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It does not matter where you are; bus lanes seem to be everywhere. We see them whether we are in a car, on a bus, a bike or on foot. When I was appointed chairman of this specialist panel I thought it would be fairly dry and very technical looking dispassionately at facts and figures. However once we had started I was surprised to learn how passionately people felt about them, views that ranged across the whole spectrum of opinion.

We soon realised that while bus lanes have a vital role to play in helping us all move about the area they are just part of the solution in our busy urban environment. However, what came across very strongly was the considerable degree of inconsistency and lack of understanding about bus lanes. What we have tried to achieve is to propose how to bring a much greater transparency and consistency into the bus lane infrastructure.

I would like to thank everyone who contributed to the panel, particularly our co-opted members who represented key external influences. I would also like to thank the public for all their valuable contributions and the officers for all their support to our work. Finally I would especially like to thank TfL for all the work they put into helping the panel and allowing us to visit CentreComm and the LTCC.

Councillor Dawn Larmouth, Chairman of the Bus Lanes Specialist Scrutiny Panel
INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee, at its meeting of 19th May 2007, proposed the establishment of a Bus Lanes Specialist Panel. This was agreed at the Council meeting of 15th May 2007. The Panel held its first meeting on 27th June 2007.

1.2 The Council's Corporate Plan, reflecting the Community Strategy, in its “Key commitments for future years, 2008-2010 “ includes the statement “Review all bus lanes in the borough with a view to standardised bus lane operating across the borough and abolish 24 hour or Sunday operating”. The panel worked on the basis that they would be able to make recommendations to drive this commitment forward.

1.3 Bus Lanes in London were first introduced in the late 1960s to protect buses from traffic congestion. There are over 1,100 bus lanes in London with 90% of them operating to ten common periods though the other 10% have a further 60 variations in operating times.

1.4 There are 38 Bus Lanes in Ealing with ten different operating periods. Nearly half (18) of the bus lanes are along the Uxbridge road and if you drive along the whole of the road located in Ealing you would find six different operating periods along the route.

1.5 Four Co-optees joined the panel’s nine councillors. The co-optees represented the Association of British Drivers, Ealing Cycling Campaign, Ealing Passenger Transport Users Group and TfL (Stakeholder Engagement). In addition all panel meetings were attended by officers from the Bus priority Network Team at TfL.

1.6 Expert Witnesses who presented to the panel included representatives from The Fire Service, London TravelWatch, The Police, and St John’s Ambulance,

1.7 Visits and other external engagement activities were a key part of the panel’s work. Members made individual observations on bus lanes, as pedestrians, motorists or passengers. Some members visited the Ealing CCTV bus control room, the TfL emergency control room and the London Traffic Control Centre. They also visited Greenford bus depot to talk with bus drivers. Two area committees were visited to encourage members and the public to give their views.

1.8 Resident’s and Councillors Comments were solicited through press releases, articles in “Around Ealing” the council’s website and mailings to all members. Over sixty members of the public responded giving well over 100 comments with 75 comments received from Councillors and put before the panel.

1.9 Acknowledging diversity was a key consideration for the panel. The members themselves represented the whole borough through gender, race
and geography. The panel balanced out the interests of road users by having co-optees (see para 1.5) who represented the whole spectrum of use. The wide use of different media to solicit views ensured everyone in the borough had a chance to participate.
2. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Emerging Themes

Panel members spent the early part of their work looking in detail at bus lanes in Ealing through reports, comments, observations and visits. Over the meetings a number of clear themes emerged both in relation to distinct aspects of examining bus lanes and two overarching themes. The panel also commented on a number of current projects where work was sufficiently developed for the panel to make an input. This is described in the diagram below. The section following gives details of these.
2.2 **Model for Bus Lane Review or Installation**

Members concluded that one of the difficulties in reviewing bus lanes was the absence of clear and coherent criteria. There was no evidence that a transparent model existed; one which set out the criteria by which to consider a proposal for a bus lane. Members therefore felt that they could not confidently recommend that any particular bus lane be removed neither could they feel certain that any new ones should be installed.

The model should be clearly set out and include:

- Current Bus flows / frequency
- Current Congestion / delays
- Current flows of all other traffic
- Width of road
- Width of relevant junctions
- Other road characteristics such as loading and parking pressures
- Other lanes in vicinity
- Consultation with the relevant transport operators
- Consultation with the emergency services
- Safety and accident statistics
- Judgement on improved bus journey times
- Judgement on effect on other road users
- A clear date for an evidenced based review after 18 months

**R1.** A clear framework must be produced and publicised outlining clear and consistent procedures for the installation and review of bus lanes

**R2.**

No existing bus lanes will be removed or new lanes introduced until there is a clear framework in place.

2.3 **Projects Already in Planning Stage**

2.3.1 **Ruslip Road, Northolt Proposed Lane**

In light of their views at point 2.2 above members felt that the planned proposals for a bus lane in the Ruislip road, Northolt / should be delayed until justification for the proposed scheme could be demonstrated in relation to the newly developed model. It would also be a useful test of the suitability of the model.
2.3.2 **Good for Greenford Project**

Members had discussed and welcomed the “Good for Greenford” project which is currently being developed and consulted upon. It was noted that the timing of the project would enable the bus lane elements of the scheme to be put through the newly developed framework.

**R3.**

A bus lane should **not** be introduced in Ruislip Road, Northolt at the present time.

---

2.4 **Bus Lane Lengths**

When the panel started their work they thought that they would be able to come up with a firm view on bus lane lengths. This aspect of the subject did not raise much public comment (around 5% of comments). The panel concluded that lengths were generally “about right” though there were potentially some issues specifically around junctions dealt with elsewhere in this report (para 2.7)

**R4.**

There is no current requirement to alter the length of any borough bus lanes though this might not be the case once reviews have taken place.

---

2.5 **Bus Lane Reviews**

The panel looked extensively at all the bus lanes in the borough. During the course of the panel there were special meetings on Acton and Greenford lanes, informed by visits from the chairman and vice-chairman to the relevant area committees. There was also a special meeting on Bus Lanes in the W5 area and draft consultants reports were received on “The Northolt Bus Lanes Experimental Hours”, “The Southall 120 Route” and on “Key Junctions on the Uxbridge Road”.

However there was a strong feeling that until the model, as mentioned in Para 2.2 was developed there was no purpose in carrying out reviews. Nevertheless it was agreed that once such a model had been devised all lanes should be evaluated by the model.

**R5.**

That all bus lanes should be reviewed once the framework is established with a clear timetable for the reviews.
Members recognised that a programme of reviews would take some time to carry out thoroughly. They also recognised that individual reviews could often be done most effectively while an area is being studied for other traffic or regeneration projects. However members identified two areas that should be given the highest priority for a review.

The work around the 120 bus route along with the strength of feelings from both members and the public indicated to the panel that priority for a review should be given to the lane in South Road in Southall. During the discussion members felt strongly that the flowerbed in the road only served to hinder traffic flows. A TfL representative in attendance agreed to ask their consultants to remodel traffic flows in the area on the assumption that the flowerbed was removed.

The other bus lane that had given rise to a number of concerns was that in the Ruslip road leading up to Greenford. Given the developments with the “Good for Greenford” project it was felt that this was the other review priority.

R6.
The South Road, Southall and Ruslip Road Greenford Bus lanes be the first for review.

The Northolt bus lanes, consisting of lanes in Church Road, Mandeville Road, Petts Hill and Yeading Lane had an experimental change to the operating times. The panel looked at the consultants draft findings. From these it was clear that the change in hours did not have a real effect on journey times. Where there were differences, it was suggested that these could well be due to other factors rather than the change in operational times.

It was also clear that the Target Roundabout was one of the key factors contributing to congestion, particularly in peak periods. It was therefore felt by panel members that the current (experimental) operational times should be made permanent with weekend operation abolished and only peak hour operation in the week. These hours should align with the adopted pattern for “other “ bus lanes in the borough. The panel also stressed that urgent attention must be given to easing congestion at the Target Roundabout.

R7.
That Cabinet are asked to note that the current experimental hours operating in the Northolt bus lanes have not had an adverse effect on traffic flows. Cabinet are asked to make permanent no weekend operation of the bus lanes. For weekdays they should follow the pattern for “other” bus lanes in the Borough of only operating at peak times.
R8.
That Cabinet are asked, as a matter of urgency, to work with TfL and investigate and implement improvements to the Target Roundabout in 2008/09.

2.6 Operating Hours and their Consistency

“My view would be to keep all bus lanes and make them all 24 hour 7 days a week.”
Resident

“I would like to see bus lanes with uniform times only in the Borough and these times clearly signposted.”
Resident

“I would like an end to ALL bus lanes. I have found that since their advent, traffic has got slower, with councils using infractions as an invisible tax.”
Resident

“Generally some standardisation of bus lane timings would be very welcome”.
Councillor

When asked about 24 hour bus lanes, all bus drivers, without exception said that they weren’t necessary. Some added that after 8.00 pm, bus lanes were not necessary and that more consistent times would be well received.
Report of discussion at bus garage

Operating hours and consistency are the key elements of bus lanes. Members were clear that bus lanes should be considered within a clear and consistent framework.
2.6.1 Operating Hours.

Members were interested to find that views on the hours varied from those who wanted more bus lanes (all in constant operation), against those who wanted them completely abolished. Members rejected both these extreme views. The main argument in favour concerned simplicity of understanding; this, members felt, could be dealt with in other ways. Members recommended that there be no 24 hour bus lanes in the borough.

R9.
There should be no 24 hour bus lanes anywhere in Ealing.

The panel also recommended other changes to the operating times shown below (R10 & R11).

2.6.2 24 Hour Enforcement

The panel observed that no 24 hour lane in Ealing was enforced and suggested that if their recommendations for changes to hours were rejected then enforcement should take place. They noted that to carry out overnight enforcement of 24 hour bus lanes would cost around an extra £120k p.a.

2.6.3 Consistency of Times

Members found the current plethora of operating times hard to justify. Over 10% of all comments received concerned this and there was much comment on how this was confusing and not necessarily readily understood, not just by the many people who drive through Ealing, but also by residents.

Members concluded that consistency was an extremely important principle as one needed to look further afield than just one stretch of road and look at the road system as a whole.

Nevertheless members understood that one consistent set of operating times would not be appropriate for the whole borough.

The Uxbridge Road plays a crucial role in West London traffic movements and consequently should be treated differently from other roads in the borough. It was therefore proposed that there be one consistent model for the Uxbridge Road and one for all other lanes in the Borough.

Therefore for the Uxbridge Road members proposed that Cabinet consider a simpler model with all day operation during the day time in town centres and peak hours only on the other parts of the road. This would include the removal of all 24 hour operating. Members thought that, given the changing nature of working patterns that a finishing time of 20.00 hours be adopted as the universal time for bus lane operation.
R10.  
Uxbridge Road- Acton, Ealing & Southall town centres to be 7.00-20.00 on weekdays and 10.00-18.00 at weekends  
The other parts of the Uxbridge Road to be 7.00-10.00 and 16.00-20.00 on weekdays and 10.00-18.00 at weekends.

Other Bus Lanes. For other lanes in the borough members considered that the peak hours only model was appropriate. The key driver in members’ thinking was that this should be consistently applied across all the lanes. There was some debate as to whether any lanes should operate at weekends. Members recognised that they could not be universally prescriptive and that in some areas weekend operation might be appropriate.

R11.  
All bus lanes in the borough (except those on the Uxbridge Road) to operate 7.00-10.00 and 16.00-20.00 Monday to Fridays. 10.00-18.00 at weekends can be applied in some key areas if justified by the framework.

2.7  Junctions

Safety and layout issues were the most common cause of concern and comment\(^1\) from residents and members. Junctions were of most concern. Junctions play a significant role in traffic flow; when linked with a bus lane ingenious traffic management is required to maximise benefits for all users. It was clear that there were stronger feelings about some junctions than others and a clear priority list of junctions to be reviewed emerged. It was noted that some junction reviews do not always pay particular attention to any bus lanes in the vicinity. Members recommended that all current and future junction reviews should include the operation of the relevant bus lanes.

R12.  
That priority be given to reviewing the operation of the following junctions:  
a) Lido junction – Uxbridge Road / Northfield Avenue  
b) Askew Road, Old oak Common lane / Uxbridge Road  
c) Church Road /Uxbridge road.  
The reviews must include the length and operation of bus lanes in the immediate proximity of a junction.

\(^1\) Nearly half of all comments related to “Safety and Layout”
2.8 Crossing Lanes

The other major issue relating to safety and layout concerned crossing bus lanes. This is particularly problematic when crossing one to do a left turn. Motorists are unclear when they are permitted to enter the lane to turn; similarly the enforcement of such offences appears to be a matter of judgement as to what is a reasonable distance before the turning. Members felt that the key aspect was of clarity of enforcement. The panel strongly felt that there should be clear and unambiguous markings to allow this. The panel commended this marking on the north side of the Uxbridge Road near the junction with Twyford Avenue.

![Figure 1- Bus Lane marking to permit a left turn](image)

R13. That alterations to signage and/or road markings should be considered, to enable drivers to cross bus lanes safely. The alterations should adopt a standard form throughout the borough. The panel recommends the arrow format.

These alterations may include the adjustment of bus lane lengths close to busy junctions.
2.9 Signage

“My major problem with bus lanes is the signage. The signs are not clear and I often have to stop to look at the signs to see if I can drive in the lanes”

Resident

While consistency of hours of operation is highly desirable, there was also much concern over the signs indicating the hours of operation. Many motorists felt that they were not able to read the signs in time to take the appropriate action and consequently avoided driving in bus lanes at all times. Others complained of being penalised having driven in lanes at the wrong time. These problems are exacerbated by the impression that the signs are not the same throughout the Borough even for the same operating times. Members and residents also suggested that some form of electronic signs could be utilised or at least piloted. It was suggested that the Northolt bus lanes be used as a pilot area.

R14.
That bus lane signage should be clear and consistent throughout the borough. The largest permissible type of sign and lettering should be used – consistent with Department for Transport regulations. Times should not use the 24 hour clock.

R15.
That a pilot study be implemented of electronic signs indicating whether or not a bus lane is in operation and that the Northolt bus lanes be selected for this study. TfL should be approached to see if they will fund such a pilot as part of their studies into electronic signs.

2.10 Cycling

Cycling is a useful, healthy and non-polluting way of travelling around the area. Cyclists enjoy the use of bus lanes as a way of having a safer and faster journey. The recommendations to make all lanes finish at 20.00 would, if implemented, cater for the trend towards later homebound cycling trips and help the safety of bus lanes for cyclists. However these benefits are reduced when vehicles are parked in bus lanes. Where cyclists suffer is when a bus lane ends and they have to re enter the main traffic stream and have to avoid kerbside parking. Comments
on enforcement of illegal parking are shown below.

2.11 Enforcement

While much of the work of the panel concentrated on traffic movement the issue of (illegal) parking in the lanes was of great concern both to cyclists—where this negates the safety aspects of the lane and for bus drivers who get delayed or have to pull out into traffic. Members felt that parking infringements should be enforced rigidly as appropriate to the regulations governing each particular stretch of road. It was felt that Southall and West Ealing should be looked at as a matter of priority.

R16.
More rigorous enforcement using all methods available to the council, during hours of operation should be carried out and where there are points where parking is restricting free movement all measures available to the council should be considered.

The priority areas to look at should be

Southall
West Ealing
Hanwell

2.12 Motorcycling in Bus Lanes

Motorcyclists are not permitted to drive in bus lanes unless an exception has been made for a particular stretch of road. There is much debate on this topic even within the motorcycling fraternity. There are a few such experimental conditions in London, but none in Ealing. TfL are monitoring this experiment and at some point will be asking boroughs for their views. When this happens the Transport and Environment Standing Scrutiny Panel should be asked for their views before a response is given to TfL.

R17.
That officers investigate the facts and conditions for allowing motorcycles to use a borough bus lane on an 18 month trial basis.

2.13 Extending Consistency Without the Borough

Road users cross borough boundaries frequently. Members felt that once Ealing has created a simpler and consistent approach this could be extended across the
Borough boundaries particularly on the Uxbridge Road and in Northolt. Members therefore recommended that officers and the portfolio holder should initiate discussion with their neighbouring counterparts to see if they would fall into line with the new Ealing Model.

R18.
That officers, once the new operating hours are in place, instigate discussions with officers in Hillingdon and Hammersmith & Fulham to persuade them to change the operating hours of their bus lanes to ensure a uniform approach throughout the length of these key roads.

2.14 **Involving Scrutiny in Progress of the Recommendations.**

The recommendations contained within this report are linked to each other. If accepted the first stage is for a model for review and implementation of bus lanes to be drawn up. The Transport and Environment Standing Scrutiny Panel should consider this at an early stage. Once the model is finalised and agreed by Cabinet the panel should be involved in pre-decision scrutiny of any reviews of bus lanes or a decision to implement a new bus lane, with particular attention paid to the application of the model. The panel will also monitor the implementation of all the recommendations as they arise.
3. KEY LEARNING POINTS

Members had enjoyed their time on the panel and considered their key learning points to be:

- They found it "very useful" to get out and about both doing visits and carrying out observations
- They enjoyed talking about real practical actionable topics
- Having a major partner (in this case TfL) actively involved with the panel meant that members could test out their views with experts.
- Publicising a relevant topic enabled good participation from Ealing residents
4. MEMBERSHIP AND ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel Member</th>
<th>Maximum possible</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Apologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Dawn Larmouth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Allott</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Costello</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Dheer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Gupta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Mahfouz</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Noori</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Marie Randall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Rosa Popham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gashion (Ealing Passenger Transport Users Group)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hemsley (Association of British Drivers)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Mynors (Ealing Cycling Campaign)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Shirley (Transport for London)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ashok Banerjee from the NorthWest Bus Priority Team at TfL attended every meeting and contributed fully to each one. London TravelWatch and the Hillingdon Motorists Forum were also in attendance at most meetings.
5. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

All panel reports and minutes can be found at


All details of evidence shown to the panel have been consolidated in one document


Further Information

For further information please contact Keith Fraser, Head of Scrutiny,
Tel: 0208 825 7497 fraserk@ealing.gov.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ref</strong></th>
<th><strong>PANEL RECOMMENDATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>SERVICE OFFICER COMMENTS</strong> (including any resource and legal implications)</th>
<th><strong>Cabinet Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| R1 | A clear framework must be produced and publicised outlining clear and consistent procedures for the installation and review of bus lanes | If TfL do not have a framework in suitable form, there could be financial implications for collating, consulting on and publishing appropriate documentation.  

In summary the approach includes: Each junction with a proposed approach bus lane should be computer modelled using standard procedures (Transyt or Linsig). The process involves collecting data on existing traffic volumes and junction throughputs of traffic and then modelling them with the proposed bus lane included. The result is a direct comparison of ‘before’ and ‘after’ in terms of queue lengths, delay to traffic and degree of saturation of the junction. This can be tested for various options including changes to signal timings. This data can be presented in summary tabulated form so that the effect of the bus lane and any other scenarios can be seen.  

Of course the location of the setback is a derivative of this modelling such that the same number of vehicles should pass through the junction at each green phase, the only difference being that the bus is brought up to the rear of the queue, so that it gets through as well.  

In addition before and after bus journey time data needs to be collected to ensure the bus lane is giving journey time benefits to buses.  

TfL have always made it clear that if a bus lane is not functioning correctly in terms of benefits to buses or causing unnecessary delay to general traffic they will pay to amend it or remove it. | That officers liaise with TfL on availability of a framework in suitable form. If fails, officers to forward a costed proposal for which a budgeted would need to be found |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>PANEL RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>SERVICE OFFICER COMMENTS (including any resource and legal implications)</th>
<th>Cabinet Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| R2  | No existing bus lanes will be removed or new lanes introduced until there is a clear framework in place. | OK but see comments for R3  
No financial implications.  
However consultation has taken place on new bus lanes in Greenford Town Centre where these meet the assessment criteria recommended for R1 and where these form part of an integral package of transport measures designed to facilitate regeneration of the town centre. These proposed bus lanes would not take any existing road space, being created by moving parking and loading facilities into inset bays, nor would they have any adverse effect on the traffic throughput of the main Greenford Road junction. These assurances are backed up by extensive computer modelling. Cabinet has approved the Greenford proposals. | If it is agreed to develop such a framework, in the interim, Cabinet needs to reserve the right to decide on schemes on merits of the case. |
| R3  | A bus lane should not be introduced in Ruislip Road, Northolt at the present time. | The proposed Ruislip Road bus lane is included as a proposed study in 2008/9. Further design and evaluation work on this proposal will be needed before a future decision.  
No financial implications if the bus lane is not pursued. | Accepted |
| R4  | There is no current requirement to alter the length of any borough bus lanes though this might not be the case once reviews have taken place. | OK  
No financial implications. | Accepted |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>PANEL RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>SERVICE OFFICER COMMENTS (including any resource and legal implications)</th>
<th>Cabinet Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>That all bus lanes should be reviewed once the framework is established with a clear timetable for the reviews.</td>
<td>OK, subject to funding. There is uncertainty as to whether TfL funding would be available for modelling but the Council is proposing to bid in June round of funding submissions to TfL for 09/10. If accepted would be funded by TfL.</td>
<td>Accepted, subject to funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>The South Road, Southall, and Ruslip Road Greenford Bus lanes be the first for review.</td>
<td>The South Road review should be done as an add-on to the Route 120 Bus Priority review previously reported to the Panel and to Southall Area Committee. If accepted would be funded by existing budgets for these projects. No funding allocated for review of Greenford bus lanes, but bid to TfL planned for 2009/10.</td>
<td>Accepted, subject to funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>That Cabinet are asked to note that the current experimental hours operating in the Northolt bus lanes have not had an adverse effect on traffic flows. Cabinet are asked to make permanent no weekend operation of the bus lanes. For weekdays they should follow the pattern for “other” bus lanes in the Borough of only operating at peak times.</td>
<td>See comment in R11. The TMO's will cost approximately £1,000 and a further £1,000-£1,500 for advertising them. The costs will be met by existing budget.</td>
<td>Subject to separate report to Cabinet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>PANEL RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>SERVICE OFFICER COMMENTS (including any resource and legal implications)</td>
<td>Cabinet Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>That Cabinet are asked, as a matter of urgency, to work with TfL and investigate and implement improvements to the Target Roundabout in 2008/09.</td>
<td>Consultants to TfL have produced a draft report on options. If accepted would be funded by TfL.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>There should be no 24 hour bus lanes anywhere in Ealing.</td>
<td>Accept. Changes to signs and associated costs would need to be built into future budgets, unless part of the review process agreed with TfL. On defined strategic routes (e.g. Uxbridge Road) consideration would need to be given to obtaining “network assurance” from TfL.</td>
<td>Accepted, subject to finance and network assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Uxbridge Road- Acton, Ealing &amp; Southall town centres to be 7.00-20.00 on weekdays and 10.00-18.00 at weekends. The other parts of the Uxbridge road to be 7.00-10.00 and 16.00-20.00 on weekdays and 10.00-18.00 at weekends.</td>
<td>It reflects the key times when bus services can be unreliable. Changes to signs and associated costs would need to be built into future Council budgets. On defined strategic routes (e.g. Uxbridge Road) consideration would need to be given to obtaining “network assurance” from TfL.</td>
<td>Accepted, subject to finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>PANEL RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>SERVICE OFFICER COMMENTS (including any resource and legal implications)</td>
<td>Cabinet Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11.</td>
<td>All bus lanes in the borough (except those on the Uxbridge Road) to operate 7.00-10.00 and 16.00-20.00 Monday to Fridays. 10.00-18.00 at weekends can be applied in some key areas if justified by the framework.</td>
<td>Changes to signs and associated costs would need to be built into future budgets.</td>
<td>Accepted, subject to finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R12 | that priority be given to reviewing the operation of the following junctions:  
  a) Lido junction – Uxbridge Road / Northfield Avenue  
  b) Askew Road. Old Oak Common Road / Uxbridge Road  
  c) Church road / Uxbridge Road  
  The reviews must include the length of bus lanes in the immediate proximity of a junction. | As a rule of thumb, bus lane reviews at junctions cost from about £5,000 upwards per junction depending on the complexity of the traffic movements, number of surveys required, options to be tested etc. There is no existing budget for these but it is possible that TfL would provide the funding and the Council proposes to bid for funding in 09/10 | Accepted, subject to funding |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>PANEL RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>SERVICE OFFICER COMMENTS (including any resource and legal implications)</th>
<th>Cabinet Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R13</td>
<td>That alterations to signage and / or road markings should be considered, to enable drivers to cross bus lanes safely. The alterations should adopt a standard form throughout the borough. The panel recommend the arrow format. These alterations may include the adjustment of bus lane lengths close to busy junctions.</td>
<td>Consideration of the proposal in line with regulations (TSRGD 2002) and if feasible a standard approach would be adopted. If agreed and implemented, appropriate budget needs to be found.</td>
<td>Accepted, adjustments to bus lanes would be subject to finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>That bus lane signage should be clear and consistent throughout the borough. The largest permissible type of sign and lettering should be used – consistent with Department for Transport regulations. Times should not use the 24 hour clock.</td>
<td>The design of much bus lane signing is mandatory on the council. A standard for the presentation of bus lane operating hours on signs needs to be agreed with Highways Management as variations have occurred over time. The cost to replace existing signs would be about £650 per sign. There is no funding for this at present and these costs would need to be built into future budgets</td>
<td>Accepted, subject to finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>PANEL RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>SERVICE OFFICER COMMENTS (including any resource and legal implications)</td>
<td>Cabinet Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R15 | That a pilot study be implemented of electronic signs indicating whether or not a bus lane is in operation and that the Northolt bus lanes be selected for this study. TfL should be approached to see if they will fund such a pilot as part of their studies into electronic signs. | Would have to be advisory signs in addition to the regulatory signs.  
The costs which could be about £5,000 per sign and monitoring would need to be built into the traffic enforcement programme.  
If installed, the public expectation could lead to installation requests on every bus lane. Due to the different operating times, the suggested electronic sign would also require to be controlled by a time clock of kind which could lead to further confusion if found not working correctly  
Offenders, will most certainly when appealing, refer to the sign being misleading if not operating correctly.  
There is the important issue of on-going maintenance of these signs which will lead on and a process and budget for which needs to be agreed. Maintenance costs per sign would be a minimum of £1,000 per year. | Further consideration of the practicalities of the proposal before deciding whether to undertake the pilot. Any pilot would be subject to finance. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>PANEL RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>SERVICE OFFICER COMMENTS (including any resource and legal implications)</th>
<th>Cabinet Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| R16 | More rigorous enforcement using all methods available to the council during hours of operation should be carried out and where there are points where parking is restricting free movement all measures available to the council should be considered.  
   Priority areas to look at should be  
   Southall  
   West Ealing  
   Hanwell | OK in principle.  
   Parking Services are currently carrying out a high level of enforcement within the entire borough and would agree to increase this level if required to do so. | Accepted |
| R17 | That officers investigate the facts and conditions for allowing motorcycles to use a borough bus lane on an 18 month trial basis. | No financial implications.  
   Officers consider the information available from the TfL trial and liase with TfL on any review of its current position that motorcycles are banned from bus lanes. | Accepted |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>PANEL RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>SERVICE OFFICER COMMENTS (including any resource and legal implications)</th>
<th>Cabinet Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R18</td>
<td>That officers, once the new operating hours are in place, instigate discussions with officers in Hillingdon and Hammersmith &amp; Fulham to persuade them to change the operating hours of their bus lanes to ensure a uniform approach throughout the length of these key roads.</td>
<td>Liaison could take place through the West London Alliance and WestTrans group of officers.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>