages of the bus network.

- 4.2.17 TfL pointed out over the longer term Hackney's public transport offer has improved. The North London line (London Overground) was introduced 15 years ago and it's the 10th year since phase 2 for the North London line. The Director highlighted that the trains used to run every quarter of the hour now there is one approximately every 6 minutes (10 trains per hour).
- 4.2.18 The Director explained TfL is making progress. The East London line opened in 2010 and has improved from zero trains to 16 trains per hour. The Victoria Line now has 36 trains per hour for morning and evening peak times. Leabridge station is now step free access and a few other stations have had these improvements too.
- 4.2.19 Compared to other London boroughs Hackney's share of sustainable transport modes (cycling, walking and public transport) is 86%. This figure has increased over the last decade (since 2012) from 81%. This would indicate that the changes being made across the whole transport network is making a difference.
- 4.3 The Chair welcomed to the meeting from London TravelWatch (LTW) Alex Smith, Head of Campaigns. The Head of Campaigns commenced her presentation and made the main points below.
- 4.3.1 Buses in London have the highest use by Londoners than any other mode of public transport. Buses are the backbone of how people move around the city. Buses are the most accessible, affordable and city-wide way to travel.
- 4.3.2 From their research London TravelWatch found that bus passengers tend to be on lower incomes, people of colour, women or young people. These groups are likely to be the hardest hit to any cuts or changes to bus services. Along side disabled people and older people who rely on buses for their day to day activities.
- 4.3.3 London TravelWatch submitted their concerns about the proposed changes to the bus services. LTW highlighted that the changes will impact 78 routes across 23 boroughs. This also includes the withdrawal of some services completely and will affect everyone.
- 4.3.4 LTW do accept that funding conditions do mean that TfL needs to make significant financial savings. However it is important that this is done in a way that minimizes the disruption to people travelling around London; does not disadvantage people who cannot afford alternative options and should not stop people from making their journey all together.
- 4.3.5 There were 3 key issues London TravelWatch raised in relation to the current proposals.
- **Interchanges** – they found there would be 93,000-day bus journeys that would involve a change of bus where it does not currently. This might also increase to 2 or 3 times for some journeys. This is also likely to increase journey times which could potentially put some people off from traveling at all or as frequently. A reduction in the quality of the

journey experience for passengers with more waiting at bus stops etc. further compounded by whether there is a countdown screen or seating at the bus stop. This is vital for older people and disabled people.

- **Accessibility** –LTW pointed out that if the interchange is not at the same bus stop although the bus may be seen as accessible the journey may not be for some people. Pointing out that street furniture or no drop kerb could make the journey inaccessible. These things can put people off from traveling. Therefore, their request to TfL is if a change is implemented or required TfL should make sure they occur at the same bus stop. LTW also pointed out these changes could result in less capacity on certain routes. Reducing priority seating and wheelchair and pushchairs access.
 - **Safety** – particularly for night bus. If there are less frequent buses and more journeys that require a change it is not just about inconvenience but a real safety issue too. For example, if a passenger has just missed your bus and then have to wait 30 minutes in the cold and dark potentially this is of real concern for people if they travel alone. From LTW research nearly half of women cited not travelling at certain times because they do not feel safe. The request from LTW is for TfL to abandon their night bus proposals completely.

4.3.6 Thinking about the big picture LTW pointed out that bus journey times are getting slower. This could be due to a lack of road space for bus prioritization on the streets. This could make peoples journey times slower.

4.3.7 The key is to make sure that buses remain an attractive and viable options for most people.

4.3.8 If the Mayor of London wishes to meet the target for of 80% of journeys in London being made by cycling, walking and public transport. This will require a 40% increase in bus use.

4.3.9 In relation to Hackney this borough does not have access to the tube network, although it has benefited from the expansion of the overground network. Therefore, the borough is very reliant on the bus network. LTW highlighted that the 2018 bus cuts in Hackney led to some of the issues highlighted above particularly the areas of concern outlined in point 4.3.5.

4.4 The Chair welcomed to the meeting from Bus Users UK Claire Walters, Chief Executive. The Chief Executive (CE) pointed out she was also appointed Cabinet Officer for Disability and Access Ambassador for bus and coach. This role involves working on behalf of passengers not for the Cabinet Office. The CE commenced her presentation and made the following main points below.

4.4.1 The Chief Executive from Bus Users UK explained Bus Users UK represents users wider than London but has a key role in accessibility and inclusivity for transport.

4.4.2 Bus Users UK expressed concerned when they read the proposals because a lot of users tell them how difficult it is when change occurs. The CEO pointed out if a person is suffering from a particular barrier to your accessible transport, it becomes harder to manage changes. If a person has a learning disability, they often have to learn their route over a long period of time. Therefore, any

disruption i.e., a broken-down bus or traffic lights not working can causes stress. This is not just irritation or frustration it is actual fear. This can lead to a lack of confidence in people to trust the journey. Bus User UK pointed out confidence is a very undervalued concept when it comes to travel.

- 4.4.3 Bus Users UK agreed with LTW's concerns about changing bus stops. Changing a vehicle mid journey is hard and annoying but if you also have pains with movement or if you are not well sighted, this all gets very stressful. Therefore, the concept of getting off and finding another bus stop will require talking to people to find out where to go. Also, if you are digitally excluded then the barriers start to increase, and this can lead to people thinking 'why bother' and if there is an option not to go they will not go. The CE pointed out life for this cohort then gets smaller and their personal life becomes more confined. Therefore, the person's aspirations evaporate (like going out for a walk, a ride and going on visits) and taking part in the standard activities of life becomes more challenging.
- 4.4.4 Professor Marmot's research showed that social isolation was more harmful to your health. It was pointed out that a disabled person was more likely to be unemployed than a non-disabled person.
- 4.4.5 Referring to deprivation indices, the CE from Bus Users UK pointed out for Hackney in every ward there are 3-4 thousand people who are income deprived and in every ward approximately a thousand people are job deprived. The CE noted there is a lot of people in Hackney alone that depend on buses as a reliable way of getting around.
- 4.4.6 It was acknowledged that London has a good transport system in comparison to a lot of other places however it is not perfect. The CE commented if you have a system that works and then you change it there needs to be an expectation that this will be very hard for people to accept who do not have alternative options.
- 4.4.7 It was highlighted that 16% of Hackney's population is digitally deprived (no access to a smart phone or the internet); and that policy is often viewed from the prospective of middle-class people who have a debit card or bank account and the means to have an oyster card.
- 4.4.8 The Bus Users UK commented in their view the consultation was insufficient because it was largely digital. Although they recognized TfL held focus groups in their view these people were likely to be people who can get out and about. They were unlikely to represent the whole community.
- 4.4.9 Bus Users UK urged TfL to reconsider the proposals before they change the journey for numerous people who do not have alternative options for travel. Their plea to TfL was not to have more than one change in a journey otherwise it becomes extremely difficult.
- 4.4.10 Bus Users UK strongly recommended that TfL ensure bus drivers are trained to stop at bus stops appropriately and close to the kerb for people to board and dismount the bus. It was highlighted that this becomes a challenge for parents with a pushchair or wheelchair too. Particularly when the bus is too far from the pavement to step onto the bus.

- 4.4.11 Bus Users UK also suggested that TfL stop using electric ramps on buses too. It was pointed out that the electric ramps breakdown all the time and nearly all bus companies outside of London have reverted to manual ramps because they always work.
- 4.5 The Chair welcomed to the meeting from London Borough of Hackney's Mayoral Adviser for older people and carers, Cllr Yvonne Maxwell, Lead Officer for Public Transport, Dominic West and Head of Policy and Strategic Delivery, Sonia Khan.
- 4.5.1 The Lead Officer for Public Transport commenced the presentation and made the main points below.
- 4.5.2 Buses are an essential mode share in Hackney and Hackney has a highest mode share of bus users in all London Boroughs at 22.6%. Hackney is still at the top of the table reflecting the fact that buses are the main mode of transport. Although residents do have access to tube stations it is on the periphery of the borough.
- 4.5.3 As Bus Users UK have pointed out the elderly and less ambulant are reliant on the buses. This is particularly the case in Hackney.
- 4.5.4 The bus network in Hackney has already had cuts to the bus network serving the borough. The previous changes have been:
- 308 re-routed away from Leyton ASDA to Stratford
 - D6 cut back to Ash Grove
 - 277 cut back from Highbury & Islington to Dalston
 - 242 withdrawn between St Paul's and Liverpool Street
 - 48 withdrawn completely
 - Frequency cuts on over 50% of Hackney's bus network including night buses in just over 3 years.
- 4.5.5 In addition, to the proposals TfL announced route simplification on the following routes:
- Route 21 withdrawn from Southgate Road and diverted up the 271 route to Newington Green
 - Route 56 missing out Barts Hospital
 - Route 135 withdrawn from Old Street and its divert via the 242 route
 - Route 236 withdrawn between Homerton and Hackney Wick. Leaving only the 276.
 - Route 242 replaced by 135. But there is still the question mark over if it will serve Liverpool Street. This is the destination Hackney residents wants to travel to rather than Aldgate.
 - Route 349 withdrawn.
- 4.5.6 The Lead Officer for Public Transport from LBH pointed out that interchanges need to be convenient and sheltered.
- 4.5.7 One of the strongest comments from residents and users was about the loss of the 277 to Highbury and Islington. Pointing out this is still a big issue in Hackney.

- 4.5.8 The officer highlighted that the only interchange for the 277 bus (coming off the bus from Highbury and Islington) is on Dalston Lane. The picture in the presentation showed that this bus stop had no shelter, so when the weather was bad there was no place to wait, a congested pavement and it was not a nice place to wait at night. The officer informed this was an example of a poor interchange in Hackney.
- 4.5.9 Hackney Council urged TfL to think about the passengers. Hackney cited examples of good and bad changes.
- Good being a 24-hour bus lane along the A10 is seen as a good example whereas
 - Bad being the temporary removal of the bus stop at Old Street for works to the roundabout (also pointed out in the Commission's focus group with residents). Has resulted in a very long gap between the stop outside Argos on Old Street to the next stop at Great Eastern Street.
- 4.5.10 Another example cited was a row of buses sitting in the bus lane outside Ash Grove Garage while the drivers change shifts. Leaving a lot of frustrated passengers on the buses.
- 4.5.11 Hackney Council said they are promoting the bus and extending the operating hours of the bus lanes in the borough, putting in bus filters and low traffic neighbourhoods.
- 4.5.12 Hackney Council said 87% of trips in the borough are made by walking, cycling or public transport. Hackney has London's highest cycling rate, 48 school streets and 16 low traffic neighbourhoods.
- 4.5.13 Hackney Council informed TfL they would like to see more zero emission buses in the borough. Currently the Council pointed out there are only 2 zero emission bus routes running through the centre of Hackney and 2 on the periphery.
- 4.6 The Head of Policy and Strategic Delivery from LBH continued the presentation and made the main points below.
- 4.6.1 Hackney adopted an Ageing Well Strategy in 2020 and public transport is a key part of that strategy to support people to age well.
- 4.6.2 The key rationale for presenting the views of older people to the Commission is because good transportation is about helping people to age well and become an age friendly city.
- 4.6.3 Hackney highlighted national research shows the benefits (social, economic and healthier lives) that can come from having a good bus network.
- 4.6.4 This presentation is about demonstrating the impact of bus changes for older people. If bus routes change then older people cannot be supported to age well.

- 4.6.5 The over 65s portion of the population in Hackney is growing and are more likely to be deprived and not drive. Hackney wants to continue to be an age friendly borough where people can come live, feel connected and stay. Bus routes are key to achieving this.
- 4.6.6 Bus journeys should not just be seen from the perspective of “the commute”. If this is the view, then the assumptions will be based around home working.
- 4.6.7 Older people cannot carry out their activities remotely e.g., going to the doctors, socializing and taking exercise.
- 4.6.8 For older people buses are more accessible than trains and should not be seen as an alternative even if it does have step free access.
- 4.6.9 For older people who do want to connect with the tube at Highbury and Islington, Manor House and Finsbury Park. This is more challenging, and they are already having to change buses to get a tube.
- 4.6.10 Car ownership in the borough is low and Hackney Council wants to keep it this way (34% compared with 57% in Greater London).
- 4.6.11 Some of the insight from older people showed that there is a risk that car ownership could increase if they are faced with a broken journey or inaccessible trains. A car or cab may feel like a better option if people can afford it.
- 4.6.12 As highlighted previously many older people cannot afford to pay for other transport options. This may restrict them from doing activities.
- 4.6.13 The issues raised have been:
- Difficult for anyone with buggy, small children or mobility issues or someone with a lot of essential shopping
 - New bus not always at the same bus stop - sometimes involves crossing roads
 - Waiting at a bus stop after dark can make you feel more at risk - not all changeover stops are obvious “hubs”
 - Having to walk a longer distance in the dark
 - Adds to journey time
 - Can be cold / wet
 - Buses are more crowded or don’t stop.
- 4.6.14 Other insight collated through the Ageing Well Strategy was that older people would like an ongoing voice with bus franchises. This is an ask for TfL.
- 4.6.15 Life has changed and the idea behind off peak and on peak is different. Older people would like the time restriction on freedom passes removed.
- 4.6.16 The prioritizing of bus lanes is key because buses need to keep moving.
- 4.6.17 The insight about older people was collated from the following sources:
- The commissions recent survey.
 - The Ageing Well Strategy (co-produced)

- Hackney's Older Citizen Committee which has a membership of 40 people who have provided testimonies and engaged.
- 4.6.18 The Mayoral Adviser for older people and carers added for older people who do have cars the council would like this cohort to use them less. Therefore accessible, safe, and affordable public transport will be key.
- 4.6.19 If older people cannot use buses or their cars they are unlikely to be getting on bikes as an alternative mode. We need to be realistic if we want to reduce car use and encourage public transport use.
- 4.6.20 There needs to be a wider discussion about public transport and buses that includes consideration about seats, shelters at bus stops, drivers wait for older people and those that are less mobile to sit down; so they do not go flying. The issues related to these proposals are not just about the number of buses operating. Training for bus drivers and raising awareness on passenger comfort and access is needed to allow people time to get off the bus.
- 4.6.21 Also, the issue of multiple buses piling up at the bus stop and stopping a long way from the bus stop. This leaves older people wondering if the bus is going to come to the stop and some people unable to move fast enough to catch the bus. This warrants a wider conversation with older people and buses.
- 4.6.22 Hackney's Older Citizens Committee is keen to look at these wider issues and have conversations with TfL. The request to TfL is to hold a wider conversation with the committee, TfL and Hackney officers to consider their needs.
- 4.6.23 If people cannot go out easily and get a bus that is near (it becomes difficult) or they have to change buses. They are not going to go out and this will have a huge impact on their health and wellbeing. The routes going through residential streets can be critical for older people. Taking older people close to home and shops.

The Chair summarized that the range of presentations at the meeting outlined the challenges faced by TfL, the challenges, opportunities and potential solutions and some of the big barriers and issues around bus use in the borough for everybody. To ultimately make the bus network operate effectively for everyone.

4.7 Questions, Answers, Discussion and Comments

(i) **Members asked TfL the following questions:**

- a) **From the presentations its clear that older people and people with mobility issues will find it difficult to do interchanges. What work has been done to look at the impact for people with mobility issues?**
- b) **Has there been detailed analysis carried out to identify the types of journeys people take and the places they go (e.g. hospitals, big supermarkets etc.) to minimize the changes on what is perceived as essential journeys?**
- c) **On page 104 of the EIA it makes reference to the equality impact on older people and disabled people stating new direct journey opportunities with new links provided on 29 bus routes. Could you provide details of the positive impacts for journeys in Hackney.**

Monday 21 November 2022

In response the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL explained the problem they are trying to solve is one that is well known. TfL has a large financial challenge. TfL's network is facing reduced revenue so the question was how can they reduce costs with the least impactful outcome. The routes put forward in the proposals were deliberately picked with the criteria being that the impact on people with protected characteristics would be lower than average. Across London 14% of passengers have a disability. For these proposed changes TfL highlighted they will impact 3% of passengers with that characteristic. The Director highlighted that the website contains further reports with more detailed information about the nature of the adverse impacts and describes how the current and proposed network will cope with the changes. TfL have tried to ensure for nearly every occasion they have a same stop interchange.

The Chair asked for clarification of the percentage of interchanges at the same stop?

In response the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL advised its approximately 90% but this would need to be clarified.

The Chair asked for clarification that in terms of what the Bus User Group and other stakeholders are asking for in relation to interchanges was captured in 90% of the route changes?

In response the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL confirmed that was correct.

The Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL informed that they consider if the quality of the interchange is appropriate or not e.g., seating, lighting, shelter etc. Again, they have found that most of the interchanges are appropriate. In the reports TfL outline what they can do to provide quality interchange where it is lacking. The Director highlighted that sometimes it's possible sometimes it's not.

The Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL also explained the funding agreement for the budget between the Government and TfL was subject to cost saving requirements.

The Director informed the Commission that TfL could have chosen to reduce frequency on all London bus routes equally but the impact of this would have been worse paradoxically because there is a large minority of people who interchange bus to bus. The Director explained if you reduce frequency it impacts on the waiting time for interchange and the quality of the interchange gets much worse. Feedback from the consultation highlighted that a key factor was how long they have to wait at the second bus stop. Therefore, TfL decided to withdrawn routes but keep frequencies high to protect the large minority of people that do make bus to bus interchange.

TfL is aware that maintaining the quality of interchanges is important, so they do not lose a disproportionate number of passengers. Therefore, losing passengers would impact on their ability to achieving the target of financial stability as required by the Government for their funding agreement.

Monday 21 November 2022

In response to the question about the EIA and examples the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL highlighted the number 26 bus currently goes to Waterloo and the reason they are diverting it to Victoria, is because they currently have a number of bus already going over Waterloo bridge than there are passengers. Currently there are 90 buses per hour equating to a bus every 45 seconds. This is also providing, providing a new opportunity to travel direct to Victoria.

A second example cited was the merger of the 242 and 135 bus routes. There will be a direct link along Commercial Road into Docklands as a result. These are a couple of examples of the new links implied by the proposals. However, it was recognized and acknowledged that some other links have been broken.

Studying the feedback and analyzing the suggestions TfL is looking at how they can minimize and reduce it further.

- (ii) Members referred to the presentations about older people and the impacts and asked if TfL did an impact assessment for health and social staff that rely on the buses to get around the borough to see residents at their home? Members wanted to know if TfL consulted with the wider health and social care organizations notable North East London Integrated Care System about the impact. Members highlighted that there is push for more care to be delivered to people in their homes which means this workforce will be reliant on public transport to travel around the borough to see residents. Members commented this cohort of people did should not be forgotten when TfL are considering their proposals.**
- (iii) Members referred to accessibility and affordability in relation to the withdrawal of some bus routes. Members referred to the withdrawal of the 242 route and acknowledged the report outlined some mitigations by extending the 135. Members pointed out these routes are vital routes that go into the City of London. Hackney has many residents in lower income jobs such as cleaners, security etc who rely on these bus routes specifically the night bus. Member commented this could have a big impact on people's lives in terms of getting to work at 2 or 3am.**
- (iv) Referring to TfL's presentation about the big improvements to the transport network in Hackney. Members pointed out many residents cannot afford to use alternative modes of transport. Members asked what has been done to take this into consideration to ensure that the bus routes that remain are accessible to the most vulnerable residents in the borough?**
- (v) Members referred to the dual cost of living and climate change crisis and asked how TfL will ensure the cuts and changes for many will not result in a change from a single bus route to multiple routes and delays. The council has pledged to increase demand for bus travel to 40% sustainable travel. How will TfL's plans fit with the borough's low traffic neighbourhoods and the aim of making it easy for people to make the modal shift from cars?**
- (vi) Members referred to passenger numbers and the aim to increase sustainable travel to 40% by 2041. It was mentioned that in 2018 there**

Monday 21 November 2022

was a previous round of bus cuts and Members asked if TfL had looked at the impact this had on passenger numbers and if there was modelling on the current proposals to identify the impact on passenger numbers too?

In response to the question about health and social care staff the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL informed not a single metre of road currently served by buses in Hackney will be missed in the future. There will also still be quite high frequency levels on all the main affected corridors e.g. Baring Street will have 23 bus per hour instead of 21. Kingsland Road will have 24 instead of 25 and Old Street will have 27 instead of 30 (every 2 mins). A very dense network on every single road that is currently covered will remain.

In response to if they consulted with the health and social care sector the Director confirmed the short answer is yes. They sent out thousands of letters and emails to stakeholders of all types including the health and social care sectors. TfL received thousands of responses London wide.

In response to the question about accessibility and affordability the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL explained there is no change in the proposal that will affect fares. Bus fares have been subject to a fare freeze and are lower now than they have been. As noted earlier there will remain a very high connectivity.

The Director confirmed there are no changes in the proposals that will cut night bus frequencies. The report sets out how they will maintain night bus frequencies for this part of London and other areas. TfL will be maintaining the relationship between night bus numbers and day bus numbers.

In response to the question about meeting the targets on increasing bus users, active travel and climate change, the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL informed the rate of recovery post covid is slowest for morning peak times. But this is when the most buses run and its not sensible to run more buses than needed. This means for the main corridors they are running more capacity than needed resulting in more carbon emissions than necessary. After looking at the main corridors and usage TfL noted that the capacity provided is multiple to the usage. In essence TfL are currently running more capacity than they need even if they returned to 2019 levels at the busiest time of day, at the busiest direction and parts of the route. The Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL pointed out there is no virtue in environmental terms. Therefore, these proposals allow them to find savings as required and reduce emissions.

In response to the question about the impact on TfL's revenue the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL informed if frequency was reduced then journey times become longer. And if journey times get longer i.e. 10% increase in journey time. This would result in a 6% loss in usage. The Director pointed out the aim was to reduce frequencies where the impact on aggregate frequencies is relatively low because the increase in journey times would be least impactful for Old Street. The proposals would mean moving from having a bus every 2 minutes to 2 minutes and 10 seconds. This is how TfL demonstrated the adverse impact was minimized for users and travel experience.

- (vii) **As a follow up to the response Members pointed out for many people it was less about getting from Stoke Newington to Dalston and more about getting from their house to their grandchild's school and back via football etc. The Members highlighted these connections are key and important. The high level frequencies on Kingsland Road become less relevant than can I get off with a pushchair somewhere safe and can I get there. Members asked will that reliability still be there for pick up times and so forth.**
- (viii) **Members asked the following questions:**
- a) **It TfL's modelling took into consideration constraints like finances?**
 - b) **If TfL held data about how people used the infrastructure**
 - c) **Have TfL factored in the end points of those journeys? This is beyond the big knowns to make sure you are really meeting the needs in people's lives.**
 - d) **Members explained as Councillors residents tell them, "I cannot get my child to x school so I do not want them to go there". Members highlighted how much disruption this is for the child and several generations of the family. Members asked how does TfL manage that when you are looking at a strategic solution for the whole of London whilst balancing individual people's journeys.**

In response the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL explained TfL has been careful to try to keep the bus network on as many metres of road as is currently. Keeping virtually the same level of connectivity as there is now.

In relation to the reliability of the network. Consideration is given to network design so that TfL do not have routes that are so long they become difficult to manage. This is taken into account, and they try to maintain this.

In relation to their data, they collate. TfL do not just collate data about the running of buses but also on average bus speeds, variability in the speed's hour by hour, day by day and week on week. TfL have noted some big swings particular during covid as traffic levels have changed. There is also the aspect of day-to-day operational management for the service. The Director explained there are staff in bus garages monitoring bus travel on maps to ensure they are evenly spaced out. This is the biggest single area in relation to reliability and this aspect will not be affected by these proposals. The network is expected to be simpler and will allow TfL to concentrate resource on higher frequency routes. Because getting those into even intervals will be easier with high frequency routes than with a very complex network of low frequency routes. The expectation is the networks should be neutral at worst or slightly positive at best.

- (ix) **Members expressed concern about the 93,000 day bus journeys that will involve a change of bus as noted in the London TravelWatch report. Members commented there are people who try to memorize bus journeys and this volume of changes will be very critical.**
- (x) **Members referred to the 675 routes in London and highlighted these proposals will impact 78 bus routes across 23 boroughs. Members**

pointed out TfL propose to withdraw 22 routes altogether and 5 of these routes are in Hackney. Members commented this appears to be disproportionate across the 23 boroughs.

- (xi) **Members referred to the hopper fare and highlighted TfL reported it will affect 0.2% of trips but little of this will occur in Hackney as the average journey is 2.1 miles. However 60% of people in Hackney travel outside of the borough.**

In response the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL replied for the 93,000 extra interchanges already 19% of journeys in and around central London involve a bus interchange. This will increase to 24%. The Director reiterated TfL's aim is the find the least impactful level of changes. The other way TfL could have found savings would be via frequency reductions across the whole network. But the impact of this would be greater (19%) for people who already have an interchange.

- (xii) **The Chair commented the Commission is trying to get a sense of the downsides to the proposals from TfL and pointed out at this point in the discussion this appears to predominantly be interchanges and the shorten of routes. This is increasing the number of changes for people.**

In response the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL informed the downsides is more interchange required and longer waiting times.

- (xiii) **The Chair asked London TravelWatch and Bus User UK to comment in the context of the above points and the type of mitigations they think TfL need to implement.**

In response the Chief Executive from Bus Users UK advised for 1 in 5 or a quarter this not great. However, the CE did appreciate that TfL needed to make some changes. But CE urged TfL to recognize that these are real people with real lives and having such changes to their lives is not a small matter. These changes will mean learning a new route. For most people this will not be an issue but for the people who cannot cope with changes like a bus driver not accepting you have tapped on the previous bus or missing your connection they will give up after a while and will not go to college or the training centre or that job interview. This is because they cannot work it out or it just doesn't work because 30 people got on the bus and you cannot.

The Chief Executive added that the planning required for this is appreciated; but it does not feel like it takes into consideration the human aspect / cost to the people at the bottom using the service that require more support. They are not the big earners.

The Chief Executive from Bus Users UK also made referenced to the statement about high frequency of buses down Kingsland Road. The CE pointed out that people are not starting and finishing in the same place. Therefore, the idea that all the buses will be available and that all people will come at the same time to catch a bus every 45 seconds is not realistic or a true representation of the true travel experience.

Monday 21 November 2022

The CE pointed out that people working as cleaners and young people work in entry level jobs like McDonalds and need to start work at ridiculous times in the mornings. These groups are not being catered for and may not be living in accessible places. The CE did not suggest any solution but wanted to highlight that the changes proposed may not be as low an impact as TfL thinks in terms of the actual people affected.

In response the Head of Campaigns from London TravelWatch advised although the increase is up to 24%, although this may not seem large, when you look at the detail for certain routes this figure might be higher. For example the bus route 135 will result in 23% of the current bus journeys requiring a change in the future (nearly 3000 daily journeys). For the 205 this will be 26% requiring a change in the future (6000 daily journeys). As pointed out these are people with real lives not a statistic. In reference to multiple changes on the 205 (depending on where they start or end their journey) this could require up to 3 changes. This might put a lot of people off travelling at all.

TfL advised journey times could increase by up to 36 minutes for some passengers. How will this affect people who may not be able to make the journey using an alternative mode of public transport. In addition to how this impacts the hopper fare. LTW highlighted that previously a person may have been able to make the journey within 1 hour. Now depending on how long the gap is in between buses this might put passengers outside of the 60-minute window. So, although the bus fare has not increased this could mean passengers will be paying more. There is a need to protect lower income people particularly in this cost-of-living crisis.

LTW referred to disabled people and their ability to make changes to their journey. LTW agreed with the points made by Bus Users UK about accessibility, digital exclusion and people who having low confidence traveling now the journey they know has changed. Many people are still building up their confidence post pandemic and it is vital to make sure they are supported to continue to build up their confidence.

The impact it can have on an individual should not be underestimated and making sure the bus stop has a shelter and seating for adverse weather conditions and a countdown screen will give people certainty of when the bus will be coming. If the interchange cannot be at the same bus stop LTW urged TfL to consider if the other bus stop was accessible i.e. having dropped kerbs where necessary.

TfL have a mentoring scheme and LTW asked if this is something they can expand or raise awareness about to help people build up their confidence where changes must be made.

- (xiv) **Members thanked the residents for participating in the recent survey and focus group run by the scrutiny commission about the proposed changes to capture their views about the proposals.**
- (xv) **Members pointed out that residents in the focus group talked about their experience but one point that was quite stark was how many were unaware of the proposed changes. Members highlighted that the points made previously in the discussion about digital exclusion and the**

consultation being relatively short came across from the limited knowledge among residents in the focus group about the proposals. The residents also did not feel they had the opportunity to feed in their individual concerns. Members asked if TfL had received any comments about the consultation being insufficient and if they thought they had reached people sufficiently?

- (xvi) **Members highlighted from the survey residents in the north of the borough the feedback requested for an additional direct bus service between Golders Green and Stamford Hill. Members asked if additional capacity would be considered to give a new direct route that serves Hackney residents better.**

In response the Community Partnerships Specialist from TfL explained in relation to the consultation TfL recognized the human factor within the additional interchanges and that these were still proposals. A decision has not been taken or a commitment made at this stage. However, TfL has committed, as part of the implementation, to looking at providing better customer experience for interchanges at bus stops and shelters. This can mean new bus shelters particularly in areas where they have identified the interchange might be highest. This could be new pedestrian crossings. A reviews of the street design and layout. This could be work carried out in conjunction with boroughs to consider how they can make the interchange better for all groups.

In the consultation they also committed to new training for bus drivers with a specialist provider to provide better assistance to people who need it most. Drivers not waiting for people to sit down has been mentioned a lot to TfL and this is one of the key things they would look at in the new training for drivers.

In terms of digital exclusion compared to the previous consultation TfL carried out by TfL in 2018 the response rate for this consultation was 6 fold higher. However, TfL acknowledged it is a challenge, but they have tried to get the message out about the changes to the public. TfL want to hear from seldom heard communities.

In relation to the consultation responses they provided alternatives to the website and digital. TfL provided a dedicated phone line that could make call backs. They had a freepost address for people to fill in a paper response. TfL put a lot to effort into making alternative options available for people to engage with the consultation.

The officer offered to provide details of all the channels TfL made available to capture and engage the public.

The Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL added they also made extra efforts to advertise the consultation using posters in glass displays at relevant bus stops and triangle displays at major bus stops and bus stations. TfL put out advertisements in the press, radio, the evening television, disability magazines and held a number of face to face meetings. The face to face meetings were slow and the turnout was not that high but they carried this out before and during the 10 week consultation period.

The response rate was 21,500 this was a highly response rate compared to previous consultations.

(xvii) Members made the following comments

- a) They hoped the public's response and experiences would be reflected in the final proposals when they were published.**
- b) There was a clear indication that the loss of bus services has driven people into cab services or staying at home. This may end up with more people relying on other people rather than having independence.**
- c) In relation to the hopper fare and interchanges causing delays. Members heard from residents' strong views about their experiences on bus services following the previous cuts implemented in Hackney and they were very concerned about the new proposals.**
- d) Many were finding that the hopper fare did not cover their costs because the interchanges had meant delays to their journey.**
- e) There was a lack of awareness about the consultation among the low income residents.**
- f) Members were pleased the response rate was high for the consultation but highlighted that this would be judged by whether the responses make a difference to the final proposals.**

In response the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL highlighted looking back at the history of bus consultations nearly all have resulted in changes.

In the discussion the Lead Officer for Public Transport from LBH provided a response to Members questions about the night bus network in Hackney. The officer informed the Council is keen to maintain a night bus network. The officer pointed out the biggest users of night buses were not drunken people on a Friday night they are workers in the service sector. These workers are mainly in the city in low paid jobs. Although TfL has outlined correctly that the morning peak has seen a decrease compared to 2019 they are seeing an increase in the early morning peak (before 7am). Passengers' numbers have increased and continue to steadily increase in Hackney.

Despite there being no cuts to night bus services in this consultation. In the last 2 years there have been changes to night bus routes in Hackney where frequencies have reduced to every 20-30 minutes. The people who relied on those buses may have switched to the cab service or changed jobs / shifts. This is something that needs to be reviewed.

On the issue of interchanges, the planned interchange compared to the actual interchange is different. The officer pointed out a journey from A-B may not have needed an interchange but halfway through the journey they might have to change if the bus is running late and passengers are asked to exit the bus. Late running buses are on the increase. This was picked up in the SEG focus group with resident that lived in the Kings Park area and shop at Walthamstow Central. The officer highlighted that previously residents had access to the 48 bus but as the 55 bus runs from Leytonstone the interchange is the Bakers Arms. Now the journey to Walthamstow from Leabridge Road takes an extra 5-10 minutes there and back. This is making residents think twice about using the bus. Hackney Council urged TfL to consider how the

planners run the service compared to how they planned for the service to run in their proposals. Currently these are not marrying up. The council asked TfL to discuss this with the service providers they commission.

The Lead Officer for Public Transport from LBH pointed out that people change their habits according to bus route. As mentioned earlier there has been a cut to the 308 bus going to Asda. The officer highlighted that there are not many other supermarket options around Hackney. Whereas a lot of people from Enfield and Edmonton travel to Ridley Road Market in Hackney because it is a quick and cheap journey. This has added to the number of people using the Kingsland Road corridor. It was noted that not many people want to do their shopping at Stratford City because there are a limited number of budget shops in that location.

The key message from Hackney Council is they have a good knowledge about their resident's needs and where they want to go. It would be helpful if Hackney Council could feed this information into TfL's service planning process. This input covers the views of councillors and residents and in their view would help to shape the network to meet the needs of Hackney residents.

The Chief Executive from Bus Users UK added training for drivers has been in legislation since 2013 covering disability awareness training but not assistance training. Training was previously covered by EU legislation (although compliance with this was very low). Training was transferred into regulations for bus and coach in 2019 but assistance training is not covered. This is a big gap but there is regulation to cover this.

The Head of Policy and Strategic Delivery from LBH commented in justifying decisions it is not enough to say that no group is impacted more than another. In assessing the equality impact organizations need to start from the position that groups are not on a level playing field and consider which groups are more disadvantaged already and which groups are likely to be more disadvantaged by the proposals. The officer pointed out this work cannot be just a statistical exercise it also needs to be linked to the lived experience of residents. For instances the people who have benefited from hybrid working (paid professionals) who now can work from home will be least impacted by the changes to peak hours. There are other groups that need to go to work to care for other people or need to be out for other reasons as noted in my presentation that will be impacted. Understanding the impacts will help identify the mitigations needed that would help a person with a learning disability, dementia or a person who finds a change in a dark place the most off putting.

- (xviii) **Members commented that social isolation has an economic impact on our community. This can make people's lives worse and therefore is a further cost to the State. This also reduces their ability to be active and engaged in the economy.**
- (xix) **Members asked if there was an economic impact assessment of the risks around a person's ability to be economically active because of the changes. Members pointed out that transport is about connectivity not only with our loved ones but also supporting people to be thriving economic individuals. Therefore, the Commission was keen to understand what kind of assessment had been done on the economic**

impact of reducing connectivity and the mitigations that would be put in place for work and opportunities.

In response the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL explained the proposals do not provide a loss of connectivity. The Director reiterated not a meter of road in Hackney served by a bus now will not continue to be served by a bus in the future under these proposals.

- (xx) **Following the response, the Chair highlighted if for an example a person is attending a job interview and the interchange meant that they attended late. And this was found to be a regular occurrence not just for the interview but to attend work. This was an economic impact not just for the individual but also for the economy.**

In response the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL confirmed there is nothing in the proposals that will make the bus service less reliable than it is now. It is a daily challenge to make the service reliable and hence they have talked about things that can be done to make it better such as bus lanes, junctions, and signal timing reviews etc. TfL would like to have a core network where they do increase frequencies particularly in the early mornings as noted by Hackney officers thus achieving a minimum level of frequency across the day. The Director explained this is more about the peaks when the working professionals are working from home and using the bus less and very little to do with off peak and night buses. The aim is to protect the economy and the worst thing TfL could do is to cut a whole bus route unmitigated. Especially to places which are isolated and have poor level of accessibility to all public transport.

In respect of co-production the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL there is an officer within the team who works with the Lead Officer Public Transport from LBH.

- (xxi) **Members referred to the lived experience of people and the cost of living crisis and highlighted that the presentation made reference that 0.2% of journeys would be impacted by some of the changes. However, in conversation with residents it was clear that they really rely on the hopper fare because it becomes affordable for them to do longer journeys on the bus. Members also highlighted that TfL mentioned that the downside to the changes would be more interchanges and longer waiting times. This could have a real impact on the journey time if you are making several bus trips to get to your destination. The Members asked how the two corresponded particularly in relation to affordability when people are really struggling.**
- (xxii) **Members made reference to the discussion covering the demand and slower bus speed. Members asked if there will be further work with Hackney Council to increase the speed of bus travel?**
- (xxiii) **Members highlighted the Council will be discussing a motion called 'cash welcome here'. This is because for some people the digital divide was increasing hardship and accepting cash is the option to ensure they are not excluded. Members asked with these unprecedented times of hardship can TfL consider re instating cash so people are not excluded?**

In response the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL confirmed the statistic stated earlier was that 0.2% of journeys would tip over the threshold. The insight behind this is that the average journey length is 3km (2 miles), this is quite short. Although they recognize buses do not go fast and within the 3 kilometers there is a big variation. A small proportion of journeys are long but there are some that go over the threshold already and will continue to. The Director acknowledged that there will be 93,000 more interchanges and this will mean there is a slightly greater probability of going over the 60 minute threshold.

In response to the question about slower bus speed. The Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL confirmed it is a real problem. This featured before in 2015-2017. There are a number of ways to mitigate this but it is also a challenging area to address. This can be affected by things like parking and loading. A lot of this can be mitigated by creating bus priorities at either junctions, traffic lights, bus lanes etc. TfL has changed a large proportion of the bus lanes to 24 hours. But it only takes one car to park in a bus lane to render the bus lane useless.

The Director highlighted there are a number terms and conditions in their funding agreement. One such condition is making provision for 25 kilometers more bus lanes in 2025. TfL are currently reviewing where the bus lanes can be implemented. The Director stated that his team should be in contact with the Council to get their views and ideas too. Highlighting these will be new bus lanes not improved bus lanes. The Director encouraged the council's involvement with this confirmed this would be a 10% increase.

In response to the question about reversing cash fares the Director of Public Transport Service Planning from TfL advised this would be hard to implement and this would add extra time to journeys. It was unlikely that TfL would reverse this policy decision would be attractive to TfL.

(xxiv) The Chair asked all guests to provide their final closing comments.

The Chief Executive from Bus Users UK made the following points.

- In 2014 TfL did a consultation about going cashless on buses. The consultation feedback was 61% against but TfL proceeded with it anyway. Therefore, it is not surprising that people may not bother to send in responses to the consultation. Although TfL have discarded all the infrastructure for cash it is really important to start thinking about ways in which people can pay for a fare particularly for people who do not have an oystercard or a debit card. TfL could consider having retailers hold tickets to give people with the fare on it. This will keep people traveling using the cash they have available and maintain TfL's infrastructure.
- In reference to smart technology and digital exclusion 35% of over 65s do not have access to a smartphone or smart cash. They are completely excluded from free fares or special offers. If TfL want people to know about changes TfL should put notices on the bus not just bus stops. As changes are made get staff to remind people of it because people will not remember.

The Head of Campaigns from London TravelWatch made the following points.

Monday 21 November 2022

- London TravelWatch agreed with the Bus Users UK points about digital exclusion and were in the process of conducting some research on this and the impact it has on people travelling.
- It was encouraging to hear about plans for bus prioritization and this is welcomed.
- It is not only important to have the bus priority infrastructure but also a good service too. Therefore, LTW would call on TfL to reconsider the cuts particularly for night buses and people travelling home after working till 3am.
- Consider longer journeys and the impact this can have on hopper fare and to consider extending the hopper fare.
- Improve bus stop facilities and accessibility for interchanges.
- Although it is stated that it will impact a small percentage of people. For this small percentage it could be a very important part of their finances.

The Mayoral Adviser for older people and carers from LBH made the following points.

- The changes will impact on climate change and older people.
- In relation to inequality and diversity the Mayoral Adviser was concerned about how they are looking at older people and people on low incomes. The Mayoral Adviser urged TfL to take into consideration that some older people will be doing cleaning jobs that start early in the morning (because they cannot afford to retire).
- The view is Hackney will be disproportionately impacted because our residents do not have easy access to tubes and rely heavily on the bus network.

(xxv) **The Chair made the closing remarks below.**

- **It is recognized that London is well served for buses in comparison to the rest of the country. However, this means the rest of the country needs to be better served rather than London spiraling to the level of other place.**
- **London has an integrated public transports system for a reason. This system underpins our economic strengths as well as showcases some of our greatest inequalities.**
- **The Chair urged TfL decision makers to do all they can to ensure London's bus network remains the jewel of this city.**
- **Hackney's residents rely on buses so much because they are a really good way to get around and not just an alternative method of transport.**

In summing up then discussion the Chair highlighted some recommendations from the Commission to TfL were likely to cover the following areas:

- **What they would like to see when TfL are making decisions like these in the future.**
- **What they would like to see TfL prioritize when it comes to decision making about buses serving in Hackney**
 - **Exploring co-design further with Hackney so that when TfL is thinking about route changes they consider affordability and connectivity. Hackney is keen to ensure the proposals will meets the needs of the community now and in the future.**

5 Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Minutes from the previous meeting held on 20th June 2022 were agreed.

5.2 Minutes from the previous meeting held on 18th July 2022 were agreed.

RESOLVED	Minutes for the meetings held on 20 th June 2022 and 18 th July 2022 were approved.
-----------------	---

5.3 The Chair outlined the action updates as noted on pages 111 – 112 of the agenda.

5.4 In relation to the matters arising update Cllr Smyth highlighted that the action request was asking the Council to explore finding an alternative to glass that is not single use plastic and is reusable.

The Chair suggested this is added as a suggestion for the work program to explore further with officers.

6 Skills, Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission Work Programme 2022/23

6.1 Chair referred to the papers in the agenda on pages 37-50 for the work program.

6.2 The Chair pointed out following the death of the Monarch the scrutiny commission's meeting was cancelled. This meeting has been rescheduled for 25th April 2023. The discussion items scheduled for the September meeting date have been moved to the 14th December 2022.

6.3 As noted in the work program on pages 37-50. The discussion item on 9th January 2023 will cover library services.

Members queried if the discussion about libraries should be in December 2022 as this was a live topic of discussion.

The Chair explained the timescale for discussion was agreed with officers and they wanted to have this item post consultation with staff and when the decision making was complete.

6.4 The Chair referred to Cllr Smyth's point raised under 5.4 about sustainability and licensing and suggested the Commission considers if they want to add this as a discussion item to the work program.

7 Any Other Business

7.1 None.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 9.10 pm