

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Thursday 11 February 2016

09:30 am in Meeting Room 4, London Councils, 1st Floor,
59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL

Contact Officer:

Alan Edwards

Tel:

020 7934 9911

Email:

Alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Agenda item	Pages
1 Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies	
2 Declarations of Interests*	-
3 Transport & Mobility Performance Data	
4 London's OLEV Go Ultra Low City Scheme Bid	
5 TEC Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2015/16	
6 Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 10 December 2015 (for noting)	
7 Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 24 November 2015 (for agreeing)	

Declarations of Interests

If you are present at a meeting of London Councils' or any of its associated joint committees or their sub-committees and you have a disclosable pecuniary interest* relating to any business that is or will be considered at the meeting you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your disclosable pecuniary interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

It is a matter for each member to decide whether they should leave the room while an item that they have an interest in is being discussed. In arriving at a decision as to whether to leave the room they may wish to have regard to their home authority's code of conduct and/or the Seven (Nolan) Principles of Public Life.

*as defined by the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012

If you have any queries regarding this agenda or are unable to attend this meeting, please contact:

Alan Edwards
Governance Manager
Corporate Governance Division
Tel: 020 7934 9911
Email: alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

**Declarations of Interest – TEC Executive Sub Committee
11 February 2016**

Freedom Pass Holders/60+ Oyster Cards:

Cllr Alan Smith (LB Lewisham), Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton), Cllr Caroline Usher (LB Wandsworth) and Michael Welbank (City of London)

North London Waste Authority

Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield), Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney) and Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington)

South London Waste Partnership

Councillor Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton)

Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (RFCC)

Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield), Cllr Tim Coleridge (RB Kensington & Chelsea), Cllr Alan Smith (LB Lewisham) and Cllr Darren Merrill (LB Southwark)

Car Club:

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing – Chair), Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney) and Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington)

London Cycling Campaign

Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney)

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Transport & Mobility Services Performance Information

Item no: 03

Report by: Tony O'Connor **Job title:** Mobility Services Manager
Date: 11 February 2016
Contact Officer: Tony O'Connor
Telephone: 020 7934 9501 **Email:** tony.o'connor@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report details the London Councils Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Q2 and Q3 of 2015/16

Recommendations: Members are asked to note the report.

1. London Councils provides a number of transport related services to London's residents on behalf of the London boroughs. These include London Tribunals support services, Parking Services and enquiries, Freedom Pass, Taxicard, the London European Partnership for Transport, Lorry Control Enforcement and Lorry Control permit issue.
2. Appendix 1 sets out the position on each of the main services. This report reports on Quarter 3 of 2015/16 compared to Quarter 2 of 2015/16, and provides complete figures for 2014/15.

Equalities Considerations

None.

Financial Implications

None.

APPENDIX 1: TRANSPORT & MOBILITY SERVICES: PERFORMANCE

LONDON TRIBUNALS

	Target (where appropriate)	2014/15 Full Year	2015/16 Q2	2015/16 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA)					
No. of appeals received	n/a	54,564	11,261	11,883	n/a
No. of appeals decided^	n/a	46,764	7,025	8,167	n/a
% allowed^^	n/a	46%	37%	49%	n/a
% Did Not Contest	n/a	19%	19%	24%	n/a
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time*	80%	90%		41%	Red
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	39 days	40 days	44 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	42 days	44 days	43 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	40 days	44 days	44 days	Green
Road User Charging Adjudicators (RUCA)					
No. of appeals received	n/a	6,283	881	1632	n/a
No. of appeals decided^	n/a	5,753	982	790	n/a
% allowed^^	n/a	28%	27%	28%	n/a
% Did Not Contest	n/a	23%	13%	25%	n/a
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time*	80%	80%		32%	Red
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	69 days	27 days	46 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	55 days	62 days	47 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	66 days	32 days	46 days	Green
Overall service					
Notice of Appeal acknowledgments issued within 2 days of receipt	97%	99.71%	100%	100%	Green
Hearing dates to be issued to appellants within 5 working days of receipt**	100%	100%	76.4%	89%	Red
Number of telephone calls to London Tribunals	n/a	45,966	10,297	7,574	n/a
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	76%	75%	99%	Green

Comments:

^ The no. of appeals decided is consistently less than the no. of appeals received. Decided cases are those that are allowed, refused, withdrawn or non-contested. Not all cases that are received in any period are decided within that period. An appeal has to be scheduled at least 28 days after receipt and will therefore fall into the subsequent month for consideration. In any quarter, 1/3 of the cases registered cannot be decided because they will not have reached their hearing date. There are also cases that cannot be scheduled on receipt – cases that are incomplete, made by the wrong individual, out of time or duplicate and require manual intervention before they can be listed, if they can be listed at all. If an appeal is invalid for any of these reasons, then the case will be rejected as an appeal, and will not count as a decided case. Statutory declaration and witness statement cases also cannot be scheduled on receipt - the validity of a statutory declaration or witness statement has to be considered before it is either rejected or scheduled for a hearing (again 28 days in advance). We receive around 3,000 ETA and 350 RUCAT statutory declaration/witness statements each quarter that fall into this category. Finally, it is worth noting that (for ETA) there are around 2,000 cases that cannot be decided because their consideration has been delayed pending a decision in the High Court.

^^ The % allowed does not include statutory declaration/witness statement cases which are neither allowed nor refused.

* The ability to record and report the % personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time was interrupted by the change of service provider in July 2015 and the transfer to the new case management system. This performance measure will continue being reported in future reports. The target was missed for Q3 because of the way in which the new system records the hearing start. Each case is only recorded as having started once the adjudicator puts the case into hearing. Adjudicators do not have to put the case into hearing to view the evidence, hence the low percentage recorded as starting within 15 minutes. Adjudicators are being encouraged to place the case into hearing as soon as they open the case to consider an appeal, not just for this SLA but also to ensure that the length of each hearing is accurately recorded.

** The target was missed as there were problems with the format of some of the automated letter templates at the start of this quarter. To avoid incorrect letters being sent to appellants, letters were not being sent immediately so that the content could be verified and corrections could be made before dispatch. All letters are now being dispatched as soon as they are produced.

FREEDOM PASS

	Target (where appropriate)	2014/15 Full Year	2015/16 Q2	2015/16 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of active passes at end of period		1,313,438	1,226,477	1,223,800	N/A
Number of new passes issued (BAU)		55,568	12,723	13,092	N/A
Number of passes issued (2015 Renewal)		774,265	2,439	0	N/A
Number of replacement passes issued		93,714	22,875	20,290	N/A
Number of phone calls answered (BAU)		259,005	62,391	55,428	N/A
% Answered within 30 seconds (BAU)	85%	74%*	83%**	86%	Green
Number of phone calls answered (2015 Renewal)		29,297	0	0	N/A
% Answered within 30 seconds (2015 Renewal)	85%	96%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of letters, emails and faxes answered		86,555	20,975	15,630	N/A
Number of emails answered (2015 Renewal)		6,811	0	0	N/A

BAU = Business as Usual

Comments:

There were around 150,000 fewer Freedom Passes at the end of 2014/15 due to the number of people whose passes were due to expire on 31 March 2015 not renewing them. The Freedom Pass telephone helpline had a significant increase in calls in Q3 and Q4 due to the 2015 Freedom Pass renewal.

*Call volumes in Q4 of 2014/15 were significantly higher than usual due to the 2015 renewal. Phone calls and e-mails relating to the renewal are not shown separately after Q1.

**Call centre performance improved considerably in Q1 of 2015/16, but the target was missed by 2% in Q2, mainly due to an increase in calls. Performance improved again in Q3, meeting the target.

TAXICARD

	Target (where appropriate)	2014/15 Full Year	2015/16 Q2	2015/16 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of active passes at end of period		79,266	67,933*	68,208	N/A
Number of new passes issued		9,021	2,780	2,078	N/A
Number of replacement cards issued		4,846	1,307	1,223	N/A
Number of phone calls answered at London Councils		31,988	6,931	8,729	N/A
% Answered within 30 seconds	85%	95.4%	96.6%	97.8%	Green
Number of journeys using Taxicard		1,268,546*	310,281	302,921	N/A
% in private hire vehicles		17%	16%	19%	N/A
% of vehicles arriving within 15 minutes (advance booking)	95%	95.66%	95.55%	95.46%	Green
% of vehicles arriving within 30 minutes (on demand)	95%	96.31%	96.48%	96.66%	Green

Comments:

*The number of members has reduced in Q2 as 12,700 members were removed from the database as they had not used their Taxicards for two years and a further 3,000 deceased members identified by the National Fraud Initiative were also removed. A further, smaller, NFI exercise was done in Q3.

TRACE (TOWAWAY, RECOVERY AND CLAMPING ENQUIRY SERVICE)

	Target (where appropriate)	2014/15 Full Year	2015/16 Q2	2015/16 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of vehicles notified to database	n/a	55,783	18,047	11,310	n/a
Number of phone calls answered	n/a	67,027	14,666	10,916	n/a
% of calls answered in 12 seconds*	95%	96%	n/a	n/a	n/a
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message*	85%	n/a	89%	94%	Green

Comments:

* With the change in contractor in July 2015 this Service Level changed from “% of calls answered in 12 seconds” to “% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message”

LONDON LORRY CONTROL SCHEME

	Target (where appropriate)	2014/15 Full Year	2015/16 Q2	2015/16 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of permits on issue at end of period		87,772	84,074	87,584	N/A
Number of permits issued in period		32,113	7,675	7,709	N/A
Number of vehicle observations made	10,800 per year 2,700 per quarter	12,496	2,962	2,856	Green
Number of penalty charge notices issued		7,100	1,247	1,153	N/A
Number of appeals considered by ETA		129	13*	10*	N/A
% of appeals allowed	Less than 40%	64%	38%	33%	Green

Comment:

TRANSACTIONAL SERVICES: DEBT REGISTRATIONS AND WARRANTS

	Target (where appropriate)	2014/15 Full Year	2015/16 Q2	2015/16 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of debt registrations	n/a	346,682	71,414	103,525	n/a
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of warrants	n/a	299,276	55,292	94,194	n/a
Traffic Enforcement Court: % registered in 1 day	97%	100%	100%	98%	Green

HEALTH EMERGENCY BADGES

	Target (where appropriate)	2014/15 Full Year	2015/16 Q2	2015/16 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of badges on issue at end of period		4,283	3,554	3,551	N/A
Number of badges issued in period		2,046	364	317	N/A

LONDON EUROPEAN PARTNERSHIP FOR TRANSPORT

	Target (where appropriate)	2014/15 Full Year	2015/16 Q2	2015/16 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of Boroughs participating in EU transport funding bids	7	10	3	14	Green

Comment:

Following the Horizon 2020 call for funding bids which closed on Wednesday 20 January, there are a number of boroughs who have expressed a firm interest in being project partners.

For the LEPT led first phase bid entitled **EVolution – Electric Vehicle Charging for Smart Cities**, we have nine London boroughs (Brent, Enfield, Hackney, Hammersmith and Fulham, Haringey, Hounslow, Islington, Kensington and Chelsea, Richmond) who wish to participate. This will eventually be reduced to two implementation partners subject to the success of the initial and second stage bid.

LEPT are also the bid partners in London for a proposed project entitled **Streetlife**. So far we have received firm details from four boroughs wishing to partner this bid (Brent, Haringey, Harrow, Southwark). Again this will reduce to two subject to the success of the bid.

We have also brokered a partnership for Southwark with the following project bid under the same Horizon 2020 call: **Sensing, Monitoring and Planning the Mobility Needs of the Ageing and Liveable Neighbourhood**

London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee Executive

OLEV Go Ultra Low City Scheme Item no: 04

Report by: Steve Craddock **Job title:** Principal Policy Officer
Date: 11 February 2016
Contact Officer: Steve Craddock
Telephone: 020 7934 9832 **Email:** Steve.Craddock@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: London was announced as one of four winning cities in the Office for Low Emission Vehicles "Go Ultra Low City Scheme" and awarded £13,000,000 in capital funding and £240,000 in revenue funding over the period 2016-2020. It is suggested that a Programme Board and a Working Group are established to drive the implementation of the bid proposals.

Recommendations: The Committee is asked to:

- Note the establishment of a Programme Board to determine priorities, set milestones, and drive progress of the delivery of the London Go Ultra Low Scheme.
- Agree TEC representation on that board to take the form of TEC Chair and Labour and Conservative vice chairs.
- Authorise officers from London Councils, in partnership with TfL and GLA, to agree the Terms of Reference for the Programme Board and Working Group.
- Authorise officers from London Councils, in partnership with TfL and GLA, to agree a Memorandum of Understanding.

OLEV Go Ultra Low City Scheme

Background

1. Reports on the Office for Low Emissions Vehicles (OLEV) Go Ultra Low City scheme were presented to TEC Executive in July and September 2015. These explained that a London bid was being prepared by TfL, GLA and London Councils, with support from a working group of borough officers. Following discussions on the draft bid at these meetings, the final version was agreed for London Councils by the TEC Chair and Vice-Chairs for submission in October. Updates on the bid have also been presented to TEC in the Chair's report.
2. The London bid asked for £20,000,000 for four work streams:
 - a. Increasing EV charging infrastructure in residential areas by establishing a London-wide delivery partnership for deploying, managing and maintaining residential charging infrastructure in a more coordinated and cost-effective way.
 - b. Increasing EV charging infrastructure at car club bays, with management and maintenance of the infrastructure being undertaken by the partnership responsible for residential charging infrastructure (point a).
 - c. Increasing the number of rapid EV chargers from the approximately 150 in 2018 planned by TfL to approximately 300 in 2020.
 - d. Implementing local schemes to prioritise and encourage the uptake of ultra low emission vehicles (ULEVs), referred to as "Neighbourhoods of the Future" in the bid. Locations were included in the bid, following a mini competition that invited councils to put forward proposals.

Funding award

3. The Under Secretary of State for Transport, Andrew Jones MP, announced on 25 January that London is one of the winning cities in the Go Ultra Low City Scheme competition, alongside Nottinghamshire and Derby, Milton Keynes and Bristol. London has been awarded £13,000,000 in capital funding and £240,000 in revenue funding to be spent between now and 2020. It is expected that the funding will be paid to TfL.
4. It will be necessary to prioritise between the different elements of the bid, given that the full £20m has not been awarded, and work up more detailed proposals for how they will be implemented. There are a number of issues that require further investigation and will have an impact on the extent to which certain elements of the bid can / should be prioritised. These include:
 - Opportunities to use alternative OLEV funding streams to part-fund some of the initiatives proposed in the London bid.
 - Opportunities for match funding.
 - The implications of the split between capital and revenue funding.
 - State Aid rules.

- The need for boroughs to further develop their initial concepts for Neighbourhoods of the Future.

Programme and delivery milestones

5. OLEV has asked for a high level programme of delivery and a set of milestones by March 2016. Officers will make the case that there will need to be flexibility in the programme. OLEV officials have indicated that they recognise the need for flexibility to adjust the delivery plan over the longer term, if certain elements are considered to be more successful and cost-effective than others.

Governance

6. It is recommended that a Programme Board representing the partner organisations should be established. The board will be advisory in nature and establish joint priorities and milestones plus drive progress of the delivery of the London Go Ultra Low Scheme. This will become an outside body to which the normal London Councils' nomination arrangements will apply. It is proposed the Board will include representatives from TfL, the GLA, LEDNet (London Environment Directors Network), TEC and London Councils. This will be reviewed annually.
7. It is also proposed that a working group is established to develop options for implementing the proposals in the bid. It is suggested that the working group is chaired by a nominated LEDNet member, who will also sit on the programme board to ensure a strong link between the two. The other members will be made up of officers from London Councils, TfL, GLA and five boroughs representing the TfL sub-regions.
8. Terms of reference for the groups would need to ensure that there is a responsibility to inform and consult all boroughs on the key issues being considered and to regularly update TEC (six monthly updates are suggested). TEC is asked to authorise officers from London Councils, in partnership with TfL and GLA, to agree these terms of references over the coming few weeks in line with the principles outlined above.
9. Officers will also work on a Memorandum of Understanding for the organisations involved in the bid. These will ensure that all partners are aware of and can sign up to a set of guiding principles. Again, TEC is asked to authorise officers from London Councils, in partnership with TfL and GLA to agree these over the coming few weeks.

Recommendations

The Committee is asked to:

- Note the establishment of a Programme Board to determine priorities, set milestones, and drive progress of the delivery of the London Go Ultra Low Scheme.
- Agree TEC representation on that board to take the form of TEC Chair and Labour and Conservative vice chairs.
- Authorise officers from London Councils, in partnership with TfL and GLA, to agree the Terms of Reference for the Programme Board and Working Group.

- Authorise officers from London Councils, in partnership with TfL and GLA, to agree a Memorandum of Understanding.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications for London Councils.

Legal Implications

Legal advice has been sought as to the arrangements for implementation of the proposals having regard to LCTEC's constitution and governance. LCTEC's on-going role, as stated in the Report, is consistent with the discharge of the functions which have been delegated to the joint committee by the London local authorities under the LCTEC Governing Agreement dated 13 December 2001 (as amended).

Equalities Implications

There are no equalities implications of the recommendation.

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2015/16 Item no: 05

Report by: Frank Smith **Job title:** Director of Corporate Resources
Date: 11 February 2016
Contact Officer: Frank Smith
Telephone: 020 7934 9700 **Email:** Frank.smith@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary

This report outlines actual income and expenditure against the approved budget as at 31 December 2015 for TEC and provides a forecast of the outturn position for 2015/16. At this stage, a surplus of £562,000 is forecast over the budget figure. In addition, total expenditure in respect of Taxicard trips taken by scheme members is forecast to underspend by £1.395 million, if current trip volumes continue for the remainder of the year. The net borough proportion of this underspend is projected to be £1.146 million, with £249,000 accruing to TfL.

Recommendations

The Executive Committee is asked to :

- note the projected surplus of £562,000 for the year, plus the forecast underspend of £1.395 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in this report; and
 - note the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraph 5 of this report, and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee included in paragraphs 6-7.
-

Introduction

1. This is the third and final budget monitoring report to be presented to the Committee during the current financial year. The next report will be the pre-audited outturn position for the year, which will be reported to the July 2016 meeting of this Committee.
2. The London Councils Transport and Environment Committee's income and expenditure revenue budget for 2015/16, as approved by the Full Committee in December 2014, is set out in Appendix A (Expenditure) and Appendix B (Income), as adjusted for the confirmation of borough funding and TfL funding for the Taxicard scheme for the year. The appendices show the actual income and expenditure at 31 December 2015 and provide an estimate of the forecast outturn for the year, together with the projected variance from the approved budget.

Variance from Budget

3. The current figures indicate that the Committee is projected to underspend gross expenditure budgets by £3.274 million for the year, although £1.395 million relates to payments for taxicard trips. However, a shortfall of income of £2.712 million over budgeted targets is likely to arise, including a reduction in the financial contribution from boroughs and TfL towards taxicard of £1.395 million, making an overall projected surplus of £562,000. Table 1 below summarises the forecast position, with commentary that details the trends that have emerged during the first half of the year and providing explanations for the variances that are projected.

Table 1 –Summary Forecast as at 31 December 2015

	M9 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
Expenditure	£000	£000	£000	£000
Employee Costs	387	624	531	(93)
Running Costs	13	132	268	136
Central Recharges	38	50	52	2
Total Operating Expenditure	428	806	851	45
Direct Services	5,887	9,976	8,426	(1,550)
Research	30	40	40	-
Payments in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	268,925	366,110	364,341	(1,769)
Total Expenditure	275,280	376,932	373,658	(3,274)
Income				
Contributions in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	(271,482)	(366,381)	(365,114)	1,267
Income for direct services	(4,392)	(10,313)	(8,626)	1,687
Core Member Subscriptions	(97)	(97)	(97)	-
Government Grants	-	-	-	-
Interest on Investments	(5)	-	(5)	(5)
Other Income	(73)	(77)	(82)	(5)
Transfer from Reserves	-	(64)	(296)	(232)
Total Income	(276,049)	(376,932)	(374,220)	(2,712)
Net Expenditure	(769)	-	(562)	(562)

4. The projected surplus of £562,000 is made up broadly of the following:

- A projected net deficit of £130,000 in respect of TEC parking traded services, after considering the level of borough/TfL/GLA usage volumes after nine months of the year. The surplus is attributable to a number of areas.
 - Firstly, there is a projected net deficit of £104,000 in respect of ETA appeals. The number of notice of appeals and statutory declarations received over the nine month period amounts to 32,447, giving a projected number for the year of 43,263, 26,171 less than the budgeted figure of 69,434. The current throughput of appeals is 2.55 appeals per hour, compared to a budget figure of 3.03, and this reduction is attributable to the fact that services were interrupted this summer with the move of the appeals hearing centre from Angel Square to Chancery Exchange and the change of parking managed services provider from Capita to Northgate, which involved the introduction of an entirely new IT system. This position continues to be closely monitored over the remaining weeks of the financial year.
 - Secondly, the transaction volumes for other parking systems¹ used by boroughs and TfL over this period appear to have reduced, resulting in a projected net deficit of £33,000. On the expenditure side, this takes into account the differing unit cost pricing structures under the expired Capita contract and the new pricing structure offered by Northgate. On the income side, unit cost recharges to boroughs were set by the full Committee in December 2014 for the whole year with the change in contractor taken into consideration in calculating the charges. As for appeals, there has been some disruption to the services during the changeover of the contractor and IT systems and this might lead to further variations in the emerging forecast over the remainder of the year.
 - Finally, there is a forecast marginal surplus of £7,000 in respect of the fixed costs arising from the parking managed services contract.
- A projected underspend of £59,000 in respect of employee costs. The cost of staff providing direct services (included within the various direct service administration charges) is estimated to overspend by £19,000, although this is offset by an underspend on staffing costs attributable to non-operational and policy staff of £78,000. In addition, the maternity cover budget is estimated to be underspent by £15,000.
- A projected underspend of £681,000 in respect of the £2.2 million budget for payments to independent bus operators (LSPs). This is attributable to a number of factors:
 - a fall of 2% in the past 12 months on bus journeys across London and on most LSPs, partly due to the age eligibility increase;
 - one of the LSP operators ceased to operate in January 2015, after the 2015/16 budget had been set;
 - TGM, which used to run two routes in London, is now operating under Arriva Kent management and one of the transferred routes was withdrawn in May 2015;
 - Arriva the Shires lost one of the most expensive routes (797) to Unibus, which now runs the route a shorter distance and the average fare is lower than it used to be with Arriva; and
 - A review of the postcodes of the stops in London determined that for three operators (Arriva the Shires, Abellio and Metrobus), a few stops on routes fell outside of the

¹ These consist of TRACE, which allows a vehicle owner to find out the exact location of their towed-away vehicle and how much the release fee will be; and TEC, the system that allows boroughs to register any unpaid parking tickets with the Traffic Enforcement Centre and apply for bailiff's warrants.

London area and as result, the length of journeys included in claims reduced significantly.

- A projected overspend in respect of pass reissue costs of £98,000, which is primarily due to the reissue of 170,000 passes that expire on 31 March 2016. This will be offset by £15,000 additional income accruing during the year, plus the additional income of £158,000 forecast to be collected in respect of replacement freedom passes, as detailed below, to give a net benefit of £75,000.
- Residual expenditure on the 2015 Freedom Pass issue exercise is estimated to be £193,000, which will be fully funded from Committee reserves. Total spend on the reissue exercise is estimated to be £2.613 million, £528,000 less than the budget sum of £3.141 million earmarked by the Committee in July 2014.
- Due to the end of the Parking on Private Land Appeals (POPLA) contract with the British Parking Association (BPA) on 30 September 2015, additional central overheads will need to be spread across the Committee's functions, equating to £79,000 for the half-year period. £54,000 relates to hearing centre premises costs and can, therefore, be directly attributable to the two tribunals - Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) and the Road User Charging Adjudicators (RUCA). The residual £25,000 has been spread across all the direct service functions, including ETA/RUCA, in line with staffing numbers.
- The 2015/16 budget assumed a crossover of two months between the start of the lease at Chancery Exchange and the move out of Angel Square. However, in order to secure CE on the terms offered, the Committee had to agree to an earlier start date of the lease, leading to an additional two month leasehold costs. The estimated monthly premises costs are estimated to be £42,000, so this will incur an additional £84,000 in 2015/16. In addition, costs of £39,000 have accrued in respect of the move from Angel Square and the refurbishment of Chancery Exchange, which cannot be capitalised.
- The systems development budget of £114,000 is projected to potentially overspend by up to £136,000. This is attributable to additional IT system development costs associated with the London Tribunals move, rebranding and contract transfer. Discussions are continuing with Northgate to determine the precise level and split of responsibility for these potential costs, under the terms of the new contract.
- Based on income collected during the nine month period, receipts from Lorry Control PCN income are forecast to exceed the budget of £550,000 by £158,000.
- Based on income collected during the nine month period, income receipts from replacement Freedom Passes are forecast to exceed the budget of £500,000 by £158,000.
- Investment income on Committee reserves is estimated to generate £5,000 in the current year, against a zero budgetary provision.

Committee Reserves

5. Table 2 below updates the Committee on the revised estimated level of balances as at 31 March 2017, if all current known liabilities and commitments are considered:

Table 2– Analysis of projected Uncommitted Reserves through to 31 March 2017

	General Reserve	Specific Reserve	Total
	£000	£000	£000
Audited reserves at 31 March 2015	3,535	-	3,535
IT system developments brought forward from 2014/15	(64)	-	(64)
Residual 2015 Freedom Pass issue costs	(193)	-	(193)
Revenue costs of hearing centre move	(39)	-	(39)
Transfer to specific reserve	(1,000)	1,000	-
Projected Budget Surplus 2015/16	562	-	562
Estimated Residual Balances at 31 March 2016	2,801	1,000	3,801
One-off payment to boroughs agreed for 2016/17	(340)	-	(340)
Approved resources used to set 2016/17 budget	(303)	-	(303)
Estimated Residual Balances at 31 March 2017	2,158	1,000	3,158

Conclusions

6. This report reflects the position at the nine month stage in the current financial year and forecasts a surplus position of £562,000 for the year. In addition taxicard trips are forecast to underspend by £1.395 million, with the borough proportion of this underspend projected to be £1.146 million, with £249,000 accruing to TfL.
7. After taking into account the forecast surplus for 2015/16 and known commitments for both 2015/16 and 2016/17, general reserves are forecast to be £2.158 million, which equates to 18.5% of budgeted operating and trading expenditure of £11.673 million for the current year. This figure exceeds the Committee's revised formal policy on reserves, agreed in December 2015 that reserves should equate to between 10-15% of annual operating expenditure. However, this marginal excess does provide a buffer to contra any further effects of volatility in the trading services operated by the Committee. In addition, a sum of £1 million has been provided for in a specific reserve to contribute towards the costs of the 2020 Freedom Pass reissue process.

Recommendations

8. Members are asked to :
 - note the projected surplus of £562,000 for the year, plus the forecast underspend of £1.395 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in this report; and
 - note the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraph 5 of this report and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee included in paragraphs 6-7.

Financial Implications for London Councils

As detailed in report

Legal Implications for London Councils

None

Equalities Implications for London Councils

None

Appendices

Appendix A (Expenditure), Appendix B (Income)

Background Papers

London Councils-TEC Budget working papers 2015/16

London Councils Income and Expenditure Forecast File 2015/16

TEC Expenditure Forecast 2015/16

Appendix A

	Revised 2015/16 £000	Actual To Date £000	M9 Forecast £000	M9 Variance £000
Payments in respect of Concessionary Fares				
TfL	327,922	243,747	327,922	0
ATOC	21,334	16,001	21,334	0
Other Bus Operators	2,200	888	1,519	-681
Freedom Pass survey and reissue costs	1,518	672	1,616	98
Provision for freedom pass 2015 issue	0	193	193	193
Freedom Pass Administration	372	281	374	2
City Fleet Taxicard contract	12,285	6,773	10,890	-1,395
Taxicard Administration	479	370	493	14
	366,110	268,925	364,341	-1,769
TEC Trading Account Expenditure				
Payments to Adjudicators	1,497	891	1,189	-308
Parking managed Services variable contract costs	1,072	334	734	-338
Payments to Northampton County Court	4,000	2,040	3,000	-1,000
Lorry Control Administration	542	391	521	-21
London Tribunals Administration	2,822	2,204	2,946	124
POPLA administration	0	0	0	0
Health Emergency Badge	43	27	36	-7
	9,976	5,887	8,426	-1,550
Sub-Total	376,086	274,812	372,767	-3,319
Operating Expenditure				
Other Salary Commitments				
Officers - non-operational staffing	575	373	497	-78
Members	19	14	19	0
Maternity provision	30	0	15	-15
	624	387	531	-93
Discretionary Expenditure				
Staff training/recruitment advertising	0	0	0	0
Staff travel	0	2	3	3
IT system developments	114	0	250	136
Supplies and service	18	11	15	-3
Research	40	30	40	0
	172	43	308	136
Total Operating Expenditure	796	430	839	43
Central Recharges	50	38	52	2
Total Expenditure	376,932	275,280	373,658	-3,274

TEC Income Forecast 2015/16

Appendix B

	Revised 2015/16 £000	Actual To Date £000	M9 Forecast £000	M9 Variance £000
Borough contributions to TfL	327,922	243,747	327,922	0
Borough contributions to ATOC	21,334	16,001	21,334	0
Borough contributions to Other Bus Operators	2,200	1,650	2,200	0
Borough contributions to surveys/reissue costs	1,375	1,139	1,375	0
Borough contributions to freedom pass administration	286	286	286	0
Income from lost/faulty freedom passes	500	494	658	-158
Income from lost/faulty taxicard passes	36	2	6	30
Borough contributions to Taxicard trips	2,658	2,021	1,512	1,146
TfL contribution to Taxicard trips	9,627	5,725	9,378	249
Borough contributions to taxicard administration	338	338	338	0
TfL Contribution to taxicard administration	105	79	105	0
	366,381	271,482	365,114	1,267
TEC trading account income				
Borough contributions to Lorry Control administration	0	0	0	0
Lorry Control PCNs	550	531	708	-158
Borough parking appeal charges	2,070	559	1,342	728
TfL parking appeal charges	250	33	96	154
GLA Congestion charging appeal income	208	114	273	-65
POPLA appeals income	0	0	0	0
Borough fixed parking costs	1,910	955	1,910	0
TfL fixed parking costs	250	125	250	0
GLA fixed parking costs	493	294	493	0
POPLA fixed costs	0	0	0	0
Borough other parking services	582	149	554	28
Northampton County Court Recharges	4,000	1,632	3,000	1,000
	10,313	4,392	8,626	1,687
Sub-Total	376,694	275,874	373,740	2,954
Core borough subscriptions				
Joint Committee	46	46	46	0
TEC (inc TfL)	51	51	51	0
	97	97	97	0
Other Income				
Investment income	0	5	5	-5
Sales of publications	3	0	0	3
TfL secretariat recharge	31	41	41	-10
Sales of Health Emergency badges	43	27	36	7
Miscellaneous income	0	5	5	-5
	77	78	87	-10
Transfer from Reserves	64	0	296	-232
Central Recharges	0	0	0	0
Total Income Base Budget	376,932	276,049	374,220	2,712

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

10 December 2015

Minutes of a meeting of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee held on Thursday 10 December 2015 at 2:30pm in the Conference Suite, London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL

Present:

Council	Councillor
Barking and Dagenham	Cllr Lynda Rice
Barnet	Cllr John Hart (Deputy)
Bexley	Apologies
Brent	Cllr Ellie Southwood
Bromley	Apologies
Camden	Cllr Phil Jones
Croydon	Cllr Kathy Bee
Ealing	Cllr Julian Bell (Chair)
Enfield	Cllr Daniel Anderson
Greenwich	
Hackney	Cllr Feryal Demirci
Hammersmith and Fulham	Cllr Wesley Harcourt
Haringey	Cllr Joanna Christophides
Harrow	Cllr Graham Henson
Havering	Apologies
Hillingdon	Apologies
Hounslow	Apologies
Islington	Cllr Claudia Webbe
Kensington and Chelsea	Cllr Tim Coleridge
Kingston Upon Thames	Cllr Terry Paton
Lambeth	
Lewisham	Cllr Alan Smith
Merton	Cllr Nick Draper
Newham	Apologies
Redbridge	
Richmond Upon Thames	Cllr Stephen Speak
Southwark	
Sutton	Cllr Jill Whitehead
Tower Hamlets	
Waltham Forest	Cllr Clyde Loakes
Wandsworth	Apologies
City of Westminster	Cllr Heather Acton
City of London	Apologies
Transport for London	Alex Williams

1. Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies

Apologies:

Cllr Dean Cohen (LB Barnet)
Cllr Alex Sawyer (LB Bexley)
Cllr Colin Smith (LB Bromley)
Cllr Robert Benham (LB Havering)
Cllr Keith Burrows (LB Hillingdon)
Cllr Amrit Mann (LB Hounslow)
Cllr Ian Corbett (LB Newham)
Cllr Caroline Usher (LB Wandsworth)
Michael Welbank (City of London)

Deputies:

Cllr John Hart (LB Barnet)

2. Declaration of Interests

Freedom Pass Holders/60+ Oyster Cards

Cllr John Hart (LB Barnet), Cllr Ellie Southwood (LB Brent), Cllr Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr Nick Draper (LB Merton), and Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton)

North London Waste Authority

Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield), Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney), Cllr Phil Jones (LB Camden), and Claudia Webbe (LB Islington)

Western Riverside Waste Authority

Cllr Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham)

West London Waste Authority

Cllr Ellie Southwood (LB Brent)

South London Waste Partnership

Cllr Kathy Bee (LB Croydon)
Cllr Nick Draper (LB Merton)
Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton)

London Waste & Recycling Board

Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Waltham Forest)

Car Club

Councillor Julian Bell (LB Ealing – Chair), Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney) and Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington)

Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (RFCC)

Cllr Nick Draper (LB Merton)
Cllr Lynda Rice (LB Barking & Dagenham)
Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield)

London Cycling Campaign

Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney)

3. Overview of Vehicle Electrification

The Committee received a report that advised Members of the current situation with regards to the electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure in London, the options available and any potential future developments in the sector.

Councillor Coleridge said that he supported having more electric vehicles, but felt that the variety of schemes was making the issue too complex. Councillor Webbe said that more clarity was needed from TfL. Nick Lester informed members that funding had now been confirmed for the Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) City Scheme bid. He emphasised the importance of interoperability for the networks (paragraph 65, page 8). All of the networks should offer a payment option for charging via a credit or debit card, rather than a user having to commit to a particular network. The Chair said that the issue of interoperability should be made a strong recommendation in the report.

Decision: The Committee noted the contents of the report and agreed that the issue of interoperability would be made more explicit in the report.

4. Transport for London and Borough Bus Service Engagement

The Committee received a report that had been prepared by TfL for the Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) of London Councils, to provide a high level update on TfL's series of meetings with boroughs regarding bus network and bus priority development. The paper also set out the background to TfL's new approach to strategic bus engagement with boroughs, and the impact of the first round of meetings.

John Barry, Head of Network Development – Buses, TfL, introduced the report. He informed members that his role was to take care of the network of services and to ensure that the right resources were in place. John Barry made the following comments:

- Meetings were being convened to help develop a strategic overview to ensure that TfL was in line with the boroughs, with regards the bus network
- Borough Heads of Transport and Planning attended the meetings and a review would be carried out at the end
- It was hoped that a second round of meetings would take place in autumn 2016
- Annual Bus Network seminars took place, and a number of "themes" had been introduced. Additional funds had been allocated to fund Bus Priority work.

- A seminar on 11 November 2015 took place and looked at ways to improve customer service on the network and how to improve air quality (ie ways to help prevent pollution caused by buses)
- It was too early to tell how productive the new meetings were, but a full review would be carried out in due course.

Q and As

Councillor Whitehead said that she welcomed the meetings. She said that the borough of Sutton had received a number of new buses from TfL. However, the brakes failed on one of them, causing the bus to crash into the front of a resident's house. She said that no deaths had been caused, but checks needed to be carried out to ensure that the new buses were road worthy. Councillor Whitehead said that the residents of Sutton had also requested live traffic information. She said that bad bus driving and pollution hotspots also needed to be looked at in more detail.

Councillor Coleridge said that he also welcomed the bus engagement meetings and hoped that they would make a difference. He said that cleaner buses were required, especially in areas where pollution was high. Councillor Demirci said that engagement regarding London buses was welcomed, although communication with regards to major changes to bus routes was not adequate. She felt that the relationship between TfL and the boroughs was one-sided and this needed to be improved. Councillor Webbe said that no communication had taken place between the borough of Islington and TfL regarding the bus network yet. She said that Islington had one of the largest bus depots in Europe and less than 20% of the buses were environmentally friendly.

Councillor Rice said that seminars were taking place between TfL and the borough of Barking and Dagenham. She said that £2.5 million in funding had already been secured. John Barry said that safety, the environment and network development were all key. He said that changes would take place in these areas over time and work was currently ongoing. John Barry said that the aim was to have the cleanest buses as possible. Diesel buses were being upgraded to trap NOx and good progress was already being made in this area. There were also plans to have 1700 hybrid buses in service by 2016. John Barry informed members that it was not possible to electrify all vehicles as the current battery technology was not good enough. A partial electrification of the bus fleet was taking place in the borough of Croydon.

John Barry said that less polluting buses needed to be placed in areas where there was air quality stress (eg around Heathrow and Putney High Street). He said that safety was a top priority, and buses operated by the contractors needed to comply with statutory safety requirements. John Barry confirmed that TfL ran an intensive monitoring scheme with regards to safety and accident investigation. TfL had also recently brought in its own project manager. John Barry said that the bus accident that took place in Sutton was a very rare occurrence.

John Barry informed TEC that TfL carried out an assessment with regards to bus driver training and extra money was available for additional training for drivers. Improving customer service was also a very important issue (drivers were given a "red book"). Live travel data was now widely used and traffic delay information was also provided for free and displayed in various foyers. The Chair thanked John Barry for his talk on bus service engagement.

Decision: The Committee noted the update from TfL.

5. Future of Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) and Low Emission Zone (LEZ)

The Committee considered a report that outlined the progress and work to date, looking at the feasibility of options for expanding Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) and/or tightening the Londonwide Low Emission Zone (LEZ). The ULEZ would come into effect from September 2020

Sam Longman, Principal Policy Advisor, TfL, introduced the report and made the following comments:

- The report summarised the current work regarding the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) consultation. There was a great deal more work to do on this as boroughs wanted the ULEZ to cover a much wider area
- An engagement group that had been established encompassed a smaller number of boroughs. The membership and Terms of Reference of the engagement group could be found at Appendix A of the report
- There were very few new boundaries that would work
- A high level “sifting” had been carried regarding boundaries for future schemes and a shortlist had been produced. This would be looked at in more detail and surveys would be carried out
- Work was unlikely to conclude very quickly owing to the mayoral elections in 2016. TEC would be updated on progress with ULEZ/LEZ as and when more details were known.

Q and As

Councillor Demirci said that she welcomed the report and asked when more detailed modelling of the options would be made available. She said that borough officers had raised the issue of boundaries and displacement of traffic when plans for the current ULEZ were drawn up, which were dismissed by TfL. She was therefore surprised to see that TfL was now concerned about displaced traffic, when considering widening the boundaries. Councillor Demirci also voiced her concern that more traffic would be forced into areas that already suffered from poor air quality. Sam Longman confirmed that building more detailed traffic models was the next stage and more details on this would be forthcoming. He said that air quality would improve in boroughs around the ULEZ because of the increase in cleaner vehicles driving through these areas to get into central London.

Councillor Coleridge said that care needed to be taken to ensure that the engagement group did not consult with all the boroughs and residents too late. He also advised that there needed to be a manageable number of options. Sam Longman said that the engagement group was made up of borough officers, who would feed information back to the boroughs through sub-regional partnerships. He took on board that it was very important to ensure that the public were engaged at an early stage and he would ensure that this happened.

Councillor Rice voiced concern that the borough of Barking and Dagenham was not included in any of the options. She said that a cost benefit analysis of the options needed to be undertaken. Councillor Webbe said that the engagement group could

only provide advice and would therefore find it difficult to spread the message to all Londoners. She said that residents would have to make changes to incorporate the restrictions of the ULEZ and therefore needed plenty of notice. Councillor Webbe asked whether the engagement group would be looking at the infrastructure costs involved in expanding the ULEZ. She asked whether TfL would be meeting these costs. Sam Longman responded that a detailed cost benefit analysis would be carried out. The issue of who would pay could not be decided at present, but would be part of an early feasibility study. Sam Longman said that any costs to Londoners needed to be fair and affordable.

Sam Longman also highlighted that London Councils was represented on the engagement group - it was not practical for all boroughs to be involved. He said that the issue of boundaries would be looked at in more detail. Councillor Webbe said that there appeared to be no evidence that EU6 diesel vehicles were cleaner vehicles and they were still causing significant pollution as a consequence. Sam Longman said that TfL had carried out its own diesel testing, which showed that EU6 diesel vehicles were much cleaner than current models, although not meeting all of the emission tests. He said that the ultimate goal was to have completely zero emission vehicles within all of London, but that was not practical at present.

Decision: The Committee noted and commented on the report.

6. Chair's Report

The Committee received a report that updated members on transport and policy since the last meeting on 15 October 2015 and provided a forward look until the next meeting on 17 March 2016.

The Chair said the You Tube link to the new Freedom Pass video, with the choir "Bold Voices", would be emailed to TEC members. He informed members that the report on the response to TfL's Private Hire Regulations Review had recently gone to the TEC Executive Sub Committee. Since then, he has had discussions with the Licenced Taxi Drivers Association, who felt that there needed to be a cap on the number of private hire vehicles that were issued licences to, as London was now awash with private hire vehicles. The Chair said that this would require a change in statute, and the mayoral candidates should be looking into this. He said that he would like this reflected in the response that officers were preparing. Any further views should be sent to the Chair and Vice Chairs of TEC.

Decision: The Committee:

- Noted the Chair's report;
- Agreed that the link to the new Freedom Pass video be sent to TYEC members; and
- Agreed that officers would include the issue of the high number of licences issued in the response and if members had any further views, these should be sent to the Chair and Vice Chairs of TEC.

7a. Freight Update

The Committee received a report that had been prepared by TfL for London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) to provide an update on the progress from the 1st meeting of the London Freight Borough Officers Liaison Group.

Alex Williams informed the Committee that a productive first meeting of the London Freight Borough Officers Liaison Group had taken place on 20 October 2015. TfL were keen to work with officers on this and report back to TEC in June 2016. A first draft should be available in February 2016. The Chair said that the Group had to balance the desire to change deliveries away from peak hours whilst ensuring that concerns about noise in residential areas caused by night time deliveries were addressed.

Decision: The Committee:

- Noted the suggested programme for the Freight Borough Officers Liaison Group; and
- Endorsed the joint approach for undertaking these actions

7b. Traffic Signals Budget 2016/17

The Committee received a report that set out the cost to boroughs of maintaining traffic signals in London in 2016/17.

The Chair introduced the report and informed members that there had only been a marginal increase in costs, mainly due to the number of traffic lights going up. He confirmed that the increase in costs to boroughs for maintaining the traffic signals was considerably less than it had been in previous years.

Councillor Coleridge voiced concern that his officers at the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea had not been given sufficient time to analyse the traffic signals budget figures. He asked if future reports containing this information could be sent to TEC members earlier.

Decision: The Committee:

- Agreed the cost to boroughs for maintaining traffic signals in London in 2016/17, which was £10,983,941.61,
- Agreed that the cost be apportioned between boroughs, as shown in Appendix 1 of the report; and
- Agreed to ask TfL to send out the Traffic Signals budget figures to TEC sooner, to give borough officers adequate time to go through them.

8. Concessionary Fares 2016/17 Settlement and Apportionment

The Committee received a report that informed members of the outcome of negotiations with transport operators (Transport for London, the Association of Train Operating Companies (ATOC) and independent bus operators) regarding compensation for carrying passengers in 2016/17. The report also sought member approval to the proposed settlement and apportionment.

Stephen Boon, Chief Contracts Officer, London Councils, introduced the report. He informed members that there were three typographical errors in the original report sent to Committee, namely: (a) paragraph 10, page 3, should read 22.7% and not 23.7% on ATOC, (b) Table 1, page 3, for 2016/17 total should read 355.678 and not 355.915, and (c) highest rise was in LB Bromley and not LB Croydon. Stephen Boon confirmed that the typographical errors were purely drafting issues and did not affect the overall figures in any way and apologised to members. A revised report has been issued to members.

Stephen Boon said that there had been an overall reduction in the number of journeys taken by passholders in buses and trams. He confirmed that ATOC journey data was used for the rail settlement (as agreed by TEC in 2013) and did vary from borough to borough. Stephen Boon said that London Councils now carried out the administration for the concessionary fares and this had resulted in further savings. The methodology for the concessionary fares apportionment could be found in the Appendices 1 and 2 at the end of the report.

Decision: The Committee:

- Agreed the TfL settlement of £333.94million for 2016/17;
- Agreed to the ATOC settlement of £18.520 million for 2016/17;
- Noted that in May 2015, a number of services in north and east London transferred from TOCs to TfL;
- Agreed a budget for non-TfL bus services of £1.7 million;
- Agreed the reissue budget for 2016/17 of £1.518 million;
- Agreed the borough payments for 2016/17 of £355.678 million;
- Agreed the payment profile and dates on which boroughs' contributions are paid as 9 June 2016, 8 September 2016, 8 December 2016 and 9 March 2017;
- Agreed the 2016-2017 London Service Permit bus operators (non-TfL buses) Concessionary Scheme; and
- Noted that there were 3 typos in the original report that was sent to members, namely: (a) paragraph 10, page 3, should read 22.7% and not 23.7% on ATOC, (b) Table 1, page 3, for 2016/17 total should read 355.678 and not 355.915, and (c) highest rise was in LB Bromley and not LB Croydon.

9. TEC Revenue Budget and Borough Charges 2016/17

The Committee received a report that detailed the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscriptions and charges for 2016/17. These proposals were considered by the TEC Executive Sub Committee at its meeting on 24 November 2015. The TEC Executive Sub Committee agreed to recommend that the full Committee approved these proposals.

Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, introduced the report. He confirmed that the TEC Executive had agreed to an additional recommendation that a further £500,000 be transferred from TEC's general reserve to go towards the Freedom Pass 2020 reissue costs. Frank Smith also informed members that a sum of £10,000 would be repatriated to each borough (and TfL) from a transfer from reserves of £643,000, in the sum of a one-off payment in 2016/17 (paragraph 54 of the report).

Frank Smith said that discussions had taken place at the last TEC Executive about reviewing the level of TEC reserves. The Executive recommended that the level of reserves be increased from the current 2-3% of annual trading and operating expenditure to between 10-15% - this would still leave approximately £400,000 in reserves at the year end, which was in excess of the upper level of reserves of 15%, based on current projections.

Councillor Acton asked if the figures in the revenue budget reports could be rounded-up in the future. Nick Lester said that this was not advisable, as the volume of TEC trading services was very large and any, even minor changes to the figures could potentially have a big effect on the overall budget.

Councillor Webbe asked why there was no reduction on the £1.5million survey and re-issue costs next year when there was not a re-issue taking. Stephen Boon said that this was used to pay for all issue costs and on-going operations (except London Councils' administration costs). Frank Smith said that he would look at making the distinction between new issue and reissuing costs in future TEC budget reports. The Committee had also previously agreed that any underspend from the survey and reissue budget and any surplus in respect of replacement Freedom Pass income would be transferred to the special reserve to contribute towards the costs of the next bulk re-issue in 2020.

Decision: The Committee approved:

- The changes in individual levies and charges for 2016/17 as follows:
 - The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2015/16 - £1,500; paragraph 37);
 - The total Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.4681 which would be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2014/15 (2015/16 - £0.4333 per PCN; paragraphs 35-36);
 - No charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass Administration Charge, which was covered by replacement Freedom Pass income (2015/16 - £8,674; paragraph 16);
 - The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,182 in total (2015/16 - £338,182; paragraphs 17-19).
 - No charge to boroughs in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which was fully covered by estimated PCN income (2015/16 – nil charge; paragraphs 20-21);
 - The Parking and Traffic Appeals Charge of £33.32 per appeal or £29.90 per appeal where electronic evidence is provided by the enforcing authority (2015/16 - £33.40/£29.97 per appeal). In addition, a new differential charge is proposed for hearing Statutory Declarations of £28.17 for hard copy submissions and £27.49 for electronic submissions (2015/16 - £33.40/£29.97 per SD) (paragraph 28);
 - Congestion Charging Appeals – to be recovered on a full cost recovery basis, subject to the continuing agreement of the GLA under the contract arrangements that run until December 2016 (paragraph 29);
 - The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.31 per transaction (2015/16 - £8.60; paragraphs 33-34);
 - The TRACE (Fax) Charge of £7.48 per transaction (2015/16 - £8.80; paragraphs 33-34); and

- The TEC¹ Charge of £0.17 per transaction (2015/16 - £0.20; paragraphs 33-34);
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £378.786 million for 2016/17, as detailed in Appendix A;
- On the basis of the agreement of the above proposed charges, the provisional gross revenue income budget of £378.143 million for 2016/17, with a recommended transfer of £643,000 from uncommitted Committee reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B;
- From proposed reserves of £643,000, a sum of £10,000 be repatriated to each borough (and TfL) from TEC uncommitted reserves, amounting to £340,000 in total, in the form of a one-off payment, as per paragraph 54; and
- The proposed changes to the Committee's formal policy on reserves and the transfer of a further sum of £500,000 from the Committee's general reserves to the specific reserve for the 2020 Freedom Pass reissue, as detailed in paragraphs 56-64.

The Committee was also asked to note the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 52-55 and Table 9 of this report and the estimated total charges to individual boroughs for 2016/17, as set out in Appendix C.1.

10. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee Meeting held on 24 November 2015 (for noting)

The Committee noted the minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting held on 24 November 2015.

11. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 15 October 2015 (for agreeing)

The Committee agreed the minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on the 15 October 2015 as being an accurate record.

Members of the press and public were asked to leave the room whilst Committee considered the exempt part of the agenda.

The meeting finished at 3.50pm

¹ The system that allows boroughs to register any unpaid parking tickets with the Traffic Enforcement Centre and apply for bailiff's warrants.

LONDON COUNCILS' TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT EXECUTIVE SUB COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on **24 November 2015** at 09:30am, at London Councils, Meeting Room 1, 1st Floor, 59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL

Present:

Councillor Julian Bell	LB Ealing (Chair)
Councillor Daniel Anderson	LB Enfield
Councillor Feryal Demirci	LB Hackney
Councillor Tim Coleridge	RB Kensington & Chelsea
Councillor Alan Smith	LB Lewisham
Councillor Jill Whitehead	LB Sutton
Councillor Caroline Usher	LB Wandsworth
Councillor Heather Acton	City of Westminster

1. Declarations of Interests

There were no additional declarations of interest.

2. Apologies for Absence & Deputies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Alex Sawyer (LB Bexley) and Michael Welbank MBE (City of London).

3. London Sustainable Drainage Action Plan (LSDAP)

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that provided members with an update of the draft London Sustainable Drainage Action Plan (LSDAP)

Kevin Reid (Principal Programme Manager, GLA), introduced the report and made the following comments:

- The LSDAP was launched 3 weeks ago and evolved as part of the Mayor's London Plan Drainage policy and "Drain London". It was also required because of London's expected population growth over the next 25 years and as a consequence of climate change.
- The case for retrofitting needed to be made and land owners and landlords needed to be persuaded to help with this. The GLA acknowledged that funds to spend on retrofitting were limited and it was recognised that landlords might be reluctant to spend their own money.
- Builders/building companies needed to be consulted and asset management plans needed to be looked at to help improve drainage, eg resurfacing car parks, putting in new school roofs and making playing grounds permeable. There was now the opportunity to make drainage more sustainable, and sustainable drainage improvements can often be achieved at marginal additional cost.
- 42 "Actions" had been identified to target specific sectors, like Housing, Education, Transport and Health etc. Discussions were also taking place with housing associations, with a view to using some of the GLA budget, set aside

for sustainable drainage, to provide expert advice. The focus for the GLA now was taking time to talk and try to persuade these organisations to improve drainage.

- There was a high level target to reduce flows in combined sewers by 25% over 25 years (until 2040). The GLA acknowledged it still needed to establish how the target would be monitored and measured.
- Other resources included Thames Water's "Twenty 4 Twenty", which was a £20 million campaign to disconnect 20 hectares of land from the drainage system. Boroughs were encouraged to consider when this could be achieved in their area. Discussions were also taking place with the Thames Tideway Tunnel to look at improving drainage and they have supplied an officer resource for 18 months to 2 years to look at improvements to old estates.
- The consultation on the LSDAP was due to close on 15 January 2016

Q and As

Councillor Coleridge said that although action for new builds was welcomed, there was no sense of urgency for retrofitting older estates and properties. He felt that all planning authorities needed to look at how to increase retrofitting, especially in light of increases to London's population by 2050. Councillor Usher said that there needed to be a change in the legislation.

Councillor Whitehead said that a flooding "action" plan (management strategy) had been produced by each borough member of the South West London Floods Partnership. She said that the borough of Sutton had flooding problems caused by the River Wandle.

Councillor Smith voiced concern at the lack of action, with regards to ensuring adequate drainage, from the builders/companies that installed residential driveways. He said that there needed to be a way to educate small scale builders and make them legally responsible for installing permeable driveways. Councillor Usher said that that this would have to be incorporated in planning applications. Councillor Smith said that it was difficult to get smaller businesses to incorporate a drainage system when laying residential driveways. Councillor Whitehead said that there was also concern at people digging up trees in their back gardens.

Kevin Reid said changes to planning legislation six years ago had restricted what could be done to front gardens. However, the restrictions were limited and it was difficult to monitor and enforce what work was carried out on individual driveways. Kevin Reid said that most well established paving companies would advise residents on drainage issues, and a number of these companies were laying down permeable tarmac in driveways – less reputable companies were ignoring these issues. He said that some of the planning changes had actually reduced local authority control over what could be done in back gardens.

Kevin Reid said that it was difficult to persuade people to recognise drainage issues. He informed members that larger schemes were proposing a 50% reduction in flooding. He said that changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in April now applied to major planning permissions, and most large organisations were starting to pick this up. The next 2 to 3 years should be beneficial in beginning to achieve sustainable drainage. Kevin Reid said that one sustainable drainage scheme had installed rain gardens and a permeable pavement area. This needed to become the norm. Kevin Reid said that some of these projects could be carried out cost efficiently and the GLA had already built up a register of approximately 55 projects.

Councillor Coleridge asked whether a model had been produced to show how much work needed to be carried out on sustainable drainage. Kevin Reid said that there were two areas of work being undertaken, namely (a) modelling drainage catchment areas, which had just finished, and (b) commissioning an Atkins study to look at a sustainable drainage opportunity method. Some areas of work were straightforward and cost effective, whereas others were more difficult and restrictive (eg requiring underground tanks to be installed). Kevin Reid said that encouraging schemes to start work would begin early 2016. He said that population growth would occur all over London and there were a large number of small scale schemes that could include sustainable drainage, as well as big scale projects, like Vauxhall.

Councillor Demirci said that it was easier to implement sustainable drainage solutions to new builds, however, older properties were more difficult to retrofit. She asked whether there were any solutions planned to retrofit older properties and estates. Kevin Reid said that there were opportunities to deal with older estates, through diverting rain water from drains for instance. He said that there were limits as to what could be done in the first few years, but landlords and building managers could be encouraged and persuaded to carry out some of this work.

Councillor Whitehead said that the borough of Sutton came under the GLA's Outer London Fund (OLF) scheme. She said that rain gardens in the high streets had made a big difference in helping to prevent surface water flooding. Kevin Reid said that borough high streets presented more complex opportunities due to the use of the space. Councillor Coleridge said that some parts of London had better drainage than others. He said that the areas of London that were really under pressure from drainage problems needed to be mapped out. The Chair said that a "heat map" had already been produced. Kevin Reid confirmed that Thames Water had been working on a "drainage map" of where sewerage capacity was most under pressure. He said that it would not be beneficial to concentrate on projects that were the most difficult to retrofit, and then make little progress.

The Chair suggested that the LSDAP be reviewed by the TEC Executive Sub Committee on an annual basis, as the first phase of this was critical. Also, all TEC members should be written to in order to get as many responses as possible to the consultation. Katharina Winbeck said that London Councils' officers had already helped to write the plan and so would not be submitting a formal response to the consultation.

The Chair thanked Kevin Reid for updating the TEC Executive on the LSDAP.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted and discussed the London Sustainable Drainage Action Plan report;
- Agreed that a report on the review of the LSDAP would be presented to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on an annual basis; and
- Agreed to write to all TEC members with a view to receiving as many responses to the LSDAP consultation as possible.

4. Draft Response to TfL's Private Hire Regulations Review

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that provided members with the drafted response to TfL's Private Hire Regulations Review which was looking at a series of measures to regulate the private hire industry.

The Chair asked what the current position was regarding the recent court case involving TfL and Uber. Nick Lester-Davis said that the main High Court challenge was to ascertain whether a Smart phone application was the same as a taxi metre. The High Court ruled that the app was not a taxi metre, resulting in the Uber model being lawful. The issuing of licensing was now down to TfL through the Public Carriage Office (PCO). Nick Lester-Davis said that the report asked a number of questions that TEC Executive members needed to give a steer on regarding TfL's Private Hire Regulations Review. The Chair said that TfL could impose a number of regulations which Uber could then take to court and challenge.

Jennifer Sibley (Principal Policy Officer, London Councils) said that members did not have to respond to every question raised in the report. The more important questions were as follows: Q2 – operator to provide booking confirmation to the passenger five minutes prior to the journey, Q5 – operator to provide a pre-book facility of up to seven days in advance, Q6 – TfL proposes to no longer issue licenses for in-venue operators ("satellite offices") or temporary events, and Q8 – operators to not show vehicles being available for immediate hire, either visibly or via an app.

Councillor Smith said that taxi firms were developing their own apps (specific to their own individual taxi companies) in response to Uber. This could be carried out by an app or on a website, whilst still maintaining a phone line. Councillor Coleridge said that the most important issue was to protect the public. Councillor Usher said that that majority of the public were in favour of having an app to order a private hire vehicle. Councillor Acton voiced concern about the influx of these private hire vehicles.

Councillor Usher said that she was not in favour of the five minute waiting time (Q2). Councillor Coleridge voiced concern over how this would be enforced and monitored. Councillor Smith said that all the data would have to be monitored to ensure this was happening. Councillor Anderson said that there was an issue of not knowing what standards private hire vehicle adhered to. Councillor Demirci said that private hire vehicles went through the same standards as taxis. Councillor Smith also felt that the five minute waiting time would be unenforceable. Councillor Acton said that regulations for private hire vehicles were needed. Councillor Whitehead said that booking taxis from home also needed to be supported (eg if people needed to go to hospital).

Councillor Smith said that the public needed to know details of the car, license plate number and driver they were being sent. Councillor Demirci confirmed that Uber did provide these details. The Chair asked about the proposals concerning revoking the vehicle if the driver had their licence revoked. Nick Lester-Davis said that problems could occur if the vehicle was used by multiple drivers.

The Chair said that standards needed to be maintained and safety was key, therefore the five minute waiting period should not be supported. He asked whether members would prefer a seven or fourteen day pre-booking period (Q5). Nick Lester-Davis said that when Taxicard holders booked a cab fourteen days in advance, the operator logged the request but did not find them a taxi until half an hour before they were due

to be picked up. Councillor Acton said that she supported a fourteen day pre-booking facility.

The Chair asked whether members were in agreement with TfL's proposal to no longer issue licenses for in-venue operators or temporary events. Councillor Acton voiced concern that members of the public would approach and use illegal touts, should licenses not be issued at these events. She said that it needed to be stipulated that these were local firms and higher regulations were needed for the licensing system. The Chair agreed and said that more problems with touting would occur if there were not any temporary private hire offices. Councillor Anderson agreed that some form of standards/system should be in place. Councillor Acton said that the way private hire vehicles were licenced needed to be tightened-up in order to keep illegal vehicles away from these events.

The Chair said that Q8 ("Operators must not show vehicles being available for immediate hire, visibly or by app") related to Q2 and should also not be supported. Councillor Acton said that this put taxis at a disadvantage. Councillor Coleridge said that people used private hire vehicles because they were cheaper than taxis. Councillor Anderson said that taxis did not have a choice in the fare setting regime. Councillor Coleridge said that the Mayor of London was responsible for setting the cost per mile for taxis. Councillor Acton said she felt that the cost per mile should be set on a similar level to private hire vehicles in order to make this fairer to taxis. Councillor Anderson said that this issue needed to be addressed otherwise taxis could be driven out of business. Councillor Usher also felt that the cost per mile for taxis needed to be reduced.

The Chair said that the Vice Chairs and himself would sign this off by 23 December 2015 and members should send in any further comments before this deadline.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed that TEC Executive members did not support a 5 minute waiting time (Question 2), and as a consequence, members could not support the proposal in Question 8, regarding operators not showing vehicles as available for immediate hire;
- Agreed to respond to the consultation stating that operators should offer a facility to book cabs for up to 14 days in advance, as opposed to 7 days (Question 5);
- Agreed to oppose TfL's proposals in Question 6, and therefore express support for the continuation of the licensing of in-venue operators ("satellite offices") and temporary events, but state that TfL should increase its enforcement of such sites, in order to keep illegal touts away from the event site and improve awareness amongst the public of the need to pre-book private hire vehicles from such a venue; and
- Noted that the final consultation response would be signed off by the Chair and Vice-Chairs of TEC, ahead of the consultation deadline of 23 December 2015

5. Transport and Mobility Services Information

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the London Councils' Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Q1 and Q2 of 2015/16.

Spencer Palmer (Director, Transport and Mobility, London Councils) introduced the report. He informed members that the "grey" areas in the performance data could not be completed owing to the tribunal service transition to a new computer system, a new contractor and move to Chancery Exchange. This information would be available in the next performance report that went to the TEC Executive.

Spencer Palmer said that the target had been missed for the "average number of days (from receipt) to decide RUCA appeals" ("red" rating, page 2) because the Chief Adjudicator had not scheduled any personal hearings for the first two months from the move to Chancery Exchange and the new system. The target for the "hearing dates to be issued to appellants within 5 working days of receipt" ("red" rating) had been missed because there were errors with a number of early letters generated by the new system, which had to be checked and corrected before they were sent out. The target for the "number of calls answered within 30 seconds to the end of the automated message" ("red" rating) had also been missed because of the transition to the new IT contract. Improvements would be made to performance against these indicators in the coming months.

Councillor Demirci voiced concern at the large backlog of appeals that the borough of Hackney was currently experiencing. She asked whether the problems experienced with the IT system had been resolved. Spencer Palmer said that training with local authorities had taken place and they were now becoming accustomed to the new system. Councillor Demirci said that the reports were still not coming through and this had impacted on their appeals success rate. Spencer Palmer said that where appeals decisions may have been affected by system transition issues and delays, a number of local authorities had requested a review and, as a consequence of this, the cases had been reopened by the Adjudicators. He confirmed that the majority of issues being experienced by enforcement authorities had been resolved and that additional training and support had been provided to relevant Hackney staff. However, ongoing support would continue to be available for all authorities. Spencer Palmer said that the new "direct electronic transfer" system would be in operation by summer 2016 and would make the system much more straightforward to use.

Councillor Anderson said that there was a lack of geographical spread with regards to enforcement. Spencer Palmer said that this report was concerned with performance of the Tribunal Service as a whole and did not provide any detail relating to individual authorities' appeals. A more detailed, Chief Adjudicator's Annual Report, from the Tribunal Service went to Committee on 15 October 2015.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the Transport and Mobility Services performance data for Q1 and Q2 of 2015, and the explanations for the "grey" and "red" areas in the performance data.

6. Retiming Freight and Deliveries – Proposed Memorandum of Understanding

This report was withdrawn.

7. Appeals Hearing Centre Relocation

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that provided members with an analysis for the project for the relocation of the appeals hearing centre from Angel Square, N1 to Chancery Exchange, EC4, including a breakdown of the final project net cost of £981,469

Frank Smith introduced the report and said that two major events had occurred simultaneously, namely, the move of the appeals hearing centre from Angel Square to Chancery Exchange, and the change of contract for the appeals IT system, which made the management of this project more complex. Frank Smith informed members that London Councils did not have any “in-house” expertise to deal with the refurbishment project at Chancery Exchange, and, therefore, engaged a project manager via a framework agreement. He said that, overall, the project went well and the report was just for noting. The Chair congratulated London Councils’ officers for delivering the project efficiently and under budget.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the contents of the report.

8. TEC Month 6 Revenue Forecast 2015/16

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that outlined actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of September 2015 for TEC, and provided a forecast of the outturn position for 2015/16. At the half-year stage, a surplus of £616,000 was forecast over the budgeted figure.

Frank Smith introduced the Month 6 Revenue Forecast report. He informed members that some new cost pressures had arisen since the last monitoring report. Firstly, a full year’s contribution to overheads from the British Parking Association in respect of the POPLA contract had been budgeted for, but that the contract had ended on 30 September 2015. Secondly, the leasehold costs for the new premises at Chancery Exchange had to be paid for from February 2015, rather than the budgeted date of 1 June 2015 and there were additional costs associated with the new IT system at Chancery Exchange. Frank Smith said that some of the additional IT costs were potentially not covered by the new IT contractor, although negotiations were on-going in respect of this issue. He said that the main objective for London Councils was to get the appeals service “up and running” as quickly as possible and to provide a smooth transition for appellants and all other stakeholders.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted the projected surplus of £616,000 for the year, and the forecast underspend of £1.545 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in the report; and
- Noted the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraphs 5-6 of the report, and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee included in paragraphs 7-8.

9. Draft Revenue Budget and Borough Charges 2016/17

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2016/17.

Frank Smith introduced the report and informed members that this was the draft revenue budget report that would be presented to the full TEC meeting in December 2015 for approval, subject to any changes recommended by the Sub-Committee.

Frank Smith informed members that it is proposed that the administration costs for the Freedom Pass would now be fully covered by the revenue received from replacing lost/damaged passes. In respect of the unit cost charge to boroughs for parking appeals, there would be further cost benefits to boroughs once the volume of electronic appeals increased. Frank Smith said that the proposed budget strategy had already been considered by London Councils' Executive on 17 November 2015, and that it had endorsed the proposals in this report.

Frank Smith said that there had recently been questions from members as to what was a reasonable level for TEC reserves. This had historically been set at between 2 to 3% (as per broad guidance from CIPFA over 10 years ago). It was now clear that this benchmark was no longer valid, primarily owing to the volatility of TEC trading services, which could vary widely between financial years. Frank Smith said that after considering recent guidance and research, and having reviewed the specific operations of TEC, he now recommended an uncommitted general reserve of between 10 to 15% of operating and trading expenditure (paragraph 61 of the report).

Frank Smith confirmed that a sum of £10,000 would be repatriated to each borough from TEC uncommitted reserves, in the form of a one-off payment (paragraph 54 of the report). He asked members if they would be content to transfer another £500,000 to the specific reserve to fund the cost of the 2020 Freedom Pass renewal. An excess reserve figure of £427,000 (over the new 15% higher range benchmark) would, therefore, be left if this transfer was agreed. Frank Smith said that the Committee had managed significant recent unforeseen events through the use of uncommitted TEC reserves, very successfully. Councillor Coleridge said he considered that a 10 to 15% level for TEC reserves was the right level.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee recommended that the Main Committee approve at the meeting on 10 December 2015:

- The changes in individual levies and charges for 2016/17 as follows:
 - The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2015/16 - £1,500; paragraph 37);
 - The total Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.4681 which would be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2014/15 (2015/16 - £0.4333 per PCN; paragraphs 35-36);
 - No charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass Administration Charge, which was covered by replacement Freedom Pass income (2015/16 - £8,674; paragraph 16);
 - The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,182 in total (2015/16 - £338,182; paragraphs 17-19).

- No charge to boroughs in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which was fully covered by estimated PCN income (2015/16 – nil charge; paragraphs 20-21);
 - The Parking and Traffic Appeals Charge of £33.32 per appeal or £29.90 per appeal where electronic evidence was provided by the enforcing authority (2015/16 - £33.40/£29.97 per appeal). In addition, a new differential charge was proposed for hearing Statutory Declarations of £28.17 for hard copy submissions and £27.49 for electronic submissions (2015/16 - £33.40/£29.97 per SD) (paragraph 28);
 - Congestion Charging Appeals – to be recovered on a full cost recovery basis, subject to the continuing agreement of the GLA under the contract arrangements that run until December 2016 (paragraph 29);
 - The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.31 per transaction (2015/16 - £8.60; paragraphs 33-34);
 - The TRACE (Fax) Charge of £7.48 per transaction (2015/16 - £8.80; paragraphs 33-34); and
 - The TEC¹ Charge of £0.17 per transaction (2015/16 - £0.20; paragraphs 33-34);
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £382.284 million for 2016/17, as detailed in Appendix A;
 - On the basis of the agreement of the above proposed charges, the provisional gross revenue income budget of £381.641 million for 2016/17, with a recommended transfer of £643,000 from uncommitted Committee reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B;
 - From proposed reserves of £643,000, a sum of £10,000 be repatriated to each borough (and TfL) from TEC uncommitted reserves, amounting to £340,000 in total, in the form of a one-off payment, as per paragraph 54;
 - The proposed changes to the Committee's formal policy on reserves, as detailed in paragraphs 56-63; and
 - Agreed to formally recommend to TEC full Committee in December 2015 that a further £500,000 is transferred from uncommitted reserves to the specific reserve to fund the cost of the 2020 Freedom Pass renewal.

The TEC Executive-Sub Committee was also asked to note the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 52-55 and Table 9 of this report and the estimated total charges to individual boroughs for 2016/17, as set out in Appendix C.1.

10. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 15 September 2015 (for agreeing)

The minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 15 September 2015 were agreed as an accurate record.

¹ The system that allows boroughs to register any unpaid parking tickets with the Traffic Enforcement Centre and apply for bailiff's warrants.

11. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 15 October 2015 (for noting)

The minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 15 October were noted

Members of the press and public were asked to leave the room whilst the Committee considered the Exempt part of the agenda.

The meeting finished at 11:10am