

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Thursday 9 February 2017

10:00am in Meeting Room 1, 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 Green Infrastructure Paper	
4 Damage to Highways Update	
5 Transport & Mobility Performance Information – Quarters 2 and 3 2016/17	
6 TEC Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2016/17	
7 Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 21 July 2016 (for agreeing)	
8 Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 8 December 2016 (for noting)	

<p>Exclusion of the Press and Public (Exempt) (TBC)</p> <p>To resolve that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during discussion of the following item(s) of business because exempt information, as defined in Paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) of Section 12(a) of the Local Government Act 1972 is likely to be made known at the meeting</p>	
<p>E1 Exempt Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 21 July 2016</p>	

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 9 February 2017

Freedom Pass Holders/60+ Oyster Cards:

Cllr Alan Smith (LB Lewisham), Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton), and Cllr Caroline Usher (LB Wandsworth)

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) and Cllr Alan Smith (LB Lewisham).

Car Club:

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

London Cycling Campaign

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing – Chair) and Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney)

Board of Trustees for Groundwork London

Cllr Alan Smith (LB Lewisham)

Wandle Valley Regional Park

Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton)

London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee Executive

Green Infrastructure in London Item no: 03

Report by: Jennifer Sibley **Job title:** Principal Policy Officer
Date: 9 February 2017
Contact Officer: Jennifer Sibley
Telephone: 020 7934 9829 **Email:** Jennifer.sibley@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary This report provides members with an update on progress on the recommendations for boroughs and London Councils, made as part of the Green Infrastructure Taskforce, since July 2016 as well as an update on current work on green infrastructure.

Recommendations TEC Executive is asked to:

Note and discuss the report.

Introduction

1. Green Infrastructure is a term that recognises that trees, planting and parks provide a greater service than amenity benefits alone. Green infrastructure encompasses the full range of greening; from parks, trees and flower beds to swales, green walls, rain gardens and green roofs. The benefits and services provided by green infrastructure include air quality improvements, biodiversity benefits, protecting the city from the urban heat effect by providing shade, and reducing flood risk by capturing rainfall in more natural ways, reducing surface water run-off and 'flash flooding'.
2. The Green Infrastructure Taskforce reported in December 2015. In March 2016 TEC members received a report entitled Mayor's Green Infrastructure Taskforce. That report provided members with information about the Taskforce, its focus and its recommendations, including those that were for boroughs and London Councils to consider.
3. In July 2016 TEC Executive members received a report that discussed lobbying on locally setting planning fees, borough involvement in achieving the London Sustainable Drainage Action Plan, and updated members on the light-touch review of the flood partnerships that officers were starting to undertake. The report also asked for member comment on whether there was value in seeking to map London's green infrastructure, and whether green infrastructure was integrated into placemaking teams.
4. This report provides members with an update on progress on the recommendations and the wider work on green infrastructure London Councils is undertaking.

Green infrastructure in Placemaking

5. Recommendation 15 of the Green Infrastructure Taskforce was:

London boroughs should ensure that the concept of green infrastructure is central to a placemaking agenda and properly represented within their placemaking teams.

6. London Councils surveyed borough planning policy officers and flood risk management officers with two separate sets of questions, asking about whether the concept of green infrastructure is familiar to officers and whether, in their view, green infrastructure is central to placemaking.
7. Officers from 20 boroughs responded to at least one set of questions with officers from nine boroughs responding to both sets of questions.
8. The responses indicate that green infrastructure as a concept is recognised by every officer who responded. This is a positive indication given the relatively recent increase in use of the concept.
9. In terms of whether green infrastructure is a core part of a borough's placemaking agenda, twelve planning policy officers said it was, with three saying it was not at present but would be (for example because a borough was undertaking a Local Plan review).
10. Eight flood risk management officers felt green infrastructure was a core part of their borough's placemaking agenda, with five saying it was not, one indicating it was important but not a core part, and one was unsure.
11. Many officers were ambitious for their borough, providing information about the strategies that secure green infrastructure, or giving information about the schemes their borough had introduced.
12. These responses indicate a good level of knowledge about green infrastructure but suggest there may be more that some boroughs could do to make green infrastructure

an integral part of their placemaking agenda. The review of policies and strategies offers one such opportunity.

Partnerships for green infrastructure

13. Recommendations 16 and 17 of the Green Infrastructure Taskforce were:

16 - The Greater London Authority, London Councils and the Environment Agency should review existing relevant partnerships to identify opportunities for better collaboration and co-ordination of green infrastructure.

17 - Boroughs should support sub-regional green infrastructure partnerships. These partnerships should be funded by the Greater London Authority matched by an allocation from the boroughs, for example, from savings generated through the reduction in the levy achieved by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority over the past five years.

14. As initially reported to TEC Executive in July 2016, London Councils has continued its light-touch review of the seven London sub-regional flood risk management partnerships, as per recommendation 16. This is also usefully informing the wider flooding work that London Councils is undertaking.

15. Emerging themes are:

- a. Not all Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (Thames RFCC) members attend their sub-regional partnership meeting, but where they do not, officers would welcome their attendance. In two partnerships, the Thames RFCC member chairs the partnership meeting.
- b. One partnership hosts alternate officer and officer-member meetings, enabling officers to discuss operational challenges and members to be involved in strategic and partnership discussions. This could be adopted by other partnerships to achieve a suitable balance.
- c. All partnerships are attended by Environment Agency and Thames Water officers, with all partnerships having a dedicated Thames Water contact. Most LLFAs attend their partnership meeting, but not all.
- d. There is a great variety in length of meetings, from half an hour to three hours, depending on the number of boroughs in each partnership. Travel between boroughs can be difficult for officers, depending on local transport links.
- e. Some partnerships are more advanced at joint working than others, whilst some feel like a collection of boroughs working independently.
- f. All partnerships would benefit from better mechanisms for reporting into and from the Thames RFCC, and feedback at present relies on someone at the meeting having attended Thames RFCC meetings, which is not always possible and would mean considerable duplication.
- g. Some partnerships discuss training for officers, some have external contributors, and others can focus very heavily on the detail of specific flooding problems at a certain site. More discipline would be needed from officers were members to attend these meetings.
- h. The majority of partnerships raise the same issues and the same challenges, for example thresholds at which section 19 investigations are triggered, and whether to identify the households affected in public. Negotiating with developers about

sustainable drainage requirements is frequently discussed. London Councils officers have been in a unique position of being able to identify this by attending all the partnership meetings. This suggests there is scope for greater collaboration across the London partnerships and scope for better sharing of knowledge.

16. London Councils officers will work with the Drain London Board, which includes the GLA and Environment Agency, to share the findings of this light-touch review to enable partnerships to better understand what the others are discussing and how they operate.
17. As previously reported to TEC, London Councils does not think that the setting up of new partnerships as proposed by recommendation 17 is realistic, and so we have not progressed this further. At a time of severe financial pressures, we do not believe that savings realised from the reduction in the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority precept are able to be captured for spending elsewhere. Nevertheless, if individual boroughs are able to do this, they could choose to allocate these savings to green infrastructure in their area.
18. Responses from officers discussed in the preceding section suggest that green infrastructure is already a concept both planning policy officers and flood risk management officers are familiar with, which suggests the focus should be on including green infrastructure in new plans and strategies, rather than establishing new partnerships to promote the concept.
19. Separately, the Thames RFCC has recently agreed to fund a pilot looking at delivering large-scale sustainable drainage schemes in London boroughs, and has funded sustainable drainage schemes in at least one London borough. Whilst sustainable drainage is narrower than green infrastructure, this is nevertheless a positive step. Other London boroughs have funded sustainable drainage and green infrastructure schemes directly, and others have used other types funding, such as borough transport funding (LIP funding) to deliver integrated schemes with highways and air quality benefits.

Mapping green infrastructure in London

20. Recommendation 19 of the Green Infrastructure Taskforce was:

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee should take a stronger role in promoting, co-ordinating and supporting green infrastructure.

21. The suggestions brought to TEC in March and July 2016 focused on identifying the data needed to provide TEC with a strategic overview of progress on green infrastructure in London. London Councils has discussed with the GLA the available datasets that could be used to inform TEC members of the strategic picture of green infrastructure in London.
22. The GLA hosts on its website a map of central London's green roofs. This was undertaken in summer 2013 and there are no current plans to update this as it was a manual exercise that was highly time consuming. Remote sensing is a possible future option for mapping green roofs but there is no timescale for this.
23. The GLA is undertaking modelling for a review of the All London Green Grid, which it hopes will act as an evidence base to identify areas where green infrastructure is lacking or where green infrastructure improvements could be made. This could be particularly compelling if there is correlation with air pollution, flood risk or health data indicating poor mental or emotional health. Indicative timescales are spring 2017. London Councils will work with the GLA to understand the potential uses of this dataset when it becomes available.

24. Alongside the publication of the London Sustainable Drainage Action Plan on 13 December 2016, the GLA is crowdsourcing case studies of green infrastructure and sustainable drainage around London as an interactive map.¹ Boroughs have been invited to submit their sustainable drainage or green infrastructure projects that either they have funded or have been secured through the planning process.
25. As such officers feel that the data review the GLA is currently doing on green infrastructure means that London Councils should wait to see the results of this, and not undertake its own survey work of boroughs, as this would be time consuming for borough officers. When the data is in place for London, TEC Executive could then review on an annual basis the provision of green infrastructure in London, and play a role in highlighting where green infrastructure would be most beneficial. This could take the form of an annual update report to TEC Executive, incorporating any other updates on green infrastructure work undertaken by either London Councils or the GLA.

Locally set planning fees

27. London Councils is pursuing this in Parliament and with the support of peers has tabled an amendment to the Neighbourhood Planning Bill.

Recommendations

TEC Executive is asked to:

- Note and discuss the report.

¹ <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/environment/climate-change-weather-and-water/surface-water/sustainable-drainage-london>

London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee Executive

Damage to Highways - Update

Item no: 04

Report by: Jennifer Sibley **Job Title:** Principal Policy Officer
Date: 9 February 2017
Contact Officer: Jennifer Sibley
Telephone: 020 7934 9829 **Email:** Jennifer.sibley@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: TEC discussed the issue of highways damage in June 2015. This report provides members with an update on work undertaken since that meeting.

Recommendations: The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report.

Damage to highways

1. Building works and the delivery of equipment and materials can sometimes damage the highway (roads and pavements). Legislation allows councils to make good any damage caused by works on land adjacent to publicly maintainable footpaths or highways and recover the expenses incurred. However, boroughs have identified that there are a number of difficulties to pursuing this.
2. TEC previously discussed damage to highways caused by construction work at its meeting on 18 June 2015. That paper outlined the issues relating to damage to highways and set out some possible actions. From that meeting, it was agreed that greater sharing of best practice on this issue was desirable. In addition, there were three specific actions;
 - Check and report back on whether Section 278 of the Highways Act (1980) applied to all planning applications;
 - Cllr Coleridge would ask officers at the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea to write a short paper on construction work and damage to highways and share this best practice with TEC;
 - Noted that London Councils officers would pursue legislative changes when opportunities to that effect arose (e.g. when wider changes to the planning system were proposed).¹

Best practice

3. Following the TEC meeting, officers started to compile a best practice publication using information provided by boroughs in a survey about how they tackle damage to highways.
4. Boroughs were requested to provide case studies where they self-identified that they were having success in tackling the problem. Four case studies were received from three boroughs.
5. TEC members were asked in the Chair's Report at the October 2015 TEC meeting that if their borough was tackling highways damage particularly effectively to contact London Councils' officers. LoTAG (the London Technical Advisory Group) were asked to submit case studies. Case studies have also been requested from a highways authority outside London.
6. To date no further case studies have been received and so rather than produce a publication, it is proposed that the content already gathered on legislative options and case studies will be made available on the London Councils' website. This could be easily added to over time if more case studies are provided.

Action reporting

7. It was requested that clarification was provided on whether Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 could only be applied to larger developments or whether it was applicable to all developments. Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 allows the highways authority to enter into an agreement with any person for the execution of works. It can be used with developers to enter into legal agreements with a local authority to make improvements or alterations to the highway to support a proposed development. However, as Section 278 isn't specifically about development it is our view that it can apply to any size of

¹ Minutes of the meeting on 18 June 2015 can be viewed here: <http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/27494>. The construction work & damage to highways item can be found on page 11.

development. Members should note that it is not the only mechanism boroughs can use, and alternatives were set out in the report to TEC on 18 June 2015, a link to which can be found at the end of this report.

8. Information has been received from officers at the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea about their approach to damage to highways which is included in Appendix A.
9. There have been no opportunities to date to pursue legislative changes regarding damage to highways, but this is noted and officers continue to scrutinise new government legislation for potential opportunities.

Recommendations

The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications to London Councils arising from this report.

Legal Implications

There are no legal implications to London Councils arising from this report.

Equalities Implications

There are no equalities implications to London Councils arising from this report.

Previous reports

Construction Work Causing Damage to Highways, 18 June 2015,
<http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/26364>

Appendix A

The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea uses section 133 of the Highways Act 1980 which allows the authority to recover the cost of repairs to the highway caused by development of adjacent land from the responsible party or the land owner.

Due to the large number of properties owned offshore our preference is to do so via responsible parties, usually the contractors. If the opportunity arises to licence the site for scaffolding, hoarding etc. an appropriate deposit from the contractors will be taken in advance as part of the conditions of licence. The deposit is based on the likelihood of damage to the highway from building works and is assessed on following basis:

- details of planning permission including any traffic management plan;
- basic knowledge of construction process and methods involved;
- estimated damage from above and actual costs that would cost authority to replace highway like for like;
- this can be lowered in instances where there is separate payment to be made to the authority via section 106 planning obligations, section 184 crossover construction or section 278 agreement – as those payments will be paid by the developer rather than the contractor;
- the authority should be able to quantify and justify the deposit requested based on a proper calculation and why that level is necessary.

Points to note:

- The size of the structure and the duration of the works has no part in determining the deposit level – for example 10 metre or 200 metres of scaffolding to paint windows will attract the same nominal deposit as this is not likely to cause damage to highways;
- Licensing, estimating, subsequent repairs and cost recovery is done by the Projects Engineer who is part of Highways Maintenance and Projects and has no involvement with the enforcement side;
- There is a single point of contact within the authority (the Projects Engineer) who deals with building works. Other council officers who undertake inspections (for example enforcement, highways safety and inspection, network management etc.) know to whom they should pass information should they see damage, by taking photographs of damage cause by the building works so it can be used as evidence to assist cost recovery.
- The cost of the damage has to be of reasonable value to justify spending time pursuing the owner / contractors.

When the deposit cannot be taken upfront before the development commences the authority will collate evidence as appropriate. Although the authority is entitled to carry out the work and invoice the owner for cost of repairs without notification the authority's preference is to write to the owner in advance and advise him/her of the authority's intentions to charge for damage, providing supporting evidence, before the final completion of works. Owners will often instruct contractors to pay the costs or have some of their fee retained.

One such example of where the The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea has used this approach is the case of 77-79 Southern Row. Officers were able to justify the level of deposit requested when queried by the owner; supporting evidence of the damage was provided using photos taken by highway safety and network management colleagues; and the cost of repairs of £7411.39 was offset against the deposit taken in advance of £7500.00.

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Transport & Mobility Services Performance Information

Item no: 05

Report by: Tony O'Connor **Job title:** Mobility Services Manager
Date: 9 February 2017
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 in 2016/17.

Recommendation: Members are asked to note the report.

Performance Monitoring and Reporting

1. London Councils provides a number of transport and mobility services on behalf of the London boroughs. These include London Tribunals, Freedom Pass, Taxicard, the London European Partnership for Transport, the London Lorry Control Scheme, the Health Emergency Badge scheme and providing a range of parking services and advice to authorities and the public.
2. Appendix 1 sets out the latest position against key performance indicators for each of the main services. This report covers Quarters 2 and 3 of 2016/17, and provides complete figures for 2015/16.

Equalities Considerations

None.

Financial Implications

None.

APPENDIX 1: TRANSPORT & MOBILITY SERVICES: PERFORMANCE QUARTER 3

LONDON TRIBUNALS

	Target (where appropriate)	2015/16 Full Year	2016/17 Q2	2016/17 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA)					
No. of appeals received	N/A	42,846	10,386	11,068	N/A
No. of appeals decided	N/A	35,129	11,126	8,511	N/A
% allowed	N/A	50%	50%	49%	N/A
% Did Not Contest	N/A	21%	21%	22%	N/A
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time	80%	86%	87%	87%	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	41 days	50 days	29 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	40 days	41 days	43 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	41 days	47 days	34 days	Green
Road User Charging Adjudicators (RUCA)					
No. of appeals received	N/A	5,967	1,570	1,006	N/A
No. of appeals decided	N/A	3,876	1,539	1,405	N/A
% allowed	N/A	25%	17%	28%	N/A
% Did Not Contest	N/A	21%	15%	23%	N/A
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time	80%	80%	89%	90%	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	47 days	63 days	62 days	Red^
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	40 days	40 days	66 days	Red ^^
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	42 days	58 days	63 days	Red^^
Overall service					
Notice of Appeal acknowledgments issued within 2 days of receipt	97%	95%	99.7%	99%	Green
Hearing dates to be issued to appellants within 5 working days of receipt	100%	90%	99.7%	99%	Amber^^^
Number of telephone calls to London Tribunals	N/A	36,231	8,052	9,349	N/A
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	87%	99%	98%	Green

Comment:

^The average number of days to decide a RUCA postal appeal missed the target due to the way in which adjudicators' time is allocated. The Chief Adjudicator only schedules adjudicator time on days when personal cases are scheduled – meaning that postal cases are not considered every day, resulting in increased waiting times for decisions. Whilst the target is not met, the chief adjudicator considers that the cost benefit of working in this way justifies this approach. This period the target was also impacted by ^^ below

^^ The average number of days to decide a RUCA personal appeal missed the target because of an 8 day period at the end of September (22nd – 30th) where no hearings took place. TfL were undergoing a change in their service providers at this time and asked if all appeals scheduled for this period could be rescheduled. The Chief Adjudicator agreed to suspend the consideration of cases resulting in cases being scheduled further in advance and increasing the amount of time between receipt and schedule date.

^^^ The target was narrowly missed, which involved just 8 cases not being issued hearing dates with 5 working days.

FREEDOM PASS

	Target (where appropriate)	2015/16 Full Year	2016/17 Q2	2016/17 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of active passes at end of period	N/A	1,198,958	1,224,247	1,232,257	N/A
Number of new passes issued (BAU)	N/A	52,176	8,272	10,177	N/A
Number of passes issued (2015 & 2016 Renewal)	N/A	157,835	1,413	280	N/A
Number of replacement passes issued	N/A	91,336	21,860	20,350	N/A
Number of phone calls answered (BAU)	N/A	231,240	49,329	46,813	N/A
% Answered within 30 seconds (BAU)	85%	84%	85%	87%	Green
Number of phone calls answered (2015 & 2016 Renewal)	N/A	29,300	2,902	851	N/A
% Answered within 30 seconds (2015 & 2016 Renewal)	85%	85%	83%	89%	Green
Number of letters, emails and faxes answered	N/A	80,777	12,245	12,451	N/A
Number of emails answered (2015 & 2016 Renewal)	N/A	6,709	876	322	N/A

BAU = Business as Usual

Comment:

There was an improvement in the percentage of calls answered within 30 seconds in Q3 in both BAU and renewals.

TAXICARD

	Target (where appropriate)	2015/16 Full Year	2016/17 Q2	2016/17 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of active passes at end of period	N/A	69,604	64,611	66,701	N/A
Number of new passes issued	N/A	9,204	1,818	2,528	N/A
Number of replacement cards issued	N/A	4,961	982	980	N/A
Number of phone calls answered at London Councils	N/A	31,157	7,838	8,672	N/A
% Answered within 30 seconds	85%	97.00%	96.66%	96.14%	Green
Number of journeys using Taxicard	N/A	1,221,950	320,000	315,169*	N/A
% in private hire vehicles	N/A	19%	12%	10%**	N/A
% of vehicles arriving within 15 minutes (advance booking)	95%	96.18%	95.95%	96.77%	Green
% of vehicles arriving within 30 minutes (on demand)	95%	96.71%	96.62%	97.39%	Green

Comment:

*The number of Taxicard journeys has increased by 3.91% in Quarters 1, 2 and 3 compared to the same quarters in 2015/16, reversing a long term trend of declining usage. All boroughs projected to overspend are updated each month on their budget position and have indicated they will cover any budget overspend.

** The percentage of private hire journeys has reduced as a consequence of the contractor offering more advanced bookings to taxi drivers. This has been very popular with taxi drivers and has led to an increase in the number of taxis fulfilling advanced bookings. It has also led to service improvements, as a very high percentage of these journeys are fulfilled within the performance target timescales.

TRACE (TOWAWAY, RECOVERY AND CLAMPING ENQUIRY SERVICE)

	Target (where appropriate)	2015/16 Full Year	2016/17 Q2	2016/17 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of vehicles notified to database	N/A	45,593	11,564	11,070	N/A
Number of phone calls answered	N/A	44,174*	9,348	9,152	N/A
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	93% **	97%	96%	Green

Comment:

* There were no stats provided by our previous contractor for June 2015. This was the last month of their contract and stats for this SLA were not provided from the old system before it was decommissioned

** This target was only introduced when the contractor changed in July 2015. As such, 2015/16 full year stats only cover Q2, Q3 and Q4.

LONDON LORRY CONTROL SCHEME

	Target (where appropriate)	2015/16 Full Year	2016/17 Q2	2016/17 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of permits on issue at end of period	N/A	62,179	62,435	62,670	N/A
Number of permits issued in period	N/A	23,736	5,445	6,172	N/A
Number of vehicle observations made	10,800 per year 2,700 per quarter	11,569	3,603	3,919	Green
Number of penalty charge notices issued	N/A	4,993	1,486	1,581	N/A
Number of appeals considered by ETA	N/A	63	30	20	N/A
% of appeals allowed	Less than 40%	59%	76%	40%	Green

***Comment:**

TRANSACTIONAL SERVICES: DEBT REGISTRATIONS AND WARRANTS

	Target (where appropriate)	2015/16 Full Year	2016/17 Q2	2016/17 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of debt registrations	N/A	393,289	136,523	110,510	N/A
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of warrants	N/A	334,078	106,421	114,849	N/A
Traffic Enforcement Court: % registered in 1 day	97%	99%	100%	99%	Green

HEALTH EMERGENCY BADGES

	Target (where appropriate)	2015/16 Full Year	2016/17 Q2	2016/17 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of badges on issue at end of period		4,475	3,972	3,781	N/A
Number of badges issued in period		2,264	462	495	N/A

LONDON EUROPEAN PARTNERSHIP FOR TRANSPORT

	Target (where appropriate)	2015/16 Full Year	2016/17 Q2	2016/17 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of Boroughs participating in EU transport funding bids	7	8	6	6	Amber

Comment:

LEPT - 8 participating Boroughs in 2015/16: Barking and Dagenham (NoveLog), Hounslow (SWITCH), Newham (PASTA), Southwark, Lambeth (VeloCita), Westminster (Frevue), Hackney (STARS) and Haringey (PTP-Cycle). The STARS and PTP-Cycle projects concluded at the end of March 2016 reducing the total to 6. LEPT will continue to disseminate and ask for comments on any EU funding opportunities. LEPT are currently preparing a bid under the Horizon 2020 Smart, Green and Integrated Transport Calls for Proposals: MG-4.1-2017: Increasing the take up and scale up of innovative solutions to achieve sustainable mobility solutions in urban areas. LEPT will also assess the calls for proposals under the Urban Innovation Action programme announced in December 2016. Lastly, LEPT have brokered the participation of the London Borough of Croydon in a consortium submitting a proposal in the H2020 Call for Proposals.

London Councils TEC Executive Sub-Committee

Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2016/17 Item no: 06

Report by: Frank Smith **Job title:** Director of Corporate Resources
Date: 9 February 2017
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 to the end of December 2016 for TEC and provides a forecast of the outturn position for 2016/17. A surplus of £868,000 is forecast over the budget figure. In addition, total expenditure in respect of Taxicard trips taken by scheme members is forecast to underspend by a net figure of £621,000, if current trip volumes continue for the remainder of the year. The net borough proportion of this underspend is projected to be £424,000, with £197,000 accruing to TfL. However, as reported separately on the agenda, some boroughs are forecast to overspend their Taxicard budget and are required to take action accordingly.

Recommendations

The Executive Committee is asked to :

- note the projected surplus of £868,000 for the year, plus the forecast net underspend of £621,000 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 6-8.
-

Report

1. This is the final budget monitoring report to be presented to the Committee during the current financial year. The next report will be the provisional outturn figures for 2016/17 which will be reported to the July 2017 meeting of this Committee.
2. The London Councils Transport and Environment Committee's income and expenditure revenue budget for 2016/17, as approved by the Full Committee in December 2015, 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 2016 and 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 £1.06 million for the year, although £621,000 relates to payments for taxicard trips. However, a shortfall of income of £192,000 over budgeted targets is likely to arise, including a reduction in the financial contribution from boroughs and TfL towards taxi card of £621,000, making an overall projected surplus of £868,000. Table 1 below summarises the forecast position, with subsequent commentary providing explanations for the variances that are projected.

Table 1 –Summary Forecast as at 31 December 2016

	M9 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
Expenditure	£000	£000	£000	£000
Employee Costs	423	652	564	(88)
Running Costs	197	297	247	(50)
Central Recharges	-	74	74	-
Total Operating Expenditure	620	1,023	885	(138)
Direct Services	6,940	8,426	8,852	426
Research		40	20	(20)
Payments in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	273,031	368,677	367,349	(1,328)
One-off payment to boroughs	340	340	340	-
Total Expenditure	280,931	378,506	377,446	(1,060)
Income				
Contributions in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	(272,250)	(368,790)	(368,224)	566
Income for direct services	(5,410)	(8,892)	(9,255)	(363)
Core Member Subscriptions	(97)	(97)	(97)	-
Government Grants	-	-	-	-
Interest on Investments	-	-	-	-
Other Income	(41)	(84)	(95)	(11)
Transfer from Reserves	-	(643)	(643)	-
Total Income	(277,798)	(378,506)	(378,314)	192
Net Expenditure	3,133	-	(868)	(868)

4. The projected surplus of £868,000 is made up broadly of the following:

- A projected overall deficit of £162,000 in respect of TEC parking traded services, after considering an estimate of the level of borough/TfL/GLA usage volumes during the first quarter. This is attributable to a number of areas.
 - Firstly, there is a projected net deficit of £90,000 in respect of environmental and traffic appeals (ETA). The estimated number of notice of appeals and statutory declarations received to date amounts to 31,439, giving a projected number for the year of 41,919, 10,966 less than the budgeted figure of 52,885. The current throughput of appeals is 2.55 appeals per hour, compared to a budget figure of 2.76. Throughput has been affected by the move to a new case management system and new procedures for considering statutory declarations and witness statements. However, with the bedding in of the new systems and further planned enhancements, officers expect to see an increase in throughput over the final quarter of the year and beyond.
 - Secondly, the transaction volumes for the TRACE parking systems used by boroughs and TfL to date have significantly reduced, although use of the TEC system has increased. This has resulted in a projected net deficit of £68,000;
 - Thirdly, payments to the County Court for the registration of parking debt by boroughs is forecast to exceed the £3 million budget by £500,000; however, these additional costs will be fully funded by the boroughs generating the transaction volumes; and
 - Finally, the fixed cost of the parking managed services contract with NPS is projected to marginally underspend by £2,000, although the fixed cost element of the new RUCA contract with the GLA/TfL, which became effective on 1 January 2017, will under recover costs of £5,000.
- A projected underspend of £45,000 in respect of employee costs. The cost of staff providing direct services (included within the direct services administration charge) is estimated to overspend by £43,000, although this is offset by an underspend on staffing costs attributable to non-operational and policy staff of £58,000. In addition, the maternity cover budget is estimated to be underspent by £30,000.
- A projected underspend of £200,000 in respect of the £1.7 million budget for payments to independent bus operators, based on trends and claims emerging during the year.
- A projected underspend of £522,000 in respect of the £1.518 million budget for payments in respect of the issuing/reissuing costs of Freedom Passes.
- A projected underspend of £20,000 in respect of the research budget and a further £50,000 underspend projected in respect of the IT systems development budget.
- Based on income collected to date, receipts from Lorry Control PCN income are forecast to exceed the budget of £750,000 by £133,000.

- Based on income collected to date, income receipts from replacement Freedom Passes are forecast to exceed the budget of £550,000 by £72,000. For replacement Taxicards, there is a projected deficit on the £36,000 income budget of £17,000 for the year.

Committee Reserves

- Table 2 below updates the Committee on the projected level of reserves as at 31 March 2017, if all current known liabilities and commitments are considered:

Table 2– Analysis of Projected Uncommitted Reserves as at 31 March 2017

	General Reserve	Specific Reserve	Total
	£000	£000	£000
Audited reserves at 31 March 2016	3,269	1,000	4,269
One-off payments to boroughs 2016/17	(340)	-	(340)
Approved in setting 2016/17 budget (December 2015)	(303)	-	(303)
One-off payments to boroughs 2017/18	(340)	-	(340)
Approved in setting 2017/18 budget (December 2016)	(1,288)	1,000	(288)
Projected Budget Surplus 2016/17	868	-	868
Estimated Residual Balances at 31 March 2017	1,866	2,000	3,866

Conclusions

- This report reflects the position at the three-quarter year stage in the current financial year and forecasts a surplus position of £868,000 for the year. In addition taxicard trips are forecast to underspend by £621,000, with the borough proportion of this underspend projected to be £424,000, with £197,000 accruing to TfL.
- The majority of the projected surplus is attributable to projected additional income from Lorry Control enforcement and replacement Freedom Passes, plus underspends on non-direct salary costs, research, IT systems developments and payments to independent bus operators. This is offset by an overall net deficit on trading operations based on transaction volumes the year to date.
- After taking into account the forecast surplus and known commitments, general reserves are forecast to be £1.866 million at the year-end, which equates to 17.4% of budgeted operating and trading expenditure of £10.746 million. This figure now just marginally exceeds the Committee's formal benchmark policy on reserves, agreed in November 2015, that reserves should equate to between 10-15% of annual operating expenditure.

Recommendations

- Members are asked to :
 - note the projected surplus of £868,000 for the year, plus the forecast underspend of £621,000 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 6-8.

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 2016/17 and 2017/18
London Councils Income and Expenditure Forecast File 2016/17

	Revised 2016/17 £000	Month 9 ATD £000	Month 9 Forecast £000	Month 9 Variance £000
Payments in respect of Concessionary Fares				
TfL	333,940	249,084	333,940	0
ATOC	18,520	13,890	18,520	0
Other Bus Operators	1,700	757	1,500	-200
Freedom Pass issue costs	1,518	563	996	-522
Freedom Pass Administration	387	278	370	-17
City Fleet Taxicard contract	12,083	8,038	11,462	-621
Taxicard Administration	529	421	561	32
	368,677	273,031	367,349	-1,328
TEC Trading Account Expenditure				
Payments to Adjudicators	1,361	996	1,328	-33
Northgate variable contract costs	584	412	540	-44
Payments to Northampton County Court	3,000	2,930	3,500	500
Lorry Control Administration	624	482	643	19
PATAS/CC Administration	2,824	2,106	2,808	-16
HEB Expenditure	33	14	33	0
	8,426	6,940	8,852	426
Sub-Total	377,103	279,971	376,201	-902
Operating Expenditure				
Salary Commitments				
Non-operational staffing costs	603	409	545	-58
Members	19	14	19	0
Maternity Provision	30	0	0	-30
	652	423	564	-88
Other Commitments				
Supplies and service	210	131	160	-50
Research	40	0	20	-20
Northgate Fixed Costs	88	66	88	0
One off payment to boroughs	340	340	340	0
	678	537	608	-70
Total Operating Expenditure	1,330	960	1,172	-158
Central Recharges	74	0	74	0
Total Expenditure	378,507	280,931	377,447	-1,060

	Revised 2016/17 £000	Month 9 ATD £000	Month 9 Forecast £000	Month 9 Variance £000
Borough contributions to TfL	333,940	249,084	333,940	0
Borough contributions to ATOC	18,520	13,890	18,520	0
Borough contributions to other bus operators	1,700	1,275	1,700	0
Borough contributions to FP issue costs	1,518	1,139	1,518	0
Borough contributions to freedom pass administration	0	0	0	0
Income from replacing lost/faulty freedom passes	550	467	622	72
Income from replacing lost/faulty taxicards	36	14	19	-17
Borough contributions to Comcab	2,314	1,581	1,890	-424
TfL contribution to Taxicard scheme	9,781	4,421	9,584	-197
Borough contributions to taxicard administration	326	326	326	0
TfL Contribution to taxicard administration	105	53	105	0
	368,790	272,250	368,224	-566
TEC trading account income				
Borough contributions to Lorry ban administration	0	0	0	0
Lorry ban PCNs	750	565	883	133
Borough parking appeal charges	1,543	867	1,156	-387
TfL parking appeal charges	89	165	220	131
GLA Congestion charging appeal income	254	240	319	65
Borough fixed parking costs	2,011	503	2,011	0
TfL fixed parking costs	211	50	211	0
GLA fixed parking costs	472	354	468	-4
Borough other parking services	562	122	487	-75
Northampton County Court Recharges	3,000	2,544	3,500	500
	8,892	5,410	9,255	363
Sub-Total	377,682	277,660	377,479	-203
Core borough subscriptions				
Joint Committee	46	46	46	0
TEC (inc TfL)	51	51	51	0
	97	97	97	0
Other Income				
TfL secretariat recharge	41	0	41	0
Interest on reserves	0	0	0	0
Sales of Health Emergency badges	43	41	54	11
	84	41	95	11
Transfer from Reserves	643	0	643	0
Central Recharges	0	0	0	0
Total Income Base Budget	378,506	277,798	378,314	-192

LONDON COUNCILS' TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT EXECUTIVE SUB COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on **21 July 2016** at 10:00am, at London Councils, Meeting Room 4, 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
Christopher Hayward	City of London

Others Present:

Councillor Ian Wingfield	LB Southwark
Val Shawcross	Deputy Mayor for Transport

1. Declarations of Interests

The Chair declared an interest in being a member of the London Cycling Campaign and Councillor Alan Smith declared an interest in being on the Board of Trustees for Groundwork London (agenda item 7). Councillor Jill Whitehead declared an interest in being a trustee for the Wandle Valley Regional Park (agenda item 7). There were no further declarations of interest, other than the declarations previously supplied.

2. Apologies for Absence & Deputies

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Phil Doyle (RB Kingston), who had replaced Councillor Alex Sawyer (LB Bexley) as a Conservative member on the TEC Executive Sub Committee.

3. Talk by Val Shawcross, Deputy Mayor for Transport

Val Shawcross, Deputy Mayor for Transport, made the following comments in her presentation:

- The Mayor was looking forward to working closely with London Councils
- Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) was being developed and would start in 2017
- There were three key themes to the Mayor's vision for transport:
 - (i) Delivering a good public transport system
There would be a 4-year fares freeze and efforts would be made to reduce transport delays and invest more in the tube and rail network to reduce crowding

(ii) Delivering pleasant places

Encourage more cycling and walking and investing in public realm. Also a more holistic approach would be taken to funding schemes, and a more unified approach and more design time with projects. Keen to pedestrianise Oxford Street and have a more radical approach (eg the removal of buses in Central London).

(iii) Supporting the economy, homes and jobs

Supporting growth and transport schemes, like Crossrail 2, progressing with river crossings, Silvertown and getting more technical work carried out on air quality. Also supporting better travel options across London

- It had been agreed that Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding scheme would be rolled over for the coming year. The TfL Business Plan coming out in November 2016 would state that LIP funding would continue at broadly the current level. Partnership working with the boroughs was very important and TfL was looking at protecting LIPs.
- TfL was also continuing with funding for cycling and wanted to work in partnership with London Councils and attend future TEC meetings. There was also a LIP working group.
- The devolution of rail, especially the Southern franchise, was also a very high priority. It was important to realise what was important for Londoners (better trains/reliability/more capacity), and TfL hoped there would be cross-party support on this.
- Southern Rail was in a deep crisis and a “special measures” team was being put together to help stabilise Southern.

Q and As

The Chair said that TEC had already written a cross-party letter to the Government supporting rail devolution. Councillor Usher said that residents in Wandsworth were suffering from the problems with Southern Rail. She said that there was also no desire to have Crossrail 2 in Balham, and it would be better if it went to Tooting.

Councillor Usher said that she hoped that there would be more consultation (on paper and online) in the autumn, as there had not been enough consultation on Crossrail 2 previously. Val Shawcross said that the previous administration was responsible for that consultation exercise and she assured members that the consultation taking place in the autumn would be better publicised. Boroughs should contact Val Shawcross in the event of any crisis, as she was the political contact. Val Shawcross said that TfL was keen to progress with Crossrail 2 and was currently looking at the Tooting option. A clear set of proposals would be ready by September 2016. The regeneration impact of the scheme would be looked into as well as what the real benefits and costs were. Any decisions that were made would be rational and clearly thought out.

Councillor Whitehead said that the situation with Southern Rail was particularly bad in Sutton. She said that there were sometimes no rail services at all, and Sutton could not wait until the franchise was up in 2022. Councillor Whitehead said that bus services in Sutton were also limited and people were now taking to their cars as a result of the lack of decent public transport. She said that a campaign was needed to try and get something done about the lack of services. Val Shawcross said that she supported what Councillor Whitehead was saying. The Mayor/TfL had offered to take over the senior management at Southern Rail. However, the franchise document did not have the usual penalties and controls written in it. She said that train drivers and

conductors had also been prosecuted for fatalities that had occurred. It also took up to 18 months to take over a franchise properly.

Val Shawcross confirmed that Mike Brown (Transport Commissioner, TfL) and herself would be making a visit to Sutton to discuss the transport problems in the borough. She said that if the borough wanted the tramlink to extend to Sutton, TfL would need to look at the developmental aspect. Councillor Whitehead voiced concern that a great deal of land in Sutton was being given to schools, and there was not much spare land left. She said that the borough had the need/problem now.

Val Shawcross said that the takeover of Southern Rail would be good for passengers, especially by increasing the flow of trains by up to 30 to 40%. Councillor Whitehead said that she also in support of Crossrail 2 going to Tooting, especially as St George's Hospital was in Tooting. Val Shawcross confirmed that there was a specific reference in the manifesto around bus services and hospitals.

Councillor Coleridge thanked Val Shawcross for the talk on the MTS. He said that this issue of poor air quality was very high on the agenda for London. Councillor Coleridge said that RB Kensington and Chelsea also supported the issue of Crossrail 2 (King's Road) and hospitals. He said that there was also a big opportunity to get a station at West Chelsea. He felt that the Mayor was not divisive and would govern for all Londoners. Val Shawcross said that the Mayor had a pro-London agenda and that there was a great deal that could be agreed on cross-party. She said that the decision made needed to be the best for London.

Councillor Demirci said that she was hoping for Crossrail 2 to go to Hackney, as well as Dalston to provide an eastern spur to Essex. She said that she would like this to be on the agenda as a case had been made regarding the jobs, homes and growth that this would provide. Val Shawcross said that the Business Plan would show what could be delivered within a 5-year time span. She said that savings could be made and that it was important to keep the scheme current.

Councillor Smith felt that the first crossing should not go through the Silvertown Tunnel, but further east before the Tunnel. He said that LIP funding should be kept going, but with the opportunity to roll funding over for longer than a year, in order to accommodate projects that took longer than a year to complete. Val Shawcross said that she would look into this. She confirmed that the development of the Bakerloo Line was also in the manifesto.

Val Shawcross informed members that the Silvertown Tunnel was in the review. River crossings were being looked at along with demand management, air quality, local public realm schemes and public transport (there was currently only one bus service that went through Tower Bridge). Val Shawcross said that progress needed to be made on Silvertown and TfL was looking at a bridge from Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf.

Christopher Hayward said that there were concerns over the safety of cyclists and pedestrians on Cycling Superhighway. Val Shawcross confirmed that all the boroughs would be written to and asked about the last wave of cycling (i.e. a "lessons learned" review). She said that the segregation of cyclists and pedestrians was important, as people needed to cross roads safely. Boroughs would have an important role in the future pro-cycling and pro-walking agenda. The Chair said that joggers also presented safety issues to cyclists.

Councillor Acton said that the City of Westminster had brought out a draft walking strategy. She informed members that residents had voiced concern over the reduction in road space and the increase in traffic going through residential areas caused by the Cycle Superhighway. Val Shawcross said that the displacement of traffic was a major objection. She asked members to notify her of any areas of displaced traffic.

4. Borough Transport Funding

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that provided members with background information on Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding and engagement London Councils had undertaken with TfL on the development of a new Mayor's Transport Strategy and LIP implementation funding.

The Chair said that this item had already been discussed in the talk with Val Shawcross previously (agenda item 3). Val Shawcross said that TfL would find ways to protect LIP funding. The Chair said that he welcomed this commitment from TfL.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the report.

5. Reducing Air Pollution in London

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that informed members of the large scale public consultation that the Mayor of London had launched, on measures to tackle air pollution in London, and the associated public health and inequality impacts. The consultation had been split into three stages, with the first stage launched on 5th July and running to the 29th July 2016.

Val Shawcross said that there was a great deal of public support to tackle air quality, especially from people who live in inner London. She informed members that improving air quality was the Mayor's number one priority and there was a pressing need to get this right. The coach industry also needed to adapt to reduce air pollution. Val Shawcross said that the cleaning-up of the bus fleet was within TfL's control, as well as ULEZ. Polluting buses would be replaced with more hybrids and electric buses on single decker's (300).

Councillor Usher said that there needed to be a definition on where the boundary would be on the South Circular going through Wandsworth, as some residents faced up to four charges relating to air quality. She said that she would be keen to have that information as soon as possible. Val Shawcross said that determining an appropriate boundary was already on the radar. She said that the T-charge was a transitional arrangement only, and would be superseded by the ULEZ.

Councillor Coleridge said that the T-charge did not appear to differentiate much between petrol and diesel cars. Val Shawcross this was due to a problem with data availability- the age of the vehicle was used as a proxy to pollution levels. There was a need to get the Government's emissions database aligned with the DVLA. This was discussed with the Government before the reshuffle and Government help on this was now required. Councillor Smith said that the data was already available. Councillor Acton said that this data could not be accessed.

Councillor Anderson felt that the North/South circulars should be made wider. He also felt that fines on older cars was a tax on the poor, as only wealthier people could

afford newer, less polluting vehicles. Councillor Anderson said that outer London boroughs tended not to have as much public transport infrastructure. He felt that one of the problems with air pollution was that the transport infrastructure was not growing sufficiently to keep up. Councillor Demirci said that she welcomed the quick response from the Mayor with regards to air quality. She said that the transport infrastructure was already there and she had suggested that TfL undertook some modelling on this.

Val Shawcross said that it was recognised that the outer London boroughs were more reliant on cars, and that there were problems with the North/South circulars. She said that technology (for detection purposes) had now moved on – the Congestion Charge used old technology (ie fixed pole technology). Mobile detection could be used and TfL would be looking at what technology was now available.

Councillor Acton voiced concern that private hire vehicles were being left out of air pollution reduction measures until 2023. Val Shawcross said that entry standards were being raised for mini cab from autumn 2016. She said the sheer volume of mini cabs were now blocking up the streets in London, which was unsustainable.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed that the Chair and vice chairs of TEC would sign off the first phase of the consultation on air quality at Appendix 1 of the report; and
- Agreed that officers would email boroughs to encourage them to make their submissions

6. Social Needs Transport - Update

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that provided members with an update on the progress with TfL's Social Needs Transport Review and implications for the Taxicard scheme.

Spencer Palmer, Director of Transport and Mobility, London Councils, said that the report was for noting/commenting on before reporting to the full TEC meeting on 13 October 2016. He informed members that the proposal was to integrate the TfL run Dial-a-Ride (DAR) scheme and Taxicard (both contracts were held by CityFleet). It was hoped to jointly procure Taxicard and DAR and join together the booking process for both of them. Spencer Palmer said that Taxicard was only funded for the current year and the contract needed to be extended for a further year, in order to proceed with the integration with DAR.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed that officers would ask TfL to agree to extend the Taxicard contract by one more year and to agree to this funding;
- Noted the update on the progress with TfL Social Needs Transport Roadmap to integrate and improve social needs transport for elderly and/or mobility impaired Londoners; and
- Agreed that a further report would go to the full TEC meeting on 13 October 2016, once proposals had been developed further.

7. Green Infrastructure Partnerships

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that provided members with the recommendation made as part of the Mayor's Green Infrastructure Taskforce that affected boroughs and TEC, and set out suggestions on how they could be achieved.

Katharina Winbeck, Head of Transport, Environment and Infrastructure, London Councils, introduced the report and said that a report had already gone to full TEC, outlining four recommendations that directly related to the boroughs. She said that TEC members had given a steer that they did not think that green infrastructure should be added to the responsibility of the sub-regional flood partnerships. Other partnerships were therefore being looked into, such as the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority and the Wandle Valley Partnership.

Katharina Winbeck asked whether annual updates should be requested on how green infrastructure was put in place. Councillor Whitehead felt that funds that had been saved by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority could be invested to get Wandle Valley off the ground. Councillor Coleridge said that he agreed that sub-regional flood partnerships should not be responsible for green partnerships. He felt that the partnerships would work better at a borough level.

Katharina Winbeck said that lobbying would be taking place to set planning fees, although there were concerns if there would be enough money. Councillor Smith said that there was also concern over who was responsible for the long-term maintenance of sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS). Councillor Usher asked how far the lobbying had progressed with regards to planning fees. Katharina Winbeck said that discussions were taking place about doing some combined lobbying with the wider South East. Councillor Usher suggested increasing fees and then ask for an annual report from boroughs. The Chair said that TEC should aspire to have an annual report.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed to lobby for locally set planning fees; and
- Agreed to survey boroughs and ask the GLA for an annual assessment of green infrastructure

8. Defra Litter Strategy Update

Katharina Winbeck gave a verbal update on the Defra Litter Strategy. She said that a number of TEC members had asked if they could be represented on steering group for the Litter Strategy. Defra had responded and said that only one member from London Councils could be on the steering group, and this would be Councillor Clyde Loakes from LB Waltham Forest. Katharina Winbeck said that Councillor Jennifer Brathwaite (LB Lambeth) would act as a substitute if Councillor Loakes was unable to attend. The Chair suggested that officers have a think about best practice and sharing.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted Councillor Clyde Loakes had agreed to represent London Councils on this litter steering group (an appropriate officer or Councillor Jennifer Brathwaite to provide back-up); and

- Officers to look into the possibility of sharing and best practice.

9. Transport and Mobility Services Performance Information

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that provided members with the London Councils' Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Quarter 4 2015/16 and Quarter 1 2016/17.

Spencer Palmer said that an explanation for any missed targets (the "red" sections) had been set-out in the report. Councillor Usher asked why there had been a spike in the Taxicard overspend (journey increases by 4.88% in Q1). Spencer Palmer said that this was being monitored closely, and, as of yet, there was no clear explanation for this. Boroughs would be notified of any projected increases during the year.

Councillor Anderson said that there was no breakdown of London Lorry Control Scheme data across all boroughs. Spencer Palmer said that it will be possible to provide more detailed data in future reports, following a change of contractor and reporting systems in October.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that the spike in Taxicard overspend would continue to be monitored;
- Noted that a more detailed breaking down of the data on the London Lorry Control Scheme would be available from October 2016. Officers would look at how to represent this data to TEC in the future; and
- Noted the performance information report

10. Road User Charging Appeals (RUCA) – Potential Continuation of Service

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that explained to members the re-tender process for the Road User Charging Appeals (RUCA) service that London Councils operated under contract with the GLA. The current contract will end on 31 December 2016 and the GLA has commenced a competitive re-tender exercise. The report sought agreement for London Councils to submit a bid proposal to continue to provide the service on a full cost recovery basis.

Spencer Palmer informed members that the GLA had just advertised the tender for this work, and London Councils would now face competition. The report sought Committee approval for London Councils to submit a bid. Councillor Coleridge asked whether London Councils sub-contracted this work to Northgate. Spencer Palmer confirmed that Northgate provided off-site support, like the call centres. He said London Councils had in-house staff to manage the service.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted the re-tender process and programme for the RUCA service and agreed to submit a bid proposal to continue to provide the service on a full cost recovery basis under a new contract with the GLA; and
- Agreed to grant delegated authority to London Councils' Chief Executive, John O'Brien, to sign the contract to undertake these services, should London Councils win the tendering exercise.

11. Transport and Environment Committee Pre-Audited Financial Results 2015/16

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the provisional pre-audited final accounts for the Transport and Environment Committee for 2015/16.

Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, informed members that KPMG LLP was now London Councils' new external auditor. A provisional surplus of £1.03 million had been posted for 2015/16, compared to £562,000 reported at the end of December 2015 (M9). Frank Smith explained that this variance was primarily due to extra Lorry Control PCNs being accrued, in part due to the IT back-up system registering debts more quickly, leading to a reduction in bad debt provision. All areas of underspend and overspend were explained fully in the report.

Frank Smith informed members that the balance going forward for the provisional general reserves now exceeded the 10% to 15% threshold that had previously been agreed by members. He said that there were two options: (a) to repatriate funds that exceeded the 15% threshold to the boroughs, or (b) transfer these funds into the specific reserve to fund the Freedom Pass reissue in 2020 (£1 million had already been transferred to the reserve to fund the 2020 Freedom Pass reissue). Frank Smith reminded members that a sum of £10,000 each was also being repatriated to boroughs shortly as part of the 2016/17 budget proposals agreed by TEC in December 2015. He said that another option could be to wait and see what the situation was with the reserves in the autumn.

Councillor Coleridge enquired whether the issue with the IT system recording appeals slowly had been resolved. Spencer Palmer said that improvements continued to be made. Councillor Coleridge suggested waiting until the autumn, and if funds still exceeded the 15% threshold, they could be returned to the boroughs. The Chair said that his preference would be to transfer into the reserve to fund the Freedom Pass reissue in 2020. Frank Smith said that the TEC budget was tighter this year and figures could vary depending on the volume of transactions relating to TEC Trading Services, which were volatile.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed to defer a decision regarding the provisional general reserves that exceeded the 10% to 15% yardstick until the budget setting process for 2017/18 in November 2016. A decision could then be made on whether to repatriate funds to boroughs or to transfer further funds to the specific reserve to fund the 2020 Freedom Pass reissue; and
- Noted the provisional pre-audited final accounts for 2015/16, which showed an indicative surplus of £1.03 million for the year.

12. Minutes of the TEC AGM held on 16 June 2016 (for noting)

It was noted that Councillor Smith's name had been omitted from the list of apologies, and this should be rectified.

Subject to the above amendment, the minutes of the TEC AGM meeting held on 16 June 2016 were noted.

13. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 11 February 2016

The minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 11 February 2016 were agreed as being an accurate record.

The Chair asked any members of the public if they could leave the room in order for the Exempt part of the agenda to be considered.

The meeting finished at 11:55am

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee - 8 December 2016

Minutes of a meeting of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee held on Thursday 8 December 2016 at 2:30pm in the Conference Suite, London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL

Present:

Council	Councillor
Barking and Dagenham	Apologies
Barnet	Cllr Dean Cohen
Bexley	Cllr Colin Tandy (Deputy)
Brent	Cllr Ellie Southwood
Bromley	Cllr Colin Smith
Camden	Apologies
Croydon	Cllr Stuart King
Ealing	Cllr Julian Bell (Chair)
Enfield	Cllr Daniel Anderson
Greenwich	Cllr Sizwe James
Hackney	Cllr Feryal Demirci
Hammersmith and Fulham	Cllr Wesley Harcourt
Haringey	Cllr Peray Ahmet
Harrow	
Havering	Apologies
Hillingdon	
Hounslow	Apologies
Islington	Cllr Claudia Webbe
Kensington and Chelsea	Cllr Tim Coleridge
Kingston Upon Thames	Cllr Phil Doyle
Lambeth	
Lewisham	Cllr Alan Smith
Merton	Cllr Nick Draper (Deputy)
Newham	
Redbridge	
Richmond Upon Thames	Cllr Peter Buckwell
Southwark	Cllr Ian Wingfield
Sutton	Cllr Jill Whitehead
Tower Hamlets	
Waltham Forest	Cllr Clyde Loakes
Wandsworth	Cllr Caroline Usher
City of Westminster	Cllr Heather Acton
City of London	Apologies
Transport for London	Alex Williams

1. Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies

Apologies:

Cllr Lynda Rice (LB Barking & Dagenham)
Cllr Alex Sawyer (LB Bexley)
Cllr Phil Jones (LB Camden)
Cllr Amrit Mann (LB Hounslow)
Cllr Martin Whelton (LB Merton)
Christopher Hayward (City of London)

Deputies:

Cllr Colin Tandy (LB Bexley)
Cllr Nick Draper (LB Merton)

2. Declaration of Interests

Freedom Pass Holders/60+ Oyster Cards

Cllr Colin Tandy (LB Bexley), Cllr Phil Doyle (RB Kingston), Cllr Peter Buckwell (LB Richmond), Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton), and Cllr Caroline Usher (LB Wandsworth).

North London Waste Authority

Cllr Dean Cohen (LB Barnet), Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield), Cllr Peray Ahmet (LB Haringey), Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington), and Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Waltham Forest).

South London Waste Partnership

Cllr Stuart King (LB Croydon), Cllr Phil Doyle (RB Kingston) and Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton).

London Waste & Recycling Board

Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney)
Cllr Ian Wingfield (LB Southwark)

Car Club

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing – Chair) and Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington)

Southern Regional Flood & Coastal Committee

Cllr Colin Tandy (LB Bexley)

South East London Flood Risk Partnership (Chair)

Cllr Colin Tandy (LB Bexley)

Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (RFCC)

Cllr Lynda Rice (LB Barking & Dagenham)
Cllr Dean Cohen (LB Barnet)
Cllr Tim Coleridge (RB Kensington & Chelsea)

Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield)

London Cycling Campaign

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing - Chair) and Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney)

Cllr Stuart King thanked all of the emergency services that were involved in the Croydon tram crash and the offers of support sent from boroughs across London. He said this was very much appreciated.

3. Talk by Shirley Rodrigues, Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy, GLA

Shirley Rodrigues introduced herself to TEC. She said that she had started her career at the City of Westminster, had previously worked at London Councils and now worked for the Mayor of London. Shirley Rodrigues made the following comments:

- The Mayor will produce various strategies, including a “Spatial Development Strategy” known as the London Plan and an environment strategy (this will combine 6 or 7 strategies that have previously been standalone). Boroughs would be consulted on these in spring 2017.
- Air quality would be included in transport policies – the Mayor had made clear that the environment would be included in all the other strategies.
- The TfL Business Plan was released today and included £800 million towards air quality and £700 million for cycling and walking.
- The government had ratified the Paris Agreement on climate change. This aims for net zero carbon emissions by 2050 and to keep any temperature rises below 2 degrees.
- The Mayor will introduce “Energy for Londoners” - a group of projects to promote energy efficiency and a look at programmes already existing to see if they could be made more efficient. The Mayor is also looking at the current RE:NEW and RE:FIT programmes.
- The Mayor was looking at setting up an energy company scheme – maybe a hybrid model that would work in London. A number of boroughs were already doing a white label scheme, and talks had taken place with London Councils’ officers.
- There would be a “Fuel Poverty Action Plan” to look at what could be done to tackle fuel poverty, including looking at the affordability of fuel tariffs (end of Spring 2017).
- A “Solar Action Plan” would look at roof top solar panels.
- All these new workstreams and strategies required input from the boroughs to help make them successful.

Air Quality

Shirley Rodrigues said that a number of measures and consultations had taken place about tackling air quality. More could be done between the GLA and boroughs to tackle air quality at a local level (eg frameworks and tools). Boroughs should let Shirley Rodrigues know what they needed to help deal with pollution “hotspots”.

Shirley Rodrigues informed members that TfL had written back to Defra setting out what the GLA was doing with regards to air quality in London and what some

local authorities had been doing. Boroughs were encouraged to ask the Government to help tackle the air quality gap. Almost half of all emissions now did not come from transport related sources and boroughs should remind Defra about this.

Waste

Shirley Rodrigues said that the London Waste and Recycling Board (LWARB) was a good organisation that was carrying out some very beneficial work. The Mayor would be advertising for a Chair of LWARB soon. London Councils had nominated its representatives..

Shirley Rodrigues said that there was an issue with waste management in London. She said that the Mayor would like to see a borough recycling rate of 65% by 2030 (commercial and household waste). There was also some funding available, through LWARB, to go towards the development of services to collect commercial waste.

Green Infrastructure

Shirley Rodrigues said that the Mayor was opposed to the building on green belt land. Funding would be provided for a tree planting programme, with a view to developing a co-ordinated approach to this.

Q and As

The Chair asked about the split in work between Val Shawcross (Deputy Mayor for Transport) and herself. Shirley Rodrigues said that Val Shawcross would liaise with her regarding any areas where there was environment in Val's role and vice versa.

Councillor Alan Smith said that energy that was being lost needed to be looked into, as well as looking at waste as a means of fuel. He said that electric vehicles (EVs) should not be referred to as zero emission vehicles, as they were not. Councillor Webbe said that an energy company called "Angel Energy" had been set up in the borough of Islington to help reduce costs for residents (30% of residents had pre-paid meters, and 50% of these were from social housing). She said that she welcomed the Mayoral focus on energy commitment and she hoped Islington council could be part of the new Mayor's energy company.

Councillor Doyle said that the South London boroughs had agreed to work together to help increase recycling levels. He asked if there was a contact in the Mayor's office to ensure that nothing was missed regarding this.

Shirley Rodrigues said that the GLA was looking at what could be done in London to reduce energy consumption. The Decentralised Energy Project Delivery Unit (DEPDU) could help local authorities to develop heat networks and solar action plans. There was also a policy framework to increase renewable energy at a local level. Shirley Rodrigues said that the GLA would be working with LWARB to publish "route maps" to the circular economy and to help reduce carbon emissions in spring 2017. She said that this would help create around 12,000 net new jobs. Boroughs could write to DEPDU through the Chair of TEC. Shirley Rodrigues said that she was due to visit Bunhill plant soon and congratulated Islington on creating the Angel Energy company.

Shirley Rodrigues said that the GLA was trying to advocate for more resources and funding in London and for demonstration projects, for green funding and to support the green agenda. She said that developers had not objected to boroughs offsetting funds to help achieve zero carbon homes, and funding was

being provided to support this. Any boroughs that could not do this because of capacity issues should contact the GLA. She welcomed joint working on waste, which was more efficient. The officers that led on waste issues at the GLA were Andy Richmond and Wayne Hubbard for LWARB. .

Councillor Coleridge felt that a 65% recycling target by 2030 was somewhat ambitious. He asked whether any plans to build new flats would incorporate proposals to help with this. Councillor Coleridge said that reducing excessive packaging needed to be addressed. Councillor Demirci said that she welcomed the funding for local authorities for air quality. She asked whether more options would be forthcoming with regards to where the ULEZ boundaries stretched (ie North/South Circular). Councillor Demirci said that any new energy plan also needed to look at the impact of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) emissions and how to reduce them.

Councillor Whitehead said that the borough of Sutton was decentralising the energy network in local authority housing and civic buildings. She felt sources of funding were limited in the UK and more green funding was needed. The circular economy was needed to generate this green finance.

Shirley Rodrigues said that the GLA was looking at revisions to Supplementary Planning Guidance to improve waste and energy efficiencies and to look at the performance of flats (options would be set out in the consultation). She said that the waste recycling target of 65% was challenging, but could be achieved. The issue of packaging was not under Mayoral control – the Government needed to consult with businesses on this. However, LWARB could also be consulted on how to redesign products and packaging.

Shirley Rodrigues said that the issue of the ULEZ boundaries and the North/South Circular would be the responsibility of Val Shawcross, although all options would be considered in the next ULEZ consultation. Alex Williams said that TfL was committed to look at the ULEZ boundaries again. Shirley Rodrigues said that the GLA was trying to look at the issues regarding CHP emissions in the same way as diesel vehicles. She said that the GLA was looking at how to mobilise more funding for London.

Councillor Loakes said that the 65% waste recycling target for 2030 was “doable”, as long as England had the same recycling definition as Scotland and Wales. He said that local authorities should be part of the Courtauld Commitment which was a voluntary agreement by business on reducing waste which should expand to look at packaging, as there was currently no reference to local authorities who generally picked up most of the costs for this.

Councillor Colin Smith congratulated Shirley Rodrigues on her new role. He said that greener buses should be made available to the outer London boroughs as well. Councillor Colin Smith felt that the GLA had got its previous tree programme badly wrong – it was very restrictive and efforts needed to be made to make it easier for boroughs to plant trees. Councillor Webbe asked when a Chair of the London Sustainable Development Committee (LSDC) would be appointed, as this committee had not met in the past year.

Shirley Rodrigues confirmed that the definition of waste recycling for the 65% in 2030 was being looked at and would be proposed in the strategy, along with commercial waste. With regards to the packaging issue, she said that LWARB and the GLA would speak to Defra about getting a place at the Courtauld

Agreement table. Shirley Rodrigues said that she would talk to the officers at LB Bromley about why the previous GLA tree planting programme was so prescriptive. She said that there was now a “tree mapping” service that would tell boroughs where the trees were going. Shirley Rodrigues said that the previous Chair of the LSDC, Greg Barker, had stepped down, and an advertisement for a new Chair would be going out in the early 2017.

The Chair thanked Shirley Rodrigues for coming to talk to TEC. Shirley Rodrigues said that she would be happy to come back to talk at a future TEC meeting if members required.

4. Proposed TEC Revenue and Borough Charges 2017/18

The Committee considered a report that detailed the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2017/18. These proposals were considered by the Executive Sub Committee under the Urgency Procedure. The Executive Sub Committee agreed to recommend that Committee approved these proposals.

Frank Smith informed TEC that this report had been sent out to TEC Elected Officers via the Urgency Procedure, due to the cancellation of the TEC Executive Sub Committee in November 2016. The TEC Revenue and borough charges had also been agreed by London Councils’ Leaders Committee on 6 December 2016.

Frank Smith said that there had been a slight increase in the number PCN issued. He said that there were no charges to boroughs for the Freedom Pass Administration. The Taxicard Administration charge amounted to £338,182.

Decision: The Committee approved the changes in individual levies and charges for 2017/18 as follows:

- The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2016/17 - £1,500; paragraph 37);
- The total Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.4915 which would be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2015/16 (2016/17 - £0.4681 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 (2016/17 – nil charge; paragraph 16);
- The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,182 in total (2016/17 - £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 (2016/17 – nil charge; paragraphs 20-21);
- The Parking and Traffic Appeals Charge of £32.00 per appeal or £28.50 per appeal where electronic evidence was provided by the enforcing authority (2016/17 - £33.32/£29.90 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £26.74 for hard copy submissions and £26.06 for electronic submissions (2016/17 - £28.17/£27.49 per SD) (paragraph 28);
- Congestion Charging Appeals – to be recovered on a full cost recovery basis under the new contract arrangements with the GLA (paragraph 29);

- The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.31 per transaction (2016/17 - £7.31; paragraphs 30-34);
- The TRACE (Fax) Charge of £7.48 per transaction (2016/17 - £7.48; paragraphs 30-34); and
- The TEC¹ Charge of £0.17 per transaction (2016/17 - £0.17; paragraphs 30-34);
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £369.075 million for 2017/18, as detailed in Appendix A;
- On the basis of the agreement of the above proposed charges, the provisional gross revenue income budget of £368.447 million for 2017/18, with a recommended transfer of £628,000 from uncommitted Committee reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B;
- From proposed reserves of £628,000, a provisional 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 repayment, as per paragraph 52.

The Committee was also asked to note:

- the reduction of £9.407 million or 2.64% in the Freedom Pass settlement for 2017/18; the first time an annual budget reduction had been delivered;
- the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 51-55 and Table 9 of this report and agree on the preferred option(s) for reducing uncommitted reserves towards the agreed benchmark level of between 10%-15% of operating and trading expenditure, as specifically highlighted in paragraphs 54-55; and
- the estimated total charges to individual boroughs for 2017/18, as set out in Appendix C.1.

5. Concessionary Fares Settlement and Apportionment 2017/18

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 2017/18. The report also sought member approval to the proposed settlement and apportionment.

Frank Smith said that there had been a reduction in concessionary fares trips/take-up for the first time. He reminded members that the TEC reserves benchmark had been set at a maximum of 15%. Frank Smith confirmed that a sum of £10,000 would be returned to each borough and TfL. Councillor Coleridge said that this was a very detailed report and welcomed the paper. He said that the 15% benchmark for reserves could be reviewed on a yearly basis.

Councillor Whitehead said that the take-up of concessionary fares (Taxicard and Freedom Pass) had decreased. She said that there should be a campaign to encourage people to take-up the concessionary fares they were entitled to. The Chair said that Taxicard usage had actually gone up, although concessionary fares up-take had gone down across the board. Stephen Boon, Chief Contracts Officer, London

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

Councils, said that there had been a £9 million reduction in concessionary fares trips (2.64%), which was due to less journeys being taken, especially on buses. He said that another contributory factor to the reduction was changes to some of the fares (eg “hopper” fares).

Decision: The Committee:

- Agreed the TfL settlement of £324.181million for 2017/18;
- Agreed to the ATOC settlement of £18.872 million for 2017/18;
- Agreed a budget for non-TfL bus services of £1.7 million;
- Agreed the reissue budget for 2017/18 of £1.518 million;
- Agreed the borough payments for 2017/18 of £346.271 million;
- Agreed the payment profile and dates on which boroughs’ contributions are paid as 8 June 2017, 7 September 2017, 7 December 2017 and 8 March 2018; and
- Agreed the 2017-2018 London Service Permit (LSP) bus operators (non-TfL buses) Concessionary Scheme.

6. Delivery “Partnership” for Residential and Car Club Electric Charge Points

The Committee received a report on the delivery “Partnership” for residential and car club electric charge points.

Katharina Winbeck introduced the report and informed members that London Councils was consulting with the legal team at the City on how to proceed with the Go Ultra Low City Scheme (GULCS). She said that Louise Clancy had been seconded to London Councils to work on this project and would be consulting with boroughs individually.

Councillor Coleridge said that boroughs could decide where electric vehicle (EV) charging points were positioned. £13 million would be made available to help with this. Councillor Anderson said that he would like to have the option of limiting the number of EV charging points. He asked what the impact would be on existing charging point arrangements. Katharina Winbeck said that these issues are currently worked through and will be covered in the business plan. The Chair said that another report on this would come back to the next full TEC meeting in March 2017.

Decision: The Committee:

- Noted the on the Go Ultra Low City Scheme – Delivery “Partnership” for Residential and Car Club Electric Charge Points; and
- Agreed to engage with relevant officers in their appointing authorities to seek prompt, constructive local authority engagement with the consultation which was planned (see paragraph 12).

7. Chair's Report

The Committee considered a report that updated members on transport and environment policy since the last TEC meeting on 13 October 2016, and provided a forward look until the next meeting on 23 March 2017.

The Chair said that the night tube had so far worked very well. There were also low levels of crime at the stations. The Chair said that there were concerns on the Piccadilly line, however, caused by leaves and rolling stock problems. Alex Williams said that the aim was to go live week commencing 19 December 2017. Councillor Usher said that there had been a number of drink related problems at Tooting tube station, which was currently being monitored. She asked whether the Northern Line would be part of the 24-hour tube. Alex Williams said that he would confirm to members whether the Northern Line would be part of the 24-hour tube.

Decision: The Committee:

- Noted that Alex Williams to let Cllr Usher know whether the Northern Line extension will be part of the 24 hour Tube; and
- Noted the Chair's report.

8. Mayor's Second Air Quality Consultation Report

The Committee received a report that provided members with a draft of London Councils' response to the second phase of the Mayor's air consultation and asked for members' comments and sign off, so that London Councils could submit it to the Mayor by 18 December 2016.

Katharina Winbeck introduced the report and informed members that boroughs still had a chance to make changes to the consultation up until 18 December 2016. She said that the consultation focused on an emissions surcharge (February 2017) and the ULEZ. Katharina Winbeck said that the Mayor's emissions surcharge was supported, although it would be preferable to have a 24-hour scheme, rather than the same time as the Congestion Charge, and to include Euro 5 diesel vehicles rather than Euro 5 as suggested in the response. Regarding the expanded ULEZ, boroughs were generally not happy with the boundaries proposed ((i.e. up to the North/South Circular) and would like to see a longer term vision, which resulted in all of London having clean air.

Councillor Colin Smith said that the borough of Bromley did not want to be included in the ULEZ and he wanted this noted in the minutes. Councillor Cohen felt that more clarity was needed with regards to whether the North and South circulars were included or excluded. Katharina Winbeck said that this would be made clearer in the response and that they should be included. Councillor Coleridge said that most people supported the Mayor on addressing air quality, but he was concerned that the issue of agreeing the ULEZ boundary could delay the process.

Councillor Demirci said that a number of boroughs would not benefit from the North/South Circular boundary. She said that the report was a good first step, although it did not go far enough. Councillor Anderson said that the ULEZ was not supported by the borough of Enfield, as it did not go far enough and would have negligible impact on the outer London boroughs. He felt that it was unworkable in its current form. Councillor Anderson also said that there needed to be some type of

scrappage scheme for older polluting vehicles, especially as a large number of older vehicles were owned by people on lower incomes.

Councillor Loakes said that the ULEZ needed to incorporate the A406. He said that he would like to see the boundary go up to the M25. Councillor Doyle said that more details were required on how old the vehicles should be, and whether they included commercial and private vehicles. He said that the paper dealt with these issues only in the very last paragraph of the report. Katharina Winbeck agreed that this should be made more explicit. Councillor Buckwell said that the South Circular needed to be included, and the M4 corridor which also suffered from very bad pollution.

Councillor Alan Smith said that details on polluting vehicles could be obtained from the DVLA, but they had refused to release this information. Councillor Webbe said that the aim should be to have a diesel-free London. She said that there were also concerns over vehicle exemptions, including Blue Badge holders, taxis and MOD vehicles. Councillor Acton said that a two tier approach would be the best way forward where the first phase would include the north and south circulars and the second phase all of London. She said that the Government and the DVLA had been approached in order to get this information on vehicles, but with no real success. Councillor Acton also felt that the “sunshine period”, a discount for resident living within the area affected by the Emissions Surcharge and subsequent central London ULEZ, of 6 to 7 years was too long.

Councillor Whitehead said that a two tier approach would be preferable. She said that diesel vehicles should be phased out and that the ULEZ should eventually go up to the M25. Suitable public transport was also needed, especially in LB Sutton, owing to the Southern rail dispute. Katharina Winbeck said that she would make the necessary changes to the consultation, including the North/South Circulars within boundary, suggesting a two-phased system, take another look at the vehicle exemptions, request access to DVLA data and strengthen the fact that the sunset period suggested is too long. Councillor Demirci said that modelling needed to be carried out for the wider expansion of the ULEZ. She said that TfL were going to look into this. Councillor Colin Smith said that the air quality in outer London boroughs would improve as a result of the ULEZ.

Alex Williams informed members that a decision to implement the emissions surcharge would be made by the Mayor in early 2017, before being introduced in October 2017. He said that TfL was currently working through a proposal to expand the ULEZ, in addition to the central London scheme being implemented from 2020 (or earlier). Alex Williams said that the ULEZ was a radical and complex scheme that required a great deal of modelling. Boroughs would be consulted on this again in early 2017.

Decision: The Committee:

- Noted that LB Bromley did not want to be part of an expanded ULEZ;
- Noted that the draft consultation response needed to be more explicit as to whether London Councils supported the inclusion of the north/south circular as part of the ULEZ boundary;
- Noted that some boroughs felt that some form of Government scrappage scheme was needed for older polluting vehicles;
- Noted that LB Waltham Forest could not support the consultation response unless the A406 was incorporated in the ULEZ;

- Agreed that London Councils should look more closely at the proposed exemptions for older vehicles and whether they were appropriate;
- Agreed that the consultation response should include a two-phase approach giving support for an expanded ULEZ to the north/south circular in the first phase and then an expanded zone beyond this in a second phase;
- Agree to look into accessing the data held on vehicles by the DVLA;
- Noted that the current sunset period (6-7 years) was too long; and
- Noted that members had until 18 December to contribute to the consultation.

9. A Direct Vision Standard for Heavy Goods Vehicles

The Committee considered a report that outlined Transport for London's (TfL) work on a Direct Vision Standard (DVS) for Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) in London, which was launched by the Mayor of London on 30 September 2016. The Mayor set out how the DVS used a zero to five star rating system that rates HGVs based on how much a driver could actually see directly from the cab without using cameras or mirrors.

Ben Plowden, Director of Surface Strategy and Planning, TfL said that a large number of cycling deaths involved lorries. He said that TfL had now developed a DVS to measure how much a driver could see out HGVs

The Mayor's intention was to use the DVS to ban or restrict the most unsafe zero star rated HGVs in London's streets by 2020 (through the Traffic Order), and ensure that only HGVs suitable for urban environments (three star and above) are used in London from 2024. Councillor Demirci asked whether the ULEZ was going to be linked with the DVS. Ben Plowden confirmed that these links were being made. The Chair asked whether there would be a transitional period before full implementation. He said that there would also be a role for retrofitting. Ben Plowden confirmed that TfL was working with the construction industry and suppliers on the DVS. He said that drivers needed to be able to see directly out of their cabs, through a mirror.

Decision: The Committee:

- Members noted the creation of a Direct Vision Standard for HGVs and its contribution towards safer roads in London; and
- Endorsed the Mayor's general proposals to work towards a London-wide ban or restrictions on unsafe, "zero-star DVS rated" HGVs in 2020 (subject to the outcome of further research and consultation and further consideration of appropriate implementation measures).

10. Taxicard Update

The Committee received a report that informed members of the final Taxicard spend for 2015/16 and the projected budget outturn for 2016/17. The report also updated members on proposals which were being explored for greater coordination between the Taxicard and Dial-a-Ride schemes, and requested authority to extend the existing service contract for a further 18 months (subject to the contractor's agreement) to allow sufficient time to undertake the new procurement.

Decision: The Committee

- Noted the final Taxicard spend for 2015/16 and the projected outturn for 2016/17;
- Noted the update on the work being undertaken to explore with TfL the potential for greater co-ordination in a future re-procurement and delivery of London Councils' Taxicard service and TfL's Dial-a-Ride service, such matters to be reported back in due course for decision;
- Commented on the approach and the indicative timetable outlined in the Report;
- Resolved to extend the Taxicard contract for a further year until March 2018 as permitted under clause 3.4 of the existing contract with the provider; and
- Resolved to delegate authority to officers to negotiate and agree an additional extension to the contract of six months beyond the maximum permitted in the existing contract.

11. Traffic Signals Budget 2017/18

The Committee received a report that set out the cost to boroughs of maintaining traffic signals in London in 2017/18.

Councillor Coleridge said that TEC had agreed that the boroughs would check the figures for the traffic signals. He asked whether this data could be sent out by the end of December 2016. Spencer Palmer said that he was aware of the queries regarding this matter. He asked for TEC to conditionally agree the report. Councillor Loakes said that it would be beneficial if some historical data on the traffic signals budget could be sent to members.

Decision: The Committee

- Noted that Councillor Coleridge would like to see a more detailed breakdown of the costs for traffic signals in London;
- Provisionally agreed the cost to boroughs for maintaining traffic signals in London in 2017/18, which was £11,377,024.49;
- Agreed that this cost was apportioned between boroughs, as shown in the attached table at Appendix 1; and
- Agreed that TfL officers that dealt with traffic signals would attend a future TEC meeting to discuss how the traffic signals budget was put together.

12. Additional Parking Charges

The Committee considered a report that detailed the proposals by the London Borough of Enfield to amend the penalty charge banding from Band B to Band A across the borough.

Decision: The Committee:

- Agreed to change the penalty banding in LB Enfield from Band B to Band A, and
- Noted the proposed implementation date for the change of 1 April 2017

13. Code of Practice on Civil Parking Enforcement (Part 1)

The Committee received a report that contained a revised Code of Practice and Civil Parking Enforcement (Part 1).

Councillor Acton informed Committee that a Private Members' Bill would be going to Parliament on 25 November 2017 to take away local authority ability to increase parking fees. Spencer Palmer confirmed that information would be sent round to TEC members on this issue.

Decision: The Committee:

- Agreed that Spencer Palmer would circulate to TEC members details of the Private Members' Bill, supported by the Government, to amend the Road Traffic Regulation Act (1984), that would mean local authorities would need to consult formally if they wanted to increase the cost of parking charges;
- Noted the contents of the revised Part 1 of the Code of Practice and agreed that it should replace Part 1 of the existing Code; and
- Recommended the adoption of Part 1 of the Code of Practice by all London authorities that carried out civil parking enforcement of parking regulations

14. London Lorry Control Scheme Review

The Committee received a report that provided members with an update on the progress of the review of the London Lorry Control Scheme (LLCS).

Councillor Acton voiced concern a lorries going through London 24 hours a day.

Decision: The Committee noted the report on the London Lorry Control Scheme Review.

15. Re-appointment of Environment and Traffic Adjudicators

The Committee considered a report that proposed the re-appointment of two environment and traffic adjudicators.

Decision: The Committee recommended that the following adjudicators be re-appointed for a period of 5 years from 6 December 2016:

Christopher Rayner
Belinda Pearce

16. Items Considered under the Urgency Procedure

The Committee received and noted the following report that was sent to TEC Elected Officers on 10 November 2016:

Appendix 1: Draft Revenue Budget and Borough Charges 2016 (including Appendices A, B, C1 and C2, D and E).

17. Minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 13 October 2016

The minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 13 October 2016 were agreed as an accurate record.

Members of the press and public were asked to leave the room while the Exempt part of the minutes were discussed

The meeting finished at 16:20pm