

LONDON COUNCILS' TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT EXECUTIVE SUB COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on **12 February 2015** at 09:30am, in Meeting Room 4, London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL

Present:

Councillor Julian Bell	LB Ealing (Chair)
Councillor Don Massey	LB Bexley
Councillor Claudia Webbe	LB Islington
Councillor Mark Williams	LB Southwark
Councillor Caroline Usher	LB Wandsworth
Michael Welbank	City of London

1. Declarations of Interests

There were no additional declarations of interest.

2. Apologies for Absence & Deputies

Apologies for absence were received from the following members: Councillor Chris Bond (LB Enfield), Councillor Tim Coleridge (RB Kensington & Chelsea), Councillor Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney) and Councillor Colin Hall (LB Sutton).

No deputies were present at the meeting.

3. Roads Task Force – Street Types Programme

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, TfL) and Jeanette Baartman (Road Network Priorities Lead, TfL) gave a brief presentation on the Mayor's "Roads Task Force (RTF) - Street Types Programme". Lilli Matson said that "one size did not fit all" with regards to strategic and local roads and how different roads performed. She said that Jeanette Baartman was leading on this work.

Jeanette Baartman made the following comments:

- The RTF in the summer 2013 recommended that TfL worked with the boroughs to develop a Street Types framework. A pilot took place with five London boroughs to develop methodology, along with a Senior Stakeholder Group in 2014. An engagement programme with all 32 boroughs and the City of London took place from October 2014 to deliver work through a series of workshops.
- A set of planning tools (for outputs) were devised, along with maps to look at current and future street types. Performance issues (strategic and local) was an important tool
- Workshops looking at the process for classifying street types were taking place and included TfL, the boroughs and an expert facilitator that was completely independent

- A great deal of data/data sets had been produced and joint knowledge was being brought together
- The intended outcome for Street Types was to discuss together (TfL/boroughs) about deployment and to enhance the understanding of the role of different streets in London. This was based on a common set of nine “street family types” (a 3x3 grid). City streets were different to other streets and not all street types might need to be changed. Some streets might be high on the *road* function, but low on the *place* function
- TfL was working with the boroughs to capture all the analysis, including issues like the different types of roads and how they were used at different times of the year
- Borough responses had been very positive. Some boroughs wanted to be a “walking and cycling” borough, whereas others felt that they would be unable to cope with growth areas *and* traffic. Most were content that the RTF Street Type work was now all under one umbrella.
- Workshops had taken place with 20 boroughs to look at current Street Types. Work had also been carried out to consider future Street Types. All this work would continue to be rolled out
- Next steps would be to review the strategic network. Boroughs and TfL would be working together on how to use these assessments (ie maps). TfL was looking at having a better understanding of the road network and to come up with suitable objectives. This would enable TfL to do a better job
- TfL intended to take this work back to the RTF Sub-Regional Forum meetings that TfL attended with the boroughs in autumn 2015
- Street Types were already referred to in the LIP guidance. TfL and the boroughs were now looking at the road network in a holistic and comprehensive manner

Q & As

Councillor Mark Williams asked whether opportunity area work had been taken into account, along with the action plan and London Cycle Design Standards (LCDS). Jeanette Baartman said that the opportunity work had been taken into account. TfL was trying to understand land use and the impact on shared networks. Residential housing also caused an impact on the network (although this might be minimal). Lilli Matson said that the LCDS part referred specifically to Street Types. There was a need for greater segregation; therefore Street Types were embedded into the LCDS.

Michael Welbank said that the Roads Task Force (RTF) was the most coherent thinking about roads carried out so far. He said that he could see all the difficulties regarding this, but it was important to keep this work going. Lilli Matson said that this represented a new way of working with the boroughs and looking at prioritising the road network. Non performing roads were also being looked at, and if there was a case for doing something differently with these roads.

The Chair said that most boroughs were accepting the principals of the RTF and Street Types. Jeanette Baartman said that TfL and the boroughs were working together and having conversations that had not taken place before (eg road maps). She said that this essentially required taking a different look at the network. Lilli Matson informed members that there was no mandate for the boroughs to have to be involved in this work.

Councillor Don Massey, regarding the place/grid, said that there was a need to ensure that the Street Types work and outcomes did not become too data intensive. He felt that a more formal structure needed to be around so that the data was viewed

in a more positive way. Lilli Matson said that any level in the 3x3 grid (including any gaps) was there to help make an informed decision. She said that she appreciated the point made on data being too intensive and this needed to be monitored.

Councillor Williams said that he agreed with the comments that had been made. He asked whether the data that was produced by TfL could be used as leverage to request more investment in certain roads. Michael Welbank said that there limits to the amount of investment that could be made. Jeanette Baartman said that money was finite, as was the road network, and only a certain amount of projects could be resourced. Lilli Matson asked members to contact Jeanette Baartman or herself if they had any queries regarding the Roads Task Force Street Types Programme. The Chair thanked TfL for the presentation.

4. Transport & Mobility Services Performance Information

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the London Councils' Transport and Mobility performance information for Quarter 2 2014/15 and Quarter 3 2014/15.

The Chair said that there were two "red" ratings in the report that members had already been made aware of. Spencer Palmer said that additional staff were in place to deal with Freedom Pass renewal calls but there had been an unexpected increase in business as usual calls, including a significant number of people not choosing the correct renewal line option. Although this had had an impact on the number of calls that were not answered within 30 seconds, performance was now back to the agreed target (85%).

Councillor Usher asked whether all the Freedom Pass renewal letters had now been rolled out, as she was yet to receive hers. Spencer Palmer said he would investigate the matter as all the letters had been dispatched by mid-December 2014. He said that London Councils did have to rely on the postal service for the dispatch of these letters and a number of recipients had moved home. Spencer Palmer said that he was not aware of any significant problems with the receipt of letters and Nick Lester-Davis added that London Councils received a regular breakdown of calls, and this showed how many were enquiries from pass holders asking where their renewal letter was. Pass holders whose pass was expiring in March 2015 were advised to ring the call centre and request another letter. Nick Lester-Davis informed members that pass holders who could not complete the renewal process on time would be able to use their old passes for a further six weeks after 31 March 2015, where they would be able to "flash" their passes only.

Councillor Massey asked whether any issues involving certain post codes were being picked up on. Spencer Palmer confirmed that this was monitored. Nick Lester-Davis said that he expected between 10 to 15% of pass holders not to renew their passes. He said that approximately 80% of pass holders in boroughs on the edge of London had already renewed their passes. Two thirds of pass holders in four boroughs in central London had renewed their passes. Councillor Massey enquired about the pass renewal situation in the borough of Camden. Nick Lester-Davis said that Camden had followed a different approach to others and had carried out their own continued eligibility checks before requesting the automatic renewal of passes for their residents.

Councillor Williams suggested that a report could come to Committee to look at whether boroughs could save money by following the Camden approach through

better sharing of data. Spencer Palmer said that this was already planned to be looked at in the future. Councillor Williams said that council tax records were always very accurate. Councillor Usher said the Department for Work and Pensions data was also a good source of information. The Chair asked if any information could be reported back from the London borough of Sutton's renewal process, which had been carried out online only. Spencer Palmer agreed to report back any findings and lessons learned from the current renewal, together with any recommended changes for future renewals.

With regard to the Road User Congestion Charge appeals, Michael Welbank said that the rating for the "average number of days to decide appeals - from receipt" (page 2) would always remain "red" owing to the criteria that was used. Nick Lester-Davis explained that the all the cases were grouped together and the Chief Adjudicator only scheduled adjudicator time on days when personal cases were being decided. This meant that postal cases were not taken on these days, resulting in an increase in waiting times for decisions. Councillor Massey suggested separating out the personal and postal cases, to give a more accurate reflection of the number of days to decide Road User Charging appeals.

Councillor Webbe asked whether there was any particular reason why the percentage of London Lorry Control Scheme appeals that were allowed had increased to 58%, when target was less than 40%. Nick Lester-Davis said that the numbers involved here were too small to be of any significance. Also, the operators and drivers often sent in further information to support their appeals after the initial representation stage had passed, and a number of these appeals were then not contested, if the additional information was adequate.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted the London Councils' Transport and Mobility performance information for Quarter 2 2014/15 and Quarter 3 2014/15, and the explanations given for the two "red" ratings in the report, and
- Agreed to report back to Committee with any findings and lessons learned from the current renewal project, including how the London borough of Sutton's online only renewal process had gone.

5. Traffic Signals Budget 2015/16

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that set out the cost to boroughs of maintaining traffic signals in London in 2015/16 and described a significant saving of 14.4%, compared to the current year, as a result of a major retender process.

The Chair noted the significant savings of 14.4%. Spencer Palmer said that London Councils was very pleased with these savings, and to present to members a very positive Traffic Signals Budget report for 2015/16

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed the cost to boroughs for maintaining traffic signals in London in 2015/16, which was £10,863,463.73 - a significant 14.4 per cent decrease on

the final 2014/15 cost of £12,688,395.73, achieved through a major retender process described in the report, and

- Agreed that this cost be apportioned between boroughs, as shown in the table in the report

6. Application to Approve to Commence Enforcement of Moving Traffic Contraventions in the London Borough of Bexley

This report was withdrawn.

7. Month 9 TEC Revenue Forecast 2014/15

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that outlined the actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of December 2014 for TEC and provided a forecast of the outturn position for 2014/15. At this stage, a surplus of £418,000 was forecast over the budget figure. In addition, total expenditure in respect of Taxicard trips taken by scheme members was forecast to underspend by £1.852 million, if current trip volumes to date continued for the remainder of the year. The borough proportion of this underspend was projected to be a net figure of £1.681 million, with £171,000 accruing to TfL

Frank Smith informed members that there was a projected underspend of £418,000 for the year, and a series of firm trends were now emerging. He said that there were a number of reasons for this, including an underspend of £155,000 of payments to the independent bus operators, receipts from the Lorry Control PCN income was forecast to exceed the budget by £102,000, and for the 2015 Freedom Pass issue exercise, expenditure was projected to be £200,000 less than the budget provision (these funds would be returned to TEC reserves at the end of the process). Frank Smith said that receipts from the administration of the Health Emergency Badge Scheme (HEB) was forecast to exceed the budget of £30,000 by £26,000.

Frank Smith said that the final bullet point on page 3 of the report highlighted the average monthly cash balance held over this nine month period. Councillor Massey had asked if monthly TEC cash balances could be incorporated in future budget reports at the TEC Executive meeting held on 13 November 2014.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted the projected surplus of £418,000 for the year, plus the forecast underspend of £1.852 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in this report; and
- Noted the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraphs 5-7 of this report and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee included in paragraphs 8-10.

8. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 11 December 2014 (for noting)

Item 11 Freedom Pass 2015 Reissue, (page 9): It was agreed to delete the word “outside” in the sentence “The London Borough of Bexley had the highest level of renewal *outside* London, and replace with “in outer” London.

Subject to the above amendment, the TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 11 December 2014.

9. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 13 November 2014

The minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 13 November 2014 were agreed as being an accurate record.

10. Any Other Business

It was noted that the TEC Main meeting had been rescheduled from 12 March to the *19 March 2015*. Timings of the pre-meets and Main TEC meeting remain the same.

It was agreed that Alan Edwards would send the TfL presentation on “Roads Task Force – Street Types Programme” to TEC members after the meeting.

The meeting finished at 10.26am