

## London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

### 11 December 2014

Minutes of a meeting of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee held on Thursday 11 December 2014 at 2:30pm in the Conference Suite, London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL

#### Present:

Council	Councillor
Barking and Dagenham	Cllr Cameron Geddes
Barnet	Cllr Dean Cohen
Bexley	Cllr Don Massey
Brent	Cllr George Crane
Bromley	Cllr Colin Smith
Camden	
Croydon	Cllr Kathy Bee
Ealing	Cllr Julian Bell (Chair)
Enfield	Cllr Vicki Pite (Deputy)
Greenwich	
Hackney	Cllr Feryal Demirci
Hammersmith and Fulham	Cllr Wesley Harcourt
Haringey	Cllr Stuart McNamara
Harrow	Cllr Barry Kendler (Deputy)
Havering	Cllr Robert Benham
Hillingdon	
Hounslow	<b>Apologies</b>
Islington	
Kensington and Chelsea	Cllr Tim Coleridge
Kingston Upon Thames	Cllr David Cunningham
Lambeth	<b>Apologies</b>
Lewisham	Cllr Alan Smith
Merton	Cllr Nick Draper
Newham	
Redbridge	
Richmond Upon Thames	Cllr Stephen Speak
Southwark	Cllr Mark Williams
Sutton	Cllr Colin Hall
Tower Hamlets	
Waltham Forest	Cllr Clyde Loakes
Wandsworth	Cllr Caroline Usher
City of Westminster	<b>Apologies</b>
City of London	
Transport for London	Michele Dix

## **1. Declaration of Interests**

### Freedom Pass Holders/60+ Oyster Cards

Cllr George Crane (LB Brent), Cllr Barry Kendler (LB Harrow) and Cllr Caroline Usher (LB Wandsworth)

### North London Waste Authority

Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney) and Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Waltham Forest)

### Western Riverside Waste Authority

Cllr Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham)

### West London Waste Authority

Cllr David Cunningham (RB Kingston-upon-Thames)

### South London Waste Authority

Cllr Kathy Bee (LB Croydon) and Cllr Colin Hall (LB Sutton)

### London Waste & Recycling Board

Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Waltham Forest)

### Car Club

Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney) and Cllr Colin Hall (LB Sutton)

### Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee

Cllr Cameron Geddes (LB Barking & Dagenham)

Cllr Dean Cohen (LB Barnet)

Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney)

Cllr Tim Coleridge (RB Kensington & Chelsea)

Cllr Nick Draper (LB Merton)

Cllr Mark Williams (LB Southwark)

Cllr Stuart McNamara (LB Haringey)

### London Cycling Campaign

Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney)

### Director of "Living Streets" (non-pecuniary)

Cllr Colin Hall (LB Sutton)

## **2. Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies**

### Apologies:

Cllr Chris Bond (LB Enfield)  
Cllr Varsha Parmar (LB Harrow)  
Cllr Amrit Mann (LB Hounslow)  
Cllr Jenny Brathwaite (LB Lambeth)  
Cllr Heather Acton (City of Westminster)

### Deputies:

Cllr Vicki Pite (LB Enfield)  
Cllr Barry Kendler (LB Harrow)

## **3. Flood Risk Management in London and the Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (TRFCC) – Introduction by Amanda Nobbs (Chair of the TRFCC)**

The Committee received a report that outlined the business case to enable members to make a more informed decision on the flood levy for the Thames catchment area, as requested by members at the TEC meeting on 16 October 2014.

The Chair introduced the item and highlighted his meeting with the chair of the Thames RFCC in November where a closer working relationship was discussed. He said that it would be beneficial if members that represented TEC on the TRFCC could report back to Committee to keep boroughs informed of any flooding issues affecting London on a regular basis. He then handed over to Amanda Nobbs to introduce the business case provided by the Environment Agency.

Amanda Nobbs (Chair of the Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee) made the following comments:

- The TRFCC works with the London boroughs, Environment Agency and Thames Water to deal with flood risk
- London's population and economy were exposed to five types of flood risk
- There was currently a significant surface water flood risk and another economic recession could be triggered if a major flooding event happened in London now
- Levy investment in London was between £37 and £39million and this attracted £120million from Government, which would reduce the flood risk directly for up to 7,000 Londoners.
- An additional £60million in funds had been secured, which would reduce the risk of flooding directly to over 30,000 properties.
- In 2015, every £1.00 invested by boroughs towards flood defences would receive an additional £4.50 in grant and aid from the Government.

### Q & As

Councillor Williams said that he was now happy to support a 1.99% increase to the flood levy, now that additional information had been forthcoming. Councillor Usher asked if London would receive any of the increased funding for flood recently announced by the Government. Amanda Nobbs confirmed that London would

receive some of this government funding, as mentioned in a recent statement by the Chancellor.

Councillor Massey informed Committee that some boroughs in the south east already paid into a flood levy and any further increases to the Thames flood levy would have to represent value for money. Councillor Coleridge felt that it was short sighted to resist the 1.99% increase to the flood levy. He said that flood defences were a major priority and needed to be supported.

Councillor McNamara said that he was happy with the business case presented by the TRFCC. He said that more money needed to be invested in flood defences and he did not want to regret putting money into this later down the line. Councillor Smith gave apologies for his late arrival to TEC. He said that, although he was appreciative of the work that had been carried out by the TRFCC, he did not accept the business case for an increase to the flood levy. Councillor Smith said that fees needed to be distributed more evenly among the boroughs, especially the non-riparian boroughs. He said that he wanted Committee to consider a 1-year fee levy settlement.

The Chair said that he was unsure of how the flood levy was allocated. Amanda Nobbs stated that the levy now included funding to deal with surface water and this therefore now represented a cut in funding in real terms. She said that the TEC members who were representatives on the TRFCC and the local authority members from outside of London decided on the investment programme. Councillor Loakes said that he was now prepared to endorse the package that was presented to TEC. Councillor Draper said that he was also happy to pay the 1.99% increase to the flood levy. He felt that the TRFCC should show the boroughs the effects that flooding had on businesses and infrastructure. Amanda Nobbs said that the TRFCC was the right forum for boroughs to discuss the risks of flooding. Councillor Hall said that the report was very helpful and that he was content to go with the 1.99% increase to the flood levy.

Councillor Williams asked whether TEC would be advising the TRFCC to go for a full 6-year settlement. Councillor Smith felt that TEC should advise on a 1-year settlement. The Chair asked whether members wanted a 1.99% increase to the flood levy over 1-year. Councillor Loakes said that it would be more beneficial to decide on a 6-year package, rather than having to have a vote every year. Amanda Nobbs said that more flood prevention could be planned and efficiencies made by adopting a longer-term agreement. Councillor Massey said that he would prefer a 1-year settlement. Amanda Nobbs said that TEC was providing a steer to the TRFCC and was not making any decisions. A decision on any increases to the flood levy would then be taken at the TRFCC along with other colleagues.

Councillor Alan Smith said that flood defence projects took longer than a year to deliver. He said that a 6-year deal would provide more certainty for flood risk planning. Councillor Williams agreed and said that a 6-year deal would provide better value for money.

A vote took place on whether TEC should recommend that the Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (TRFCC) adopt a 1.99% increase, per year, to the flood levy over a 6-year period. The results were as follows:

In Favour: 15

Against: 7 (Cllrs Smith, Cohen, Massey, Benham, Cunningham, Speak and Usher)

**Decision: The Committee:**

- Agreed to give a steer to the TRFCC to recommend a 1.99% per year increase to the flood levy over a 6-year period
- TEC noted and commented on the business case provided by the Environment Agency, and
- Noted that members of the TRFCC would determine on 21 January 2015 the investment programme and levy

**4. Draft Car Club Strategy**

The Committee considered a report on the Draft Car Club Strategy (as at Appendix 1) that had been jointly developed by members of the Car Club Coalition. The Coalition included representatives from the industry and key stakeholders including London Councils, GLA and TfL. Members were invited to comment on the Car Club Strategy.

Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy & Outcome Planning, Transport for London) introduced the report and gave a quick overview of the draft Car Club Strategy:

- Purpose of Strategy was to decide the role a Car Club could play in London, to get an agreed policy and to devise an action plan
- An early draft of the Strategy had been sent to TEC members and Strategy would also be sent to borough officers
- Car Clubs could help address a number of issues faced by London, including (i) population growth, (ii) congestion, and (iii) environmental issues. Management of parking spaces was also being considered.

**Q & As**

The Chair confirmed that a further draft would be presented to TEC at the meeting on 12 March 2015. Councillor Hall asked if this new Car Club Strategy replaced the previous strategy that was brought to TEC. Lilli Matson confirmed that this latest version was a more up-to-date version. Councillor Hall said that he would like to see more interoperability within the Car Clubs. He said that some local authorities were better at leading on this than others. One-way journeys were also trying to be achieved.

Councillor Demirci thanked TfL for the draft Car Club Strategy, which represented much needed guidance from the industry. She said that the borough of Hackney had over 10,000 car club members, and had just launched one-way trips. Councillor Demirci said that there was concern over the suggestion that car club vehicles would be exempt from paying the congestion charge, and that this should be removed from the Coalition Strategy. Councillor Williams also felt that the reference to car club vehicles being exempt from the congestion charge should be removed. He said that he was happy with a reduction in the number of trips made, but had concerns with the “point-to-point” model. More evidence was needed before this could be supported.

Councillor Coleridge felt that the Strategy did not contain enough detail on the effects of one-way car club trips. Councillor Harcourt asked how the issue of congestion around tube stations would be dealt with. He said that there was also an issue

regarding the use of electric car club vehicles and how this linked in with the availability of electric vehicle charging points. The Chair said that the point made by LB Sutton on the issue of interoperability was key.

Councillor Alan Smith said that the draft Strategy mentioned that London Councils should “encourage the boroughs to install points, access funding from the Office of Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) and grant car club access to charging infrastructure” (Action 7). He felt that the Strategy should be more forthright rather than just “encouraging” the uptake of low emission vehicles. Councillor Colin Smith said that Councillor Acton (City of Westminster) had asked him to mention that boroughs had not been involved in the work on car clubs. She also voiced concern about the number of spare curb sides.

Councillor Hall said that it was not beneficial for car clubs to replace journeys on public transport. The Chair said that he had similar concerns on point-to-point journeys. Councillor Demirci informed members that the borough of Hackney had recently launched “Drive Now” – a point-to-point service model. She said that a report would be drawn-up on this, including evidence on modal shift, and these findings would be shared with the boroughs. The Chair said that he looked forward to the contributions being made on this. A final report would be presented to TEC in March 2015.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Reviewed the Car Club Strategy, and
- Noted that concern was expressed over car club vehicles being exempt from paying the congestion charge and noted that a number of members wanted this removed from the draft Strategy

## **5. Chair’s Report**

The Committee received a report that updated members on transport and environment policy since the last TEC meeting on 16 October 2014, and provided a forward look until the next TEC meeting on 12 March 2015.

The Chair informed members that work had taken place on bus services, Crossrail 2 and air quality during this Chair’s reporting period. Councillor Kendler said that he was more concerned with the delivery, rather than the six pledges by TfL, with regards to bus services (page 2, paragraph 5 of the report). He voiced concern over problems with A & E services and schools, which were putting pressure on the system.

Councillor Harcourt said that the Fulham Broadway route was being missed out on the Chelsea to Hackney line (page 3, paragraph 16), and this need to be looked at again. Michele Dix said that TfL would undertake all the actions it had promised to, although there was only a finite budget to carry out the various areas of work. She said that members should let TfL know of any major changes to health provision in their boroughs. Michele Dix said that consultation on the Chelsea to Hackney route had taken place over the summer, with the best route being found to go through the King’s Road (which would relieve capacity on the District Line).

Councillor Demirci said that she was disappointed with the route chosen for the Chelsea to Hackney line. She said that there had been a large growth in population to the east of the City and therefore a strong case for routes to the east. Councillor

Williams said that it was important for bus times to remain as efficient as possible. He said that there had been extra investment in bus services and this was a good example of TfL/borough partnership working. Michele Dix thanked the borough of Southwark for these comments. She said that Sir Peter Hendy, the Transport Commissioner, had sought to obtain more money to support bus services.

Michele Dix informed members that various options for the eastern branch of Crossrail 2 had been looked into. She said that further improvements to the Central Line, in respect of Crossrail 1, had taken place, with a view to having 36 tube trains an hour going through the line and being safeguarded as a "spur".

**Decision:** The Committee noted the Chair's report.

## **6. Consultation on Fixed Penalty Notices and Setting Fixed Penalty Levels for Anti-Social Spitting**

The Committee received a paper that presented the results of the public consultation on the levels of fines for breaches of anti-social spitting byelaws. The report also sought Members' decision on whether to set a £80 fixed penalty level for spitting.

The Chair informed members that the Secretary of State had recognised the borough of Enfield's byelaw on anti-social spitting in December 2013. He said that TEC were responsible for determining the levels of fixed penalty notices (FPNs) for anti-social spitting. A consultation exercise had taken place in September 2013 and the outcome of the consultation had now been received. Members opted to set an FPN of £80 for anti-social spitting and a discount rate of £50 if paid within 14 days.

The Chair said that all boroughs had experienced problems with anti-social spitting. Councillor Colin Smith said that he would be content to see no discounted period at all.

**Decision:** The Committee

- Agreed that London boroughs should set a £80 fixed penalty level for a spitting offence, and
- Agreed to set the level of reduction at £50 if the PCN was paid before the end of the 14 day period, beginning with the date of the notice.

## **7. London Safer Lorry Scheme Progress & Next Steps**

The Committee considered a report that outlined the progress with the creation of a new Londonwide Safer Lorry Scheme which would require the fitting of extended view mirrors and side guards to all Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGVs) over 3.5 tonnes, at all times.

The Chair said that he was happy to report that all boroughs had now signed-up to the new Scheme and London Councils were now ready to go forward with the new Traffic Order and look at implementing this in the new year and enforcing the new Order in late summer/early autumn 2015. The Scheme would be enforced through the Police

**Decision: The Committee:**

- Noted that all London boroughs had now given permission to amend the TEC Governing Agreement. Approval, therefore, was given to the Borough Roads (London Safer Lorry Scheme) (Restriction of Goods Vehicles) Traffic Order 2015 contained in Appendix 2 and to authorise officers to proceed with Notice of Making in due course in conjunction with TfL and HAL, and
- Noted the progress, programme and next steps for the proposed London Safer Lorry Scheme.

## **8. Quietways Signing Guidance**

The Committee received a report that asked members to review and provide comment on the “Quietways Signing Guidance” that was attached to the report. The document was currently in draft, but would be issued for implementation on the two pilot Quietways in late January 2015.

Councillor Coleridge voiced concern that the white bicycle signs that were painted on the street were too large, and were present every 150 metres’ He felt that the signage could do with being minimised. Councillor Coleridge said that some of the pathways used were on small and unknown streets, which seemed wasteful. Councillor Colin Smith said that he was in favour of “Quietways”, but also had misgivings about the signage. Councillor Hall asked whether the routes would replace the London Cycle Network and whether TfL would continue to fund the project.

Councillor Speak voiced concern about the signage adding to street clutter. He said that TfL was already using bright green paint to indicate bicycle lanes. Councillor Usher said that she also supported colleagues regarding the signage. She said that pedestrian and bicycle signs should not be confused. Councillor Williams felt that the cycle and pedestrian signs needed to be simplified, integrated and included in “Legible London”. Councillor Harcourt said that he attended a meeting with cycle groups, and they had all supported the white bicycle signs in the middle of the road. He also said that the markings for bicycles and pedestrians were similar and needed to be made more specific.

Councillor Draper said that environmentalists did not like the signs. He said that the primary objective was to encourage cycling, but with regards to the environment. Councillor Colin Smith said that different areas required different priorities and “one size to fit all” did not work in this case. Councillor Williams said that this was the Mayor’s responsibility and consistency was needed throughout London. Councillor Colin Smith said that cycle rates would not be driven up if the scheme was too prescriptive. He said that it was important to recognise that most boroughs had different needs.

Councillor Demirci said that the whole point of “quietways” was to ensure that there were roads that cyclists could go down during quieter periods of the day. She said that consistency was needed though. Lilli Matson thanked members for their comments on the “quietways” signage guidance. She said that the document was only in draft form at the moment and the comments on minimal signage and different types of wayfinding would be taken on board. She said that it was important to get the balance right. The actual design of the “quietways” would be up to the boroughs.



**Decision:** The Committee:

- Noted and commented on the report, which was for information only, and
- Agreed that Alan Edwards would resend to members the “Quietways Signing Guidance” document by TfL.

## **9. Roads Task Force – Street Types Programme**

This “Roads Task Force – Street Types Programme” report was withdrawn.

## **10. Concessionary Fares 2015/16 Settlement & Apportionment**

The Committee received a report that informed members of the outcome of negotiations with transport operators (Transport for London (TfL), the Association of Train Operating Companies (ATOC) and independent bus operators), regarding compensation for carrying concessionary passengers in 2015/16. The report also sought members’ approval to the proposed settlement and apportionment.

The Chair informed members that usage had now been included in the calculations. The increase in usage was below the rate of inflation.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Agreed the TfL settlement of £327.922m for 2015/16
- Agreed the proposed extension of the existing ATOC agreement and the consequent settlement of £21.334m for 2015/16
- Agreed a budget for non-TfL bus services of £2.2m
- Agreed the reissue budget for 2015/16 of £1.518m
- Agreed the borough payments for 2015/16 of £352.974m
- Agreed the payment profile and dates on which boroughs’ contributions were paid as 4 June 2015, 3 September 2015, 3 December 2015 and 4 March 2016, and
- Agreed the 2015-2016 London Service Permit bus operators (non-TfL buses) Concessionary Scheme.

## **11. Freedom Pass 2015 Reissue Update**

The Committee received a report that provided members with an update on the progress of the project to renew approximately 940,000 Freedom Passes that were due to expire on 31 March 2015.

The Chair informed members that the 2015 Freedom Pass renewal was well under way and was going well. He said that 400,000 passes had already been renewed, with 80% of these being renewed online. The London borough of Bexley had the highest level of renewal in outer London, with take-up being lower in other areas. The Chair said that a Freedom Pass publicity campaign would be taking place in the new year and would be targeted in areas where take-up was low. He advised members to go back and discuss these issues with their Adult Services cabinet members.

Councillor Usher congratulated all the officers that were working on the Freedom Pass renewal for carrying out a very a good job. The Chair said that the number of

renewals carried out online should produce a saving for boroughs from the original budget.

**Decision:** The Committee

- Noted the progress on the Freedom Pass 2015 reissue since the last report to this Committee in October 2014, and
- Noted that work continued to establish new procedures for first time Freedom Pass applicants

## **12. Revenue Budget & Borough Charges 2015/16**

The Committee received a report that detailed the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription charges for 2015/16. These proposals were considered by the TEC Executive Sub Committee at its meeting on 13 November 2014. The Executive Sub Committee agreed to recommend that the full Committee approved these proposals.

Frank Smith said that a similar report had already been presented to the TEC Executive Sub Committee in November 2014. This report now incorporated the concessionary fares settlement. Frank Smith brought to members' attention the savings mentioned in paragraph 3 and the reduction in some charges in paragraph 4 of the report. He said that TEC funds were not as healthy as in previous years, owing to the costs involved in the unexpected move of the appeals hearing centre from Angel Square. The Chair said that he was pleased with the reduction of charges and savings that had been made, as outlined in the report.

**Decision:** Committee agreed the changes in individual levies and charges for 2015/16 as follows:

- The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2014/15 - £1,500; paragraph 38)
- The total Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.4333 which would be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2013/14 (2014/15 - £0.4519 per PCN; paragraphs 35-37)
- The Concessionary Fares Administration Charge of £8,674 per borough (2014/15 - £8,674; paragraph 16)
- The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,182 in total (2014/15 - £417,360; paragraphs 17-19).
- No charge to boroughs in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which was fully covered by estimated PCN income (2014/15 - £98,612; average charge £3,287; paragraphs 20-21);
- 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 ran until December 2016 (paragraph 28)
- The Parking and Traffic Appeals Charge of £33.40 per appeal or £29.97 per appeal where electronic evidence was provided by the enforcing authority (2014/15 - £38.54/£36.92 per appeal; paragraph 29)
- The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £8.60 per transaction (2014/15 - £10.40; paragraphs 33-34)
- The TRACE (Fax) Charge of £8.80 per transaction (2014/15 - £12.83; paragraphs 33-34)

- The TEC<sup>1</sup> Charge of £0.20 per transaction (2014/15 - £0.20; paragraphs 33-34);
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £377.058 million for 2015/16, as detailed in Appendix A;
- On the basis of the agreement of the above proposed charges, the provisional gross revenue income budget of £377.058 million for 2015/16, with no proposed recommended transfer from uncommitted reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B; and
- The indicative charges to individual boroughs set out in Appendix C.
- The Committee is also asked to note the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 54-58 and Table 9 of this report.

### **13. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 11 September 2014**

Minutes of TEC on 16 October 2014 (agenda item 8, page 5) – Cllr Smith said that he had no objection to an Ultra Low Emission Zone in general, but felt that “one size did not fit all”. He asked for this to be reflected in the minutes.

Subject to the above amendment, the minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 13 November 2014 were noted.

### **14. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 16 October 2014**

The minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 16 October 2014 were agreed as an accurate record.

**The meeting finished at 16:05pm**

---

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