**LONDON COUNCILS’ TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT**

**EXECUTIVE SUB COMMITTEE**

Minutes of a meeting of the London Councils’ Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on **11 February 2016** at 09:30am, at London Councils, Meeting Room 4, 1st Floor, 59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL

**Present:**

Councillor Julian Bell LB Ealing (Chair)

Councillor Feryal Demirci LB Hackney

Councillor Tim Coleridge RB Kensington & Chelsea

Councillor Alan Smith LB Lewisham

Councillor Jill Whitehead LB Sutton

Councillor Darren Merrill LB Southwark

Councillor Heather Acton City of Westminster

Michael Welbank City of London

Marianne Fredericks City of London

**1. Declarations of Interests**

There were no additional declarations of interest, other than the declarations previously supplied.

**2. Apologies for Absence & Deputies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Alex Sawyer (LB Bexley), Councillor Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield), Councillor Claudia Webbe (LB Islington) and Councillor Caroline Usher (LB Wandsworth).

**3. Transport and Mobility Performance Data**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the London Councils’ Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Q2 and Q3 of 2015/16.

Spencer Palmer (Director, Transport and Mobility, London Councils) introduced the report and distributed to members an amended set of Q2 figures The amendments to the Q2 figures, that should have been presented to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 24 November 2015, were as follows:

*Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) - Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)* should have read 32 days and not 40 days

*ETA - Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)* should have read 38 days and not 44 days

*Road User Charging Adjudicators (RUCA) - Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)* should have read 39 days and not 27 days

*RUCA - Average number of appeals (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)*

Should have read 50 days and not 32 days

Spencer Palmer informed members that the “red” rating for the “% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time” was because the new system allowed Adjudicators to start viewing evidence before recording the start of the hearing. He explained that changes were being made to address this and the reported performance would improve significantly in the future. The “red” rating (89%) for “hearing dates to be issued to appellants within 5 working days of receipt” was due to additional checking still being carried out before they went out. This would also improve in due course.

Councillor Coleridge asked if there was a code of practice for when adjudicators were obliged to start a hearing. Spencer Palmer said that Adjudicators had been given advice on how to operate the new system while they were trying to amend the system so that the appeals were recorded from start to finish. Councillor Smith clarified that this was a failure of the system to record, rather than anything else. Spencer Palmer said that the new contractors were still working on the reporting and management information and therefore figures may still be subject to change.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the report and the amendments to the Q2 figures, as tabled at the meeting

**4. OLEV Go Ultra Low City Scheme**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that informed members of the announcement that London was one of the four winning cities in the Office for Low Emission Vehicles “Go Ultra Low City Scheme”. London had been awarded the sum of £13,000,000 in capital funding and £240,000 in revenue funding over the period of 2016-2020. It was suggested that a Programme Board and a Working Group be established to drive the implementation of the bid proposals.

Steve Craddock (Principal Policy Officer, London Councils) introduced the report and informed members that TfL would be receiving the funding from OLEV and would be considering what would constitute capital expenditure and what would constitute revenue under the terms of the grant.

Steve Craddock said that there were four elements to the bid, as outlined in paragraph 2 of the report. The main recommendation was to put in place the governance arrangements to provide an initial decision on which elements should receive which funding. TEC representation on the new Programme Board would be the TEC Chair and the Labour and Conservative vice chairs. The Programme Board would steer the implementation of the bid.

Councillor Coleridge congratulated TEC on the £13,000,000 OLEV award to London. He said that one of the issues would be on how this money would be divided out among the boroughs. Councillor Coleridge said that the revenue funding of £240,000 over 4 years did not amount to very much. Katharina Winbeck (Head of Transport, Environment and Infrastructure) said that London Councils was looking into the possibility of match funding with TfL and other partners. Steve Craddock informed members that the working group would comprise of London Councils and a number of boroughs. A wider level of consultation would also take place with all London boroughs on key decisions. Nick Lester-Davis said that it had been agreed with TfL that it would be an officer working group sitting below a steering group that included members..

Michael Welbank said that efforts to tackle the ongoing revenue needed to be maintained. Steve Craddock informed members that there was more work that needed to be carried out on this, especially with regards to the revenue/capital split. Frank Smith said that London Councils/TEC could not receive capital allocation, and were therefore not accountable. TfL, on the other hand, could receive this funding. Councillor Smith felt that staffing needed to be kept to a minimum in order to keep costs down. He said that some of the funding should be spent on buying EVs for people to try first, as this would be the best way of selling EVs. Councillor Smith said that Source London was already putting in charging points. The Chair said that the proposal in the bid to support the electrification of the Car Club network could help to get people accustomed to EVs. Councillor Demirci said that this was a great achievement for London. She said that work needed to be targeted in areas where there was poor air quality. Councillor Acton said that the City of Westminster had already been carrying out trials for residents sharing EV charging points. She said that Westminster had been fully involved in the bid, and she hoped that it would be included on the steering group. Councillor Acton voiced concern at the number of vehicles on the roads in London. She said that 1 in 30 were private vehicles, with the majority being trade.

Councillor Whitehead said that the price of EV was an issue, with one of the cheapest being a Nissan “Note” at £16,000. She said that the issue of buying second hand EVs needed to be investigated further. Councillor Smith said that the battery packs on the cheaper EVs did not last as long as the more expensive versions. He said that only the luxury end of EVs appeared to be promoted first.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

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

**5. Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2015/16**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that outlined actual income and expenditure against the approved budget as at 31 December 2015 for TEC, and provided a forecast of the outturn position for 2015/16. At this stage, a surplus of £562,000 was forecast over the budget figure.

Frank Smith (Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils) introduced the report. He informed members that this would be the last financial report for the year, with a forecasted surplus at the year-end of £562,000 currently being forecasted. The variances from budget, highlighted in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the report were for reasons reported to this Committee earlier in the year and some were a result of the change of parking managed services provider from Capita to Northgate. Processes were being established to rectify these issues, which primarily concerned data accuracy.

Frank Smith said that the Table 2 (paragraph 5) showed the projected level of uncommitted reserves through to 31 March 2017. The general reserves were forecast to be £2.158million, which equated to 18.5% of budgeted operating and trading expenditure of £11.673million for the current year. This figure exceeded the higher end of the agreed benchmark of reserves, which was between 10-15%.

Councillor Coleridge asked whether the “total income” figure of 2,712 in the bottom of the “Variance” column in Table 1 should be in brackets, and apologised for the error. Frank Smith confirmed that this figure should not be in brackets. Councillor Coleridge asked whether the additional surplus in TEC reserves (3.5%) should be returned to boroughs. The Chair said that the next Freedom Pass renewal was due to take place in 2020 and it would be beneficial to keep any extra funds in the reserves. He also said that TEC trading income was volatile and open to fluctuations. Frank Smith confirmed that a one-off payment of £340,000 was being returned to the boroughs (Table 2) in 2016/17. He said that a great deal of the volatility was due to the change in contractors, which in turn had presented some data recording issues. Also, adjudicators’ throughput to hear appeals differed, as some appeals took longer than others. Frank Smith said that consistency throughout the adjudicators was needed when it came to the time taken to hear appeals. Nick Lester-Davis said that there was also the issue regarding the number of appeals that boroughs did not contest. The non-contested rate had been 30%, but this had now been reduced to a more respectable 18%.

Councillor Smith felt that the 3.5% additional surplus should remain in TEC reserves. The Chair said that there would be further opportunities to decide what to do with the TEC reserves, especially when the outturn for the year is known. Councillor Coleridge said that the budget/surplus was a good position for TEC to be in. Frank Smith said that TEC finances were in a fairly stable position, which would be clearer once the teething issues with the new contractors, Northgate, were ironed out.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

* Agreed that the “Total Income” figure of 2712, at the bottom of the “Variance” column (Table 1 in the report), should not be in brackets;
* Noted the projected surplus of £562,000 for the year, plus the forecast underspend of £1.395 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in the report; and
* Noted the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraph 5 of the report, and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee in paragraphs 6-7

 **6. Minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 10 December 2015 (for noting)**

*Item 4: TfL and Borough Bus Service Engagement, Q and As (page 4, 1st paragraph):*

It was noted that LB Sutton had only received one new bus from TfL, which had consequently broken down, and the minutes needed to be amended to reflect this.

Subject to this amendment, the minutes of the TEC main meeting on 10 December 2015 were noted.

**7. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting held on 24 November 2015 (for agreeing)**

*Item 3: “London Sustainable Drainage Action Plan”, Q and As, page 3 (paragraph 3):*

It was agreed to remove “the high streets” in the sentence “She (Cllr Whitehead) said that rain gardens in the high streets had made a big difference” and replace with “district centres”.

Subject to the above amendment, the minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 24 November 2015 were agreed as an accurate record.

**The meeting finished at 10:05am**