

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

Thursday 23 March 2017

2.30pm in the Conference Suite, London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL

Labour Group: Meeting Room 4 at 1.30pm (1st Floor)

Conservative Group: Meeting Room 1 at 1.30pm (1st Floor)

Contact Officer: Alan Edwards

Telephone: 020 7934 9911
Email: alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Agenda items	
1	Apologies for Absence and Announcement of Deputies
2	Declarations of Interest*
3	Presentation by Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner, GLA
4	Chair's Report
5	Flood Partnerships Update
6	Fixed Penalty Levels for GLC Parks Byelaws
7	Go Ultra Low City Scheme (GULCS) – Phase 1 for Delivering Residential and Car Club Charge Points
8	Application for London Borough of Sutton to undertake CCTV Bus Lane Enforcement
9	Taxicard Progress Report
10	Freedom Pass Progress Report
11	Items Considered under the Urgency Procedure

12	Dates of TEC and TEC Executive Sub Committee for 2017/18	
13	Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 February 2017 (for noting)	
14	Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 8 December 2016 (for agreeing)	
	Exclusion of the Press and Public (Exempt) 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.	
E1	Re-tendering of Direct Services Administration: Freedom Pass and Taxicard	

Declarations of Interest

* 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

Tel: 020 7934 9911

Email: alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

TEC Declarations of Interest as at 23 March 2017

Freedom Pass Holders/60+ Oyster Cards

Cllr Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr Phil Doyle (RB Kingston), Cllr Alan Smith (LB Lewisham), 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 Phil Jones (LB Camden), Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield), Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney), Cllr Peray Ahmet (LB Haringey), Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington), and Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Waltham Forest).

Western Regional Waste Authority

Cllr Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham) and Cllr Jenny Brathwaite (LB Lambeth).

East London Waste Authority

Cllr Lynda Rice (LB Barking & Dagenham), Cllr Ian Corbett (LB Newham), and Cllr John Howard (LB Redbridge).

South London Waste Partnership

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

West London Waste Authority

Cllr Ellie Southwood (LB Brent).

London Waste & Recycling Board

Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Waltham Forest).

Car Club

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

Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (RFCC)

Cllr Lynda Rice (LB Barking & Dagenham)
Cllr Dean Cohen (LB Barnet)
Cllr Tim Coleridge (RB Kensington & Chelsea)
Cllr Alan Smith (LB Lewisham)
Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield)

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

Chair's Report

Item no: 4

Report by: Katharina Winbeck **Job title:** Head of Transport, Environment and Infrastructure, London Councils

Date: 23 March 2017

Contact Officer: Katharina Winbeck

Telephone: 020 7934 9945 **Email:** Katharina.winbeck@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary This report updates Members on transport and environment policy since the last TEC meeting on 8 December 2016 and provides a forward look until the next TEC meeting on 15 June 2017.

Recommendations Members to note this report.

Updates included in this report:

Transport

- TEC / TfL Commissioner meeting 16 February 2017
- Healthy Streets document published
- Meeting with Val Shawcross on 23 February 2017
- Mayor's Transport Strategy event with TfL 2 March 2017
- Congestion
- London Assembly Transport Committee – bus networks and bus safety investigation
- Response to TfL West End Bus Review consultation
- London Lorry Control Scheme review
- Promotion of CLOCS – Construction Logistics and Community Safety
- Press interviews

Environment

- New LWARB Chair and Business Plan Briefing
- Emissions surcharge / ULEZ response
- London Assembly Environment Committee – green spaces and Thames Water evidence session
- Thames RFCC Chair being advertised
- Press interviews

Forward Look

Forthcoming meetings and consultations

Introduction

1. This report updates Members on London Councils' work on transport and environment policy since the last TEC meeting on 8 December 2016 and provides a forward look until 15 June 2017.

Transport

TEC / TfL Commissioner meeting 16 February 2017

2. The TEC Vice-Chairs and I met Mike Brown the TfL Commissioner on 16 February. We discussed the new TfL Business Plan, particularly the situation around buses and the clean bus corridors. We also talked about the forthcoming Mayor's Transport Strategy and LIP guidance and the new Healthy Streets document that was published by TfL. We will pursue a London borough representative on the Healthy Streets Board, which the TfL Commissioner agreed to consider.
3. Although the Secretary of State has expressed his opposition to devolution to TfL of the south eastern franchise, TfL colleagues were taking lessons from the previous business case and remain hopeful that further discussions for rail devolution could still take place. We discussed the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) consultation and received assurances that TfL will provide additional modelling data in the near future. The Direct Vision Standard for HGV's consultation was also on the agenda and we were all mindful that the freight industry should not suffer excessive burdens and coordinate any vehicle changes required.

Healthy Streets document published

4. The Mayor of London has published Healthy Streets for London: prioritising walking, cycling and public transport to create a healthy city. The foreword is by Will Norman, the new Walking and Cycling Commissioner, and it has a strong emphasis on health. It highlights the Healthy Streets approach, how TfL will work with boroughs, and gives examples of places in London where the healthy streets approach has already been applied in practice.
5. I will be speaking at the launch event on 17 March, highlighting the many cases where boroughs are already putting the Healthy Streets concept into practice.
6. Healthy Streets can be read here: <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/healthy-streets-for-london.pdf>

Meeting with Val Shawcross on 23 February 2017

7. I met with Val Shawcross, Deputy Mayor for Transport, on 23 February where we discussed the Mayor's Transport Strategy and LIPs, Healthy Streets, ULEZ, the Go Ultra Low City Scheme project, and rail devolution.
8. Relating to roads, we discussed the bus network and clean bus corridors, electric vehicles, road user charging and freight initiatives.

Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) event with TfL 2 March 2017

9. London Councils held this joint event with TfL on 2 March which provided an opportunity for boroughs and TfL to discuss in more detail Healthy Streets, car reduction and mode shift, and support for Local Implementation Plans before the draft Mayor's Transport Strategy is published.
10. The day was well-attended and provided an opportunity for boroughs and TfL to discuss how aspects of the Mayor's Transport Strategy would work across London, and provided an opportunity to co-create policy.

11. We will continue discussions with TfL on the MTS going forward and will formally respond to the draft consultation document that is expected in May 2017.

Congestion

12. London Councils submitted a written response to the Parliamentary Transport Select Committee inquiry into Urban Congestion. We commented on issues, such as bus prioritisation, road pricing, parking schemes, technological innovation, and a modal shift to more sustainable and active travel modes. We highlighted wider considerations such as flexible working models, and better managing and planning of construction and development works.
13. The London Assembly Transport Committee published a report into traffic congestion following their investigation last year, to which London Councils submitted evidence. It gives 11 recommendations, two of which are of relevance to London boroughs replicated here;

Recommendation 1 - In the short-term, the Congestion Charge should be reformed, so the payments levied better reflect the impact of vehicles on congestions. The daily flat rate should be replaced with a charging structure that ensures vehicles in the zone at peak times, and spending longer in the zone, face the highest charges.

For the long-term, the Mayor needs to start to develop proposals now for replacing the Congestion Charge with a new citywide road pricing scheme, which charges vehicles according to the extent, location and timing of their road usage. Road pricing could also replace Vehicle Excise Duty, which should be devolved by the Government to the Mayor. There may be a case for the scheme to be wider than the existing Congestion Charge zone; discussions with all boroughs should take place to determine whether and how road pricing should cover their local road network.

Recommendation 4 – The Mayor and TfL should take steps to encourage more delivery consolidation. This will involve working with those running large construction schemes and retailers, potentially through Business Improvement Districts. The new London Plan should promote consolidation for new developments. TfL should also work with London Councils to reduce restrictions on night-time deliveries. The Mayor and TfL should write to the committee by the end of April 2017 setting out their plans to reduce commercial traffic in these ways.

Both London Councils submissions can be read in full on the Roads section of London Councils' website:

<http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/our-key-themes/transport/roads>

London Assembly Transport Committee – bus networks and bus safety investigation

14. London Councils provided written and oral evidence to this investigation. We highlighted a number of issues including better bus-led development; more orbital links; and more opportunities for boroughs to influence TfL's route and network planning. The response can be read in full on the Buses page of our website:

<http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/our-key-themes/transport/buses>

Response to TfL West End Bus Review consultation

15. London Councils responded to the TfL consultation on changes to buses in central London, the West End and Oxford Street to allow for changes to access to Oxford Street and the opening of the Elizabeth line. Whilst supportive of the principle being consulted on, our response outlined that we felt the review of bus routes could have been more

holistic, for example identifying opportunities to improve London's air quality and create links with the Opportunity Areas, which were missed. The response can be read in full on the Buses page of our website:

<http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/our-key-themes/transport/buses>

London Lorry Control Scheme review

16. The London Lorry Control Scheme (LLCS) is run by London Councils on behalf of the boroughs and controls the movement of heavy goods vehicles over 18 tonnes at night and at weekends. The scheme is in place to help minimise noise pollution in residential areas during unsocial hours through restricted use of London's road network. The LLCS review aims to assess whether the scheme continues to provide essential environmental benefits and protection for Londoners, as it has done for more than 30 years. The review is progressing well and the freight and haulage industry was invited to contribute to the review at a dedicated Operators' Workshop on 9th March. The aim is to complete the review and report recommendations to TEC this summer.

Promotion of CLOCS – Construction Logistics and Community Safety

17. I was written to recently by the Director of the LHC (the public sector procurement specialist organisation) in my capacity as TEC Chair to help promote the CLOCS standard amongst London local authorities in their procurement activity. CLOCS was developed by Transport for London to help improve road user and community safety in connection with construction logistic activities. It is now a nationally recognised standard and the responsibility for implementing the standard has been passed to the construction industry and LHC is part of the team tasked with promoting CLOCS to public sector clients. Their aim is to get the CLOCS standard recognised in procurement, planning and transport departments.
18. I have asked London Councils' officers to help promote the standard through relevant officer networks and to bring to Members' attention through this report.
19. For more information - <http://www.clocs.org.uk/>

Press interviews

20. London Councils and TfL issued a joint press release in January 2017 to reassure Londoners that they were prepared for winter weather and would be doing their bit to keep the capital's transport network moving. I was interviewed by Vanessa Feltz on the BBC Radio London Breakfast Show about this.
21. In January 2017 I provided a positive statement for inclusion in the Mayor of London's press release announcing successful Neighbourhoods of the Future bids.
Cllr Julian Bell, Chair of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee and the Go Ultra Low City Scheme Steering Group, said:
"These projects showcase the diverse and innovative work that London boroughs are doing to promote electric vehicle use and improve air quality. They also contribute to the overall Go Ultra Low Cities Scheme to implement charging infrastructure across the capital. It is great to see London boroughs working with the Mayor and TfL to test exciting new policies that could be rolled-out nationwide."

Environment

New LWARB Chair and Business Plan Briefing

22. Dr Liz Goodwin OBE has been announced by the Mayor as the new Chair of the London Waste and Recycling Board (LWARB). She was previously chief executive of WRAP (Waste and Resources Action Plan).
23. The LWARB Board held an informal business plan briefing session in February 2017 which London Councils and the GLA attended, in addition to the Board members.

Emissions Surcharge / ULEZ response

24. Following the 2nd phase of the Mayor's air quality consultation, to which London Councils submitted evidence, Sadiq Khan recently announced that he is going to introduce the Emissions Surcharge, also known as the T-Charge, on 23 October 2017. The Emissions Surcharge of £10 will apply to vehicles that do not meet the Euro 4 standard (those registered before 2006). The charge will operate on top of, and during the same operating times and area as the Congestion Charge (Monday to Friday 7am-6pm). In our response, London Councils called on the standards for diesel vehicles to be stricter, set at Euro 5 rather than 4, and for the operating time to be 24-7, with fewer exemptions.
25. Phase 3 of the consultation (bringing forward and extending the ULEZ) is planned for 2017, however TfL have not yet shared the exact details of this.

London Assembly Environment Committee – green spaces and Thames Water evidence session

26. Cllr Feryal Demirci, Vice-Chair of TEC attended an evidence session of the London Assembly Environment Committee which looked at green spaces in London and the issues concerning their funding and maintenance. The Environment Committee also spent a short time with Thames Water exploring the burst water main incidents that had occurred recently.
27. Cllr Demirci highlighted the key borough role in promoting green infrastructure, especially through the planning role. London Councils supports the London Sustainable Drainage Action Plan, and is positive towards better quantifying the value of green space benefits so that a proper value can be placed on them, helping ensure their long-term protection.
28. In terms of the future funding of green spaces and parks, Cllr Demirci highlighted the need for continued revenue funding to ensure maintenance; and that transferring assets to others did not necessarily address this challenge. London will also need to be creative about how it creates new green and open spaces as large tracts of land to create large parks are unlikely to be regularly available. Instead green roofs and other green infrastructure will need to be part of new development to deliver new green spaces. London Councils does not support green spaces becoming a statutory responsibility of local authorities, particularly if there is no additional funding attached.

Thames RFCC Chair being advertised

29. Amanda Nobbs, who has chaired the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee for the past seven years, is nearing the end of her appointment. TEC has established a good working relationship with the Chair in recent years and I hope this will continue with the new Chair. The role is currently being advertised and I hope TEC will be able to meet the new Chair at its meeting in October 2017.

Press interviews

30. In December 2016, the Mayor of London announced he would be doubling air quality funding to £875m over the next five years, I issued a statement to the Municipal Journal.

Cllr Julian Bell, executive member for transport and environment, said: "We know air quality is a big concern for many Londoners and London Councils is fully supportive of the Mayor's plan to make this issue one of his top priorities.

"Worrying findings by King's College London this week show pollution is having a real impact on the health of our residents, which is why boroughs have been doing active work together to achieve air quality targets, promote cycling and walking and cut down on emissions.

"We will continue to work alongside the Mayor to ensure we are given the tools and support from Government to clean up the capital's air and improve the health and quality of life of Londoners."

31. At the end of December 2016, London Councils issued a press release encouraging Londoners to recycle waste generated during the festive season. BBC London TV was interested in covering this story and I was interviewed at Ealing Recycling Centre on this issue. London Councils also created an infographic illustrating the amount of food waste that could be recycled across the capital over Christmas and New Year to communicate the scale of the challenge but also how everyone can do their bit to help.
32. In February 2017 ITV London had FOled councils in London to find out the number of reported flytipping incidents and prosecutions that had occurred within a 12 month period. I was interviewed live in the studio about this, representing the perspective of the London boroughs, alongside an ITV London reporter who had explored the issue further by visiting Haringey, the borough with the most recorded incidents in the country.

Forward Look

March

- 13 – LWARB Board Meeting, City Hall
- 22 – Natural Capital Account for London stakeholder meeting
- 24 – The Future of Transport in London conference

April

- 11 – Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee main meeting
- 13 – GLA & London Councils London Environment Strategy pre-consultation event for TEC members and officers
- 19 – [tbc] TfL night tube event
- Tbc but before 24 April – National Defra Air Quality Strategy Consultation

May

- 23 – TEC/TfL Commissioner Meeting
- Tbc – draft London Environment Strategy published, three month consultation
- Tbc – draft Mayor's Transport Strategy and LIP guidance published, three month consultation

June

- 14 – Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee Programme Sub-Committee
- 15 – TEC Main

London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee

Flood Partnerships Update

Item no: 05

Report by: Cllr Alan Smith **Title:** TEC Lead for the Thames RFCC
Date: 23 March 2017
Contact Officer: Jennifer Sibley
Telephone: 020 7934 9829 **Email:** Jennifer.sibley@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: As part of the TEC and Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (Thames RFCC) Joint Working Arrangements, TEC receives an annual update on the work of the seven London sub-regional flood partnerships, the Thames RFCC and the Environment Agency.

Recommendations: The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report.

Flood partnerships update

1. This report is the third such report TEC has received since the Joint Working Arrangements with the Thames RFCC were agreed.
2. The Thames RFCC is a statutory committee that brings together Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs; each borough and the City of London), the Environment Agency and Thames Water.
3. The Thames RFCC has catchment responsibilities that include London and encompass Oxfordshire, Hampshire, Surrey, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and parts of Essex and Warwickshire.
4. London has seven sub-regional partnerships which are each represented on the Thames RFCC by a lead member. These appointments are agreed by TEC each June. They are:
 - North West (covers Hillingdon, Hounslow, Ealing, Brent, Harrow and Barnet) represented by Cllr Dean Cohen.
 - South West (covers Richmond upon Thames, Kingston upon Thames, Sutton, Merton, Wandsworth and Croydon) represented by Cllr Nick Draper.
 - South East (covers Bromley, Lewisham, Greenwich and Bexley) represented by Cllr Alan Smith.
 - North East (covers Havering, Barking and Dagenham and Redbridge) represented by Cllr Lynda Rice.
 - North Central (covers Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea, City of Westminster, City of London, Camden and Islington) represented by Cllr Timothy Coleridge.
 - South Central (covers Lambeth and Southwark) represented by Cllr Jennifer Brathwaite.
 - London Lee (covers Hackney, Tower Hamlets, Haringey, Enfield, Waltham Forest and Newham) represented by Cllr Daniel Anderson.

Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs) – sub-regional flood partnership updates

5. London Councils requested an update from each partnership about its work over the last twelve months. All but the London Lee partnership responded.
6. LLFAs have statutory responsibilities for surface and groundwater flooding and smaller watercourses. They are responsible for producing Local Flood Risk Management Strategies which identify the risks of flooding and the measures which could be taken to reduce this risk. These strategies inform Flood Risk Management Plans which must be produced for all Flood Risk Areas. Almost all of London is designated a Flood Risk Area, and every borough and the City of London has at least some of its area within the Flood Risk Area.
7. Defra has continued to raise its concerns that not all of London's authorities have a Local Flood Risk Management Strategies in place. The latest picture is that all but two authorities now have a strategy out for consultation or in place.
8. Other duties include producing an asset register which identifies significant assets in the local authority area and their risk of flooding. LLFAs are statutory consultees as part of the planning process, responsible for considering the impact of a planning application on surface water flooding risk. They investigate flooding incidents, and where appropriate complete flood investigations.
9. All LLFAs in London are eligible to apply for funding from the Thames RFCC to address flood risk management in their area. Three boroughs have a proportion of their area in the Southern RFCC catchment (Greenwich, Bexley and Bromley), and so are eligible to put forward projects in that catchment area to the Southern RFCC for funding.

North West

Summary of key themes / issues discussed at partnership

10. Projects in critical drainage areas, investigations into flooding incidents, planning applications and the statutory consultee role are discussed. Updates include funding, legislative changes and soft engineering techniques.

11. Projects in this partnership – brief update

- Ealing, Hounslow and Hillingdon will be looking to explore joint working opportunities going forward in critical drainage areas across boundaries with Thames Water and the Environment Agency.
- Ealing – four initial assessment flood studies for four critical drainage areas with three being progressed to outline business case.
- Harrow – two river restorations and flood storage projects completed, and Thames RFCC funding allocated for four other projects.

Sustainable drainage

12. Boroughs continue to work with planning colleagues to ensure planning applications comply with policies. The TfL streetscapes guidance and London Sustainable Drainage Action Plan published last year will assist with this. Ealing is drafting local sustainable drainage guidance.

South West

Summary of key themes / issues discussed at partnership

13. Variety of discussions and presentations on the following topics: project updates; policy changes; LLFA duties; funding routes; regional and national meetings (e.g. Drain London, London Drainage Engineers Group (LoDEG), Thames RFCC); asset management; sustainable drainage; climate change allowances; Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment updates; flood risk resilience; TfL Comprehensive Review of Flood Risk; retrofitting sustainable drainage; training possibilities.

Projects in this partnership – brief update

14. Numerous critical drainage area / local flood risk zone flood alleviation schemes (feasibility studies, modelling and options appraisal) in all boroughs – all Thames RFCC funded.

Sustainable drainage

15. Generally there has been a slight improvement in the level of information submitted by applicants with planning applications but the majority still have limited above ground/green sustainable drainage features and often achieve the minimum London Plan requirements and no better. There is generally no cost or benefit quantification given as to why increased number of sustainable drainage features cannot be included in a new development. Developers typically play Thames Water off against the local authority. The partnership is going to build a list of case studies of constructed sustainable drainage schemes within the boroughs to aid lessons learnt.

South East

Summary of key themes / issues discussed at partnership

16. The partnership meets regularly both with members and as officers. Many subjects are discussed including boroughs current progress, projects and issues. The meetings are always attended by the Environment Agency, Thames Water and London Councils which allows the partnership to discuss and act on issues both strategically and locally.

Projects in this partnership – brief update

17. All boroughs have funded projects from both Thames and Southern RFCC currently in study or design. The boroughs are also progressing their own projects mainly around asset collection.

Sustainable drainage

18. All boroughs are commenting on major developments, and all boroughs are designing, installing or incorporating sustainable drainage within their own work.

North East

Summary of key themes / issues discussed at partnership

19. Partnership recently re-established; aspiration is to meet quarterly. This has led to an open dialogue on flood risk matters between the boroughs; for example the sharing of modelling outputs and an analysis of development impacts alongside one river on a shared boundary.

Projects in this partnership – brief update

20. Redbridge

- Mayesbrook – modelling identified properties at risk, though not cost beneficial to develop risk reduction options at present time.
- Seven Kings Water/Loxford Water – flooding occurred June 2016, work underway to understand mechanism of flooding and develop risk reduction options.
- Clayhall – modelling identified properties at risk, risk reduction options being developed. Intend to submit a business case to the Environment Agency in late spring 2017.
- Woodford – modelling identified properties at risk, risk reduction options being developed. Intend to submit a business case to the Environment Agency in late spring 2017.
- Wanstead Flats – modelling being developed to improve understanding of flood risk in area.

21. Havering

- Following the June 2016 floods and the EA's report received in December 2016, feasibility studies are being carried out on the following schemes:
 1. Identify a way of slowing down the River Rom catchment north of Collier Row.
 2. Identify improvements to the land drainage north of Frinton Road.
 3. Identify additional ways for the River Rom to flow under Collier Row Road bridge during high flow levels.
 4. Consider re-commissioning the Cross Road Flood lagoon.
 5. Environment Agency to look at creating a new flood storage area at the confluence of the River Ravensbourne and Rom.

22. Barking & Dagenham

- Thames RFCC funding being utilised to update borough-wide flood risk modelling. This will inform five schemes that were awarded funding in 2016/17.

Sustainable drainage

23. Boroughs note the volume of planning applications requiring input is increasing. Havering has used its Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to inform the Local Plan and Barking and Dagenham is updating its planning guidance to incorporate more advice on sustainable drainage.

North Central

24. Summary of key themes / issues discussed at partnership

- LLFA statutory consultee role on planning applications – application numbers and how they are managed internally;
- Challenges securing sustainable drainage higher up in the sustainable drainage hierarchy – and the need for incentives to reuse water to come from Thames Water;
- LLFA Teams – resourcing and expertise issues;
- Asset register – definition of assets;
- Section 19 investigations;
- Limitations on capital funding for surface water schemes and how LLFAs are funding them;
- Potential Thames Water investment opportunities (Twenty4Twenty).

25. Projects in this partnership – brief update

- Kensington and Chelsea – considerable number of sustainable drainage projects following successful bid for over £1.3m from Thames RFCC. Arundel Gardens (Thames Water Counters Creek sustainable drainage pilot scheme) in construction phase.
- Camden – Hampstead Heath dams project reaching conclusion. Seeking to mainstream sustainable drainage into highways work using Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding with a pilot in York Rise in early development. Sustainable drainage will be incorporated into the Central Somers Town greening strategy.
- Hammersmith and Fulham –no Thames RFCC funded projects in borough, delivering sustainable drainage through the use of other funding streams (LIP, Quietways, Highways Planned Maintenance, LLFA funds, EU Bids, Housing Estate Investment Plan funding etc).
- City – there are no Thames RFCC funded projects in the City at present.
- Partnership is discussing a potential joint sustainable drainage project to address the lack of capacity in the Counters Creek sewer, in particular looking at areas within the upstream catchment area (Wormwood Scrubs and Camden). This requires greater input from Thames Water to identify potential areas.

26. Sustainable drainage

- Boroughs often find planning applications do not consider the London Plan Drainage Hierarchy and do not maximise opportunities for above ground sustainable drainage (for example green roofs) before opting for below ground (attenuation tanks). This means LLFAs spend considerable time working with applicants to bring them to a level where they comply with Local Plan and London Plan requirements. Kensington and Chelsea report that developers are starting to improve their proposals, and the City of London is

considering whether to extend sustainable drainage requirements to all developments rather than only major applications in its Local Plan.

South Central

27. Summary of key themes / issues discussed at partnership

- Projects being undertaken and the challenges faced in executing the roles and responsibilities as LLFAs. Lessons learnt have also been shared at meetings.

28. Projects in this partnership – brief update

- Lambeth
 - Brockwell Park – an outline project design and modelling of the scheme has been undertaken;
 - Streatham Vale – a scoping study by the Environment Agency concluded it was not a feasible project in terms of outcomes;
 - Highway schemes – Ingleborough Street and Chatsworth/Ardlui.
- Southwark
 - East Camberwell – phase 1 (Coleman Road Storm Water Storage) – construction to start by the end of this financial year;
 - East Camberwell – phase 2 (Property Level Protection Scheme) – on hold;
 - Peckham Rye – outline design to be completed by the end of the financial year.

Sustainable drainage

29. There continue to be high levels of applications requiring LLFA input. Developers are increasingly appreciating the need to manage surface water in a sustainable manner. However, the current set up is such that it is not possible to monitor if they actually build what they present at planning application stage.

Challenges facing the sub-regional partnerships

30. Partnerships highlighted challenges relating to the number of people dedicated to working on flood risk management in their authority; and ensuring their authority had the level of expertise needed (planning, drainage, engineering and sustainability). Ensuring knowledge transfer when officers left or retired were also a concern, as was the continued funding of the service given local authority budgetary pressures. Officers highlighted the need for more support to complete the economic appraisals required by the Environment Agency to access Thames RFCC funding.
31. An increase in development in areas of flood risk means that officers are spending more time on responding to planning applications and giving advice to developers. Officers want to see the London Plan Drainage Hierarchy strengthened as well as greater emphasis on rainwater harvesting in new developments.
32. Officers highlighted that the outcome measures required by Defra that drive Thames RFCC funding allocation fail to support sustainable drainage in highways projects, and do not consider reduction of risk to critical infrastructure that is not housing, making it difficult to protect other assets. In the same way, funding for small scale surface water schemes can be difficult to secure. Officers also highlighted that Defra's focus is on new capital schemes, which drives the Thames RFCC's priority for capital projects. Nonetheless, funding for the maintenance of existing schemes, assets and watercourses was raised by officers.

ad Local Flood Authority (LLFA) Project Advisors Team

33. The Thames RFCC is funding a team of Advisors to support LLFAs deliver existing and develop new capital projects. The London team is led by James Spragg and all five advisors are in post. The outside London team is led by Helen Berthonneau and further recruitment in March and April will complete this team. Contact details for the London team are included at Appendix A.

Supporting delivery of the programme

34. The LLFA Project Advisor Team has prepared a list of priority projects, identifying where their efforts can be most effective at supporting the objective of ensuring the delivery of the Thames RFCC capital programme. This list was finalised and approved by the team's Project Board in January 2017. The list contains 24 LLFA led projects across the Thames RFCC catchment area, including 16 projects within the London Boroughs. Project Advisors have contacted LLFA officers and begun to assist them with their projects. Examples of current assistance being provided include:
- Technical flood risk input to projects;
 - Working with the LLFA to develop project outline business cases;
 - Assisting the LLFA in making funding applications to the Environment Agency;
 - Review of consultants' feasibility reports and flood water models.
35. The list of priority projects is a flexible document and projects will be added based on the needs of the LLFAs.

Developing a strong pipeline of projects

36. The LLFA Project Advisor Team has discussed with LLFAs areas where the team can support the development of future LLFA led projects. After analysing the results of this the team is now working on providing general support, guidance and training. Examples include:
- Identifying and development of future projects;
 - Helping with funding sources for partnership finance;
 - Assisting in the understanding of the funding calculator;
 - Helping to formulate stakeholder engagement plans;
 - Developing partnerships, identifying experts and consultations with others;
 - Providing best practice examples.

Building relationships with Thames Water

37. Another of the LLFA Project Advisor Team's objectives is to develop partnership working with other Risk Management Authorities, specifically Thames Water. In order to achieve this, Thames Water has offered to provide office space for the outside London Advisors Team in Reading. In addition, the relationship with the Thames Water Infrastructure Strategy and Planning Team has been prioritised and both teams have met together to develop working relations and identify potential joint integrated schemes between Thames Water and LLFAs. In addition the Advisor Team aims to work closely with Thames Water to support the 2019 Price Review. Through this, priority areas for investment can be identified in each partnership area to develop future partnership schemes.

Engagement with LLFAs

38. There has been a high level of communication from the Advisor Team in order to inform the LLFAs about the team's purpose, objectives and governance. The Advisor Team has also been attending Partnership Meetings and meeting with individual LLFAs to discuss support and resources. A group has been created on the KHub website. This will allow the Advisor Team to have an internet presence and communicate with stakeholders. The LLFA Project Advisors webpages can be accessed by joining the group through the link:

<https://khub.net/web/thames-lead-local-flood-authority-llfa-project-advisors-group>. The Team's governance documents are also available on this site. A dedicated team email address has been set up for receiving enquiries and providing information. This is LLFAProjectAdvisors@environment-agency.gov.uk.

Thames RFCC and Environment Agency update

2016/17 Capital Programme Performance

39. The Thames RFCC is three quarters of the way through the second year of the six year capital investment programme. This section provides an update on financial progress and target performance so far on the 2016/17 programme.
40. In summary, against the Thames RFCC allocation of £42.6m (£38 m Grant in Aid from Defra and £4.6m Levy from local authorities), the current forecast is to spend approximately £47.1m by the end of this year. This is £4.5m over the original budget allocation which puts the Thames RFCC in a strong position to draw in additional Grant in Aid from the national programme.

41. Table 1: Thames RFCC financial position

	Budget	Forecast for 2016/17
Grant in Aid	£38m	£42.9m
Local Levy	£4.6m	£4.3m

42. Table 2 gives details of how the Thames RFCC 2016/17 programme is delivering against its national targets for households at reduced risk.

	Households at reduced risk target	Households at reduced risk forecast	Variance
Environment Agency	1,321	2,971	1,650
Local authorities	757	202	-555
	2,078	3,173	1,095

Table 2: Thames RFCC households at reduced risk performance 2016/17

43. The national target is to reduce the risk of 43,726 properties this financial year. Within the Thames RFCC, against a target of 2,078 properties at reduced risk for 2016/17, this is forecast to be exceeded by reducing risk to an additional 1,095 properties. There has been a decline of 555 properties at reduced risk protected through local authority schemes. This is mostly due to the re profiling of the delivery of some schemes, as opposed to schemes falling from the programme.

Efficiency claims

44. Defra agreed an unprecedented 6 year funding settlement for grant in aid nationally across all risk management authorities which has three conditions:
- 300,000 houses better protected over the six years of the settlement;
 - At least 15 per cent in Partnership Funding contributions from other sources;
 - A further efficiency improvement of 10 per cent in delivering the capital programme.
45. Achieving the 10 per cent efficiency target is key to offsetting the risk of inflation affecting the ability to deliver projects to achieve the Defra targets. The grant in aid funding allocation did not take into account inflation in the construction industry which is higher than the normal

inflation rate. Inflation may also rise more generally over the six years especially in London. The funding settlement was based on a very low inflation rate so in effect the affordability of the programme to deliver protection for the 300,000 houses hinges on making efficiencies in the order of the target of 10 per cent.

46. In broad terms an efficiency saving is something that:-

- Results from positive management action at any level during the project lifecycle;
- Delivers the same (or better) output/function for lower cost;
- Does not result in an increased exposure to risk than ascertained in the original baseline;
- Brings benefit that will materialise during the project or at some time in the future;
- Is measurable against a robust baseline.

47. The Environment Agency has a larger 12 per cent target against its allocated grant in aid, with local authorities asked to make 10 per cent of their grant in aid. This target is across the 6 year settlement as it is acknowledged that making savings on projects will vary depending on the stage it has reached.

48. The Thames RFCC has been looking at various approaches to achieve the efficiency target:

- Packaging – to package groups of projects into a programme for delivery and to enable greater efficiencies from the supply chain with continuity of work.
- Standardisation – greater opportunities for standardisation of design and commissioning design works once given future stability in the programme.
- Bulk Buying – the stability of the longer term settlement supports longer term planning for delivery including commitment to bulk buying and continuity of work.
- Continuity of work & performance measures – to incentivise suppliers to deliver savings and the potential of reinvestment does not mean they will lose out on possible work.

49. It is important to note that grant in aid that is released through efficiency savings are released back into the programme and re-invested locally. This allows the Thames RFCC to plan to deliver more work than it has grant in aid budget for and either drawing in recycled grant in aid from across its programme or nationally released funding that cannot be recycled in other areas.

50. So far in 2016/17 the Thames RFCC has claimed £3.1m of efficiency savings. In London the work on the Thames Estuary Asset Management 2100 (TEAM2100) programme has £2.7m of confirmed savings and has identified a further £3.5m of claimable savings they have submitted for approval before the end of the financial year.

Highlights from across London

51. The Environment Agency has successfully influenced Frasers Property (UK) Ltd through the planning process to raise the height of the Thames Tidal Defences on the Wandsworth Riverside Development taking account of climate change projections to 2100. Approximately 200m of river wall will be raised to this new standard.

52. The Caterham Multi-Agency Steering Group has been established. This was formed and is chaired by Surrey County Council following flooding in Caterham in June 2016. It consists of members from Surrey County Council, London Borough of Croydon, Tandridge District Council, the Environment Agency and Thames Water Utilities Ltd. The group work collaboratively on three capital projects and it provides a forum for all risk management authorities to address issues in a holistic way. This has proved to be a very efficient way of moving projects along and also acts as the conduit for local flood action groups. This is an excellent example of embedded Multi-Agency working.

53. The Environment Agency is working closely with Wandsworth Borough Council to use S.106 funds working with the Thames Tideway Tunnel project to remove Half Tide Weir at the confluence of the Thames and Wandle. This is a significant redundant structure that once removed will greatly improve fish passage and riverine habitat in the Wandle.
54. The Thames Barrier flood gates are undergoing inspection and maintenance. The works started in 2016, with work on the six smaller gates. Accessing the gates is complex and at times risky. Successes include saving in the region of £60m over the next 50 years, by reducing the need for a full repaint of the gates. Instead the gate steel is protected from corroding using Cathodic Protection. This is safer and quicker to maintain. There is now a highly specialist team of staff and suppliers with intimate knowledge of the risks and complexities of working on the gates. The team will continue to work on the next phases of work to the remaining gates.

Recommendations

55. The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report.

Financial Implications

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

Legal Implications

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

Equalities Implications

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

Appendix A – Contact details for the LLFA Project Advisors Team (London)

LLFA Project Advisors Team (London)

Team Email address: LLFAProjectAdvisors@environment-agency.gov.uk

Ergon House, Horseferry Road, London, SW1P 2AL

James Spragg CEng. M.I.C.E.

LLFA Project Advisors Team - Team Leader

Email: james.spragg@environment-agency.gov.uk

Tel: 07585 125 426

Experienced with working for a large marine contractor through all project stages including design, tendering and execution of capital maritime projects. Experience of project planning as well as supervising contractors, plant and resources.

Luis Brines

LLFA Project Advisors Team - Advisor

Email: luis.brines@environment-agency.gov.uk

Tel: 07771 388 359

Knowledge and experience in GIS Mapping and Flood Model Data reviews, Environmental Permitting for Flood Risk and Flood Risk Assessment for Planning Applications. Experienced in reviewing surface water management plans and ensuring implementation of SuDS.

Selisa Fergus-Fleary

LLFA Project Advisors Team - Advisor

Email: selisa.fergusfleary@environment-agency.gov.uk

Tel: 07789 273 546

Knowledgeable in relating government policy into practical FCRM solutions, with a particular understanding of the planning system. Extensive experience supporting LLFAs deliver physical works involving external partners and stakeholders.

Anna Parr CIWEM (Currently on Maternity Leave)

LLFA Project Advisors Team - Advisor

Email: LLFAProjectAdvisors@environment-agency.gov.uk

Tel: t.b.c

Holds a complete overview of the Environment Agency FCRM with in-depth knowledge of planning, environmental permitting and Environmental Impact Assessments. Experience at reviewing flood risk assessments, activity permits & flow modelling, leading on River Lee sites.

Chris Thilthorpe

LLFA Project Advisors Team - Advisor

Email: chris.thilthorpe@environment-agency.gov.uk

Tel: 02030 258 995

Knowledge of flood risk planning policy for development, particularly with flood risk implication and development in a floodplain. Experience of the promotion of SuDS and project management of flood alleviation schemes in North West London.

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

Go Ultra Low City Scheme (GULCS) - Phase 1 for Delivering Residential and Car Club Electric Charge Points

Item No: 07

Report by: Katharina Winbeck **Job titles:** Head of Transport, Environment & Infrastructure

Date: 23 March 2017

Contact Officer: Katharina Winbeck

Telephone: 020 7934 9945 **Email:** Katharina.winbeck@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary:

This report updates TEC on the work that has been undertaken by officers in investigating the legal, constitutional and financial implications arising from the ambition for London Councils TEC to take on the strategic oversight and operational management roles for a London-wide delivery "partnership".

At this point in time there is no satisfactory resolution of these issues, so officers have developed a 'Phase 1' for the delivery of residential and car club electric charge points utilising existing structures, skills and funding.

'Phase 1' proposes that TfL set up the procurement mechanism, using a jointly (by TfL, GLA, London Councils and boroughs) drawn up specification through the existing Crown Commercial Services Framework. Interested boroughs would then be able to call down from this Framework to install electric vehicle charging infrastructure and its maintenance and management.

Recommendations: Members are asked to:

1. Note and comment on the report
2. Note and comment on the detail for Phase 1 as outlined at Appendix 1

GULCS Phase 1 for delivering residential and car club electric charge points

Overview

1. TEC received an update report on GULCS covering the residential and car club elements at its December meeting. This report highlighted the ambitions held by the delivery partners (GLA, TfL and London Councils) for establishing a London-wide delivery “partnership” for deploying, managing and maintaining both residential and car club electric vehicle charge points in London.
2. It also discussed the ambitions of the GULCS Steering Group comprising Cllrs Bell, Coleridge, Demirci as well as officers representing London Councils, GLA and TfL; for London Councils TEC to undertake both the strategic oversight and the operational management of such a delivery “partnership”. This required further assessment of the legal, constitutional and financial implications for the joint committee and London Councils.
3. This report updates TEC on the work that has been undertaken in investigating these matters and presents a way forward to start delivering electric vehicle charge points on the ground as early as possible using the GULCS funding.

Legal and Constitutional

4. London Councils legal advice is clear that in order to take on the operational management role, a variation to the TEC Agreement would be required, authorising London Councils TEC to exercise such functions. Such a variation would be “subject to consultation with the Participating Councils and the written agreement of each Participating Council”, which in our experience will take at least six months to achieve.
5. Furthermore, London Councils TEC is not a body corporate and as such not a legal entity/person which can hold capital assets or accept capital funding given for the purposes of the creation of assets. This means that London Councils TEC is unable to directly procure assets on behalf of the scheme. London Councils could, however, set up a procurement framework from which individual boroughs could call down contracts. A prerequisite for this activity is the variation of the TEC Agreement as outlined in the paragraph above.

Financial

6. London Councils requires certainty that the costs of running the delivery “partnership’s” operational management functions are covered before agreeing to undertake this role. This certainty cannot currently be provided for a number of reasons;
 - The GULCS funding is almost entirely capital funding and OLEV, the grant awarding body, is unable to change this.
 - Most of the activities of the delivery “partnership” constitute revenue expenditure and cannot be capitalised in accounting terms.
 - Although match funding is anticipated to support the scheme, there is currently no certainty on who will be providing this and how much that will raise.

Delivery of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure in London

7. Pressure to start delivering electric vehicle charging infrastructure in London is growing from all sides. This is not only driven by the fact that GULCS funding has been in place for almost 12 months now, but policy drivers, such as the emission surcharge, the requirements for taxis

to be zero emission capable and introduction of variable parking charges by boroughs to actively encourage cleaner vehicles.

8. Given the legal, constitutional and financial constraints outlined above, officers have looked at alternatives to start delivering electric vehicle charge points for London as soon as possible. On 3 March, an alternative solution was presented to the GULCS Steering Group.
9. This alternative utilises existing structures, skills and funding as much as possible and it is envisaged that this will form Phase 1 of the delivery of GULCS with the view of any future phases to include the setting up of a delivery “partnership”. During this phase, London Councils role will remain advisory in nature, as is currently the case.
10. This Phase 1 proposes that TfL will lead on procurement. There are two reasons for this. First, the London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2013 provides the powers. Second, it already has the required skills set within its procurement function.
11. TfL will set up the procurement mechanism for the electric vehicle charge points, utilising the existing Crown Commercial Services Framework Traffic Management Technology 2. A specification will jointly be drawn up by TfL, GLA, London Councils and the boroughs using existing expertise and resources. Interested boroughs then call down from this newly created Framework to install the charge point and have it maintained and managed. Appendix 1 gives more details on the process for Phase 1.
12. There are a number of guiding principles for Phase 1;
 - a) It should give certainty to London whether the cheaper lamp post charging technology can be scaled up
 - b) It should mitigate any risks that could prevent any implemented charge points under Phase 1 to be transferred to a delivery “partnership” in the future
 - c) Phase 1 should meet existing demand in the first instance as well as address strategic demand, pending further discussions with the potential service providers
 - d) It should be consistent with (or easier than) the OLEV “Grants to Provide Residential On-Street Chargepoints for Plug-in Electric Vehicles: Guidance for Local Authorities” published in December 2016 and administered by the Energy Savings Trust (EST)
13. The Business case that officers have been working on for the delivery “partnership” assumes that boroughs cover their own management costs and that of TMOs, signing and lining already. Given that Phase 1 will not create a delivery “partnership”, they will also need to fund 25 per cent of the capital costs, and potentially the operating costs, depending on market interest. Boroughs will therefore be required to fund the following;
 - 25 per cent of capital costs, which can range from £257 to £6,140 per charge point depending on the technology and installation requirements
 - The boroughs Traffic Management Orders and signs and lines, which can range from £0 to £1,720, per charge point again depending on the technology chosen and installation requirements
 - The boroughs project management costs for which we currently do not have an estimate
 - The operating costs of the charge points, such as maintenance and management ranging from £0 to £1,350 depending on technology and required services.
14. Phase 1 will provide the GULCS project with valuable learning and experience for the future roll out of charging infrastructure and inform the following phases. The data and information

provided in this phase will give London Councils TEC much better understanding of the level of risk required in setting up the delivery “partnership” and will inform any future business planning for this purpose.

15. It is proposed that Phase 1 will be the focus of officers working on GULCS for the next six months or so. However, officers will continue to explore ways in which the constraints highlighted above could be alleviated. They will also consider how a delivery “partnership” where London Councils TEC undertakes both the strategic overview and operational management functions could be established in the future.

Recommendations: The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report
- Note and comment on the detail for Phase 1 as outlined at Appendix 1

Financial Implications

The Director of Corporate Resources reports that there are no specific financial implications at this stage for London Councils, although there may need to be a realignment of central costs to reflect this new area of work. The cost of the GULCS Senior Lead Officer seconded to the project is being met from GULCS grants funding.

Legal Implications

The addition of the operational management role for London Councils TEC would require each of the 33 London local authorities participating in the TEC joint committee arrangements to delegate the exercise of additional functions to the joint committee, which requires the TEC constitution (Governing Agreement, dated 13 December 2001 (as amended)) to be varied. Should London Councils TEC wish to undertake these functions in the future, this will have to be agreed at full TEC at a future meeting.

Equalities Implications

There are no equalities implications of the recommendations.

Appendix 1 – More detail on the process for Phase 1

Stage 1: Expressions of interest

There will be a two week period in which boroughs can express an interest. Boroughs can only progress to the next stage if they have completed this stage. During this stage the amount of work they have to complete will be minimal. This approach allows the GULCS team to quickly test the level of borough interest and to establish how much funding per borough is likely to be required.

At this stage boroughs will be made aware of, and asked to set out their interest within the context of the following:

- Boroughs do not need to fully commit, this comes at a later stage.
- The costs that they will need to cover (e.g. TMO, signing and lining, their own project management costs, a contribution to freestanding units, maintenance and management);
- What the funding can cover e.g. capital costs only;
- The timelines that they will need to meet regarding the application and installation processes;
- The procurement framework that will be used.

Stage 2: Allocating Funding to the Boroughs

The “OLEV/EST funding” assesses bids for on street EVCPs for local authorities (non GULCS funding) against the following criteria:

- The chargepoints will be located in a residential area(s);
- The proposed location lacks off street parking;
- The location will meet current and/or anticipated future demand;
- The chargepoints will be accessible to local residents;
- The chargepoints will adhere to OLEV’s technical specifications;
- Applications may be made for one or more chargepoints;
- The project will adhere to procurement and state aid rules and value for money considerations;
- The project will be delivered in reasonable timescales;
- The local authority will meet ongoing commitments.

All of these criteria will apply to the GULCS Phase 1. The GULCS funding will also have the additional criteria:

- The GULCS funding must lead to additional EVCPs than the borough is intending with existing funding;
- It must not fund EVCPs that would provide benefits to a private operated network (due to state aid);
- Any potential delivery “partnership” set up by GULCS will be able to have first refusal on operating and managing the EVCPs in the future;
- EVCPs must adhere to the open charge point protocol;
- Boroughs commit to providing feedback on the trials including feeding into process mapping, operational learnings (such as usage and enforcement), issues and costs.

Stage 3: Writing joint specification/requirements

This stage will be run concurrently to Stage 1 and 2 and utilise existing officers from within the project team, such as TfL officers and the GULCS secondee, ensuring that boroughs input into the specifications drawn up.

Stage 4: Procurement

The boroughs will be required in their funding applications to set out a timetable that they will meet once the call off framework has been developed by TfL. Should they fall significantly behind the timetable then their funding may be reallocated. Otherwise funding will be released to the boroughs when the EVCP installation has been completed.

Timeline

The table below sets out a **desired** timeline for lamp post EVCP for residential; however it will depend on borough uptake and ability to deliver, and the responses to the tenders from the market including lead times. Freestanding units will take considerably longer due to the TMO process.

Table: Desired grant timetable for residential lamp post EVCPs

Deadlines (2017)	Activity
March	Stage 1: Expressions of Interest
March	Issue expression of interest form
April	Indicative level of borough interest and funding allocation
May	Stage 2: Outline of grant funding availability and full application form sent to boroughs (based on how many boroughs expressed interest)
May	Full funding applications from boroughs
June	Review of funding applications (GULCS)
June	Funding approved (GULCS) (including any further information requests for boroughs)
April-June	Stage 3: Writing joint specifications/requirements
July	Stage 4: Procurement
July	Issuing of specifications
September	Market responds
September	Tender review
November	Approval of winning tender(s) (includes 2 weeks for challenge) and contract is signed
November	Works begin
December	EVCPs in the ground (lamp post only)

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

London Borough of Sutton Approval Item No: 08 to Commence CCTV Bus Lane Enforcement

Report by: Andrew Luck **Job title:** Transport Manager
Date: 23 March 2017
Contact Officer: Andrew Luck
Telephone: 020 7934 9646 **Email:** andrew.luck@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report seeks approval for the London Borough of Sutton to commence enforcement of bus lane contraventions under the London Local Authorities Act 1996.

Recommendations: The Committee is asked to:

- agree that permission be given to the London Borough of Sutton to enforce bus lane contraventions using CCTV.

Background

1. London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee is responsible for the approval of applications from London local authorities that wish to commence CCTV enforcement. London Councils also promotes best practice which ensures a consistent approach to CCTV enforcement across London.
2. The London Local Authorities Act 1996 allows London authorities to take on the powers for civil enforcement of bus lane contraventions. The Transport and Environment Committee agreed in 2000 that those authorities wishing to take on the powers should apply to the Committee for approval to commence.
3. Aside from LB Sutton, the only remaining boroughs who have not yet sought to take up these powers to enforce bus lanes are: RB Greenwich and RB Kensington and Chelsea.
4. Transport for London also enforces bus lane contraventions by CCTV, but does not require the Committee's approval to do so.

Application to Commence Bus Lane Enforcement by the London Borough of Sutton

5. The key steps for boroughs planning to adopt the powers are:
 - Liaise with the police regarding transfer of enforcement
 - Produce an inventory of all locations where the prohibitions, restrictions and instructions to vehicles can be found
 - Review all prohibitions and restrictions to make sure they are appropriate
 - Review all related signs and markings to make sure they are in good condition
 - Identify the enforcement regime and capacity
 - Determine enforcement priorities
 - Apply to London Councils TEC for approval to take on the powers
 - Carry out local publicity and an awareness campaign
6. An application to commence enforcement of bus lane contraventions has been received from the London Borough of Sutton (Appendix 1), which is proposing to commence enforcement from 27 March 2017. Members are recommended to approve the application as the authority has followed the key steps above and the application meets the criteria set down by the Committee.

Financial Implications

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

Legal Implications

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

Equalities Implications

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

Recommendations

10. The Committee is asked to:
 - agree that permission be given to the London Borough of Sutton to enforce bus lane contraventions using CCTV.



London Borough of Sutton

Environment, Housing and Regeneration
Parking Services

Your Ref:
My Ref:
e-mail: parking@sutton.gov.uk

Call Centre: 020 8770 5000
Fax:
Date 02/03/2017

Andrew Luck
Transport Manager
London Council's
59 ½ Southwark Street
London
SE1 0AL

Please reply to:

London Borough of
Sutton
Parking Services
Civic Offices
St Nicholas Way
Sutton
SM1 1EA

Minicom 020 8770 5178
DX No 134342 Sutton 11

Dear Andrew,

Application for approval to commence enforcement of Bus Lanes in the London Borough of Sutton.

I wish to formally submit an application to commence Bus Lane enforcement in the London Borough of Sutton with effect from 27th March 2017.

I have attached an inventory of all the locations in the borough where there are Bus Lanes that fall within our remit.

I can confirm that any CCTV monitoring operations will take place in a controlled environment and will be carried out in accordance with the Code of Practice.

Also enclosed with this application is a sample copy of the Penalty Charge Notice, Enforcement Notice and Charge Certificate that will be issued for this contravention.

Yours faithfully

Warren Shadbolt
Executive Head of Safer and Stronger Communities

Strategic Director -
Mary Morrissey
Environment, Housing and
Regeneration Directorate

Chief Executive
Niall Bolger

Inventory of Bus Lane Locations

Location 1: Crown Road

Description: from its junction with St. Nicholas Way to a point 36 metres west of the western kerb-line of High Street, Sutton

Direction: In an easterly direction, with flow lane

Times: At any time

Type: Bus, local bus, dial-a-ride bus, pedal cycle and taxi

Location 2: Lodge Road, Sutton

Description: Lodge Road, Sutton

Direction: In a southerly direction, with flow lane

Times: At any time

Type: Bus, local bus, dial-a-ride bus and pedal cycle

Location 3: Rose Hill

Description: from a point 60 metres north of the northern kerb-line of Rosehill Avenue to a point 40 metres south of that kerb line

Direction: In a northerly direction, with-flow lane

Times: Between 7:00am and 10:00am and between 4:00pm and 7:00pm on Monday to Saturdays inclusive

Type: Bus, local bus, dial-a-ride bus, pedal cycle and taxi

Location 4: Throwley Way

Description: (a) from its junction with Marshalls Road to its junction with the northern end of Lodge Road; and (b) from its junction with the southern end of Lodge Road to a point 42 metres north of the northern kerb-line of Throwley Road

Direction: In a southerly direction, with-flow lane

Times: At any time

Type: Bus, local bus, dial-a-ride bus, and pedal cycle

LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON
Parking Services

Head of Parking Services
Civic Offices St Nicholas Way Sutton SM1 1EA
Call Centre 020 8770 5000



&VNAME
&LINE2
&LINE3
&LINE4
&LINE5
&LINE6
&LINE7

Penalty Charge Notice Number (PCN)
&SERNO
Vehicle Registration Number
®NO
Date of this Notice
&PSTD
Date of the contravention
&DOFFC

PENALTY CHARGE NOTICE (PCN)
ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984 (as amended)
LONDON LOCAL AUTHORITIES ACT 1996 (as amended)

The Council believes that a Penalty Charge is payable with respect to the above vehicle for the following alleged traffic contravention:

&OFF11 &OFF12 &OFF13

In: &PLOCN
On: &DOFFC at &TOFFC

The alleged contravention was seen and recorded by a camera which was observing real time pictures at the time stated and has been recorded on digital storage media. This alleged contravention is supported by video evidence.

To view still photographs and the video evidence online please visit <https://suttonices.parkinguk.org/parking> or by giving notice in writing to parking.enquiries@sutton.gov.uk quoting the penalty charge number printed above and your vehicle registration number.

DO NOT IGNORE THIS NOTICE

The full amount of the penalty charge is £&CFINE

The penalty charge must be paid before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the date of the notice.

A reduced charge of £&CBALA is payable.

If the penalty charge is paid before the end of the period of 14 days, beginning with the date of the notice, the amount of the penalty charge will be reduced by 50% to £&CBALA.

If the penalty charge is not paid before the end of the 28 day period, beginning with the date of the notice, an enforcement notice may be served by the Council on the person appearing to them to be the owner of the vehicle.

PCN Number: &SERN0

HOW TO CHALLENGE AND MAKE REPRESENTATIONS

If you do not think you should have to pay this penalty charge, you may make representations, in writing, at <https://suttonices.parkinguk.org/parking> or to London Borough of Sutton Parking Services Civic Offices St Nicholas Way Sutton SM1 1EA. The statutory grounds for making representations are listed below. Whether or not any of the grounds apply, you may also give any compelling reasons why you believe the PCN should be cancelled.

If we receive your representations against the Penalty Charge Notice before the end of the period of 14 days, beginning with the date of the notice, we will give you a chance to pay at the reduced rate for another 14 days from when we write back to you.

A ☐ I have never owned the vehicle – Please supply evidence or explain any connection with the vehicle

B ☐ I was not the owner of the vehicle at the time – if you sold the vehicle before the date of the contravention or bought it after the date, you must tell us the name and address of the person who bought it from you or sold it to you, if you know it. Please supply evidence of the sale/purchase (e.g. a sales receipt)

C ☐ There was no breach of the bus lane order or regulations – Please explain why you think the contravention did not occur

D ☐ At the time the alleged breach of such order or regulations took place the person who was in control of the vehicle was in control of the vehicle without the consent of the owner – if your vehicle was reported stolen please provide the crime reference number and the name of the police station where you reported the theft. Otherwise please provide details of why you believe this ground applies including the name and address of the person you believe to have been in charge of the vehicle at the time of the alleged breach.

If the penalty charge is not paid before the end of the 28 day period an enforcement notice may be served by the Council on the person appearing to them to be the owner of the vehicle. A person on whom the enforcement notice is served will be entitled to make representations to the Enforcement Authority and may appeal to an adjudicator if those representations are rejected.

PCN Number: &SERN0

DETAILS OF REPRESENTATIONS
(Continue on additional sheets if required)

How to Pay

1. By Automated Telephone (Touchtone)

Contact the 24 hour touchtone service on 03300 884674.
You will need your Penalty Charge Number and Credit/Debit card details to complete the payment transaction.

2. Via The Internet

Safely & securely via our website <https://suttonlincs.parkinguk.org/parking> you will need your Penalty Charge Number and Credit/Debit card details to complete the payment transaction.

3. Other forms of payment

You may make payment by crossed cheque or postal order made payable to London Borough of Sutton. Please write the Penalty Charge Notice number, your Registration and your address on the reverse of the cheque. **PLEASE DO NOT SEND CASH in the post.** Cash payments can be made at 50 Grove Road, Sutton, SM1 1BT.

Do not pay this penalty charge if you wish to appeal as it is not possible to appeal after paying the penalty charge.

DATA PROTECTION STATEMENT

The London Borough of Sutton will use information, including personal information, collected through the issuing of this Penalty Charge Notice for the enforcement of traffic contraventions and it may also be used for compatible purposes. The information may be disclosed to London Councils, other enforcement agencies and third parties where it is necessary and lawful to do so e.g. for the prevention and detection of crime. All information will be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON
Parking Services

Head of Parking Services
Civic Offices St Nicholas Way Sutton SM1 1EA
Call Centre 020 8770 5000



&VNAME
&LINE2
&LINE3
&LINE4
&LINE5
&LINE6
&LINE7

Penalty Charge Notice Number (PCN)
&SERNO
Vehicle Registration Number
®NO
Date of this Notice
&PSTDT
Date of the contravention
&DOFFC

ENFORCEMENT NOTICE

ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984 (as amended)
LONDON LOCAL AUTHORITIES ACT 1996 (as amended)

The Council believes that a Penalty Charge is payable with respect to the above vehicle, and we previously issued a Penalty Charge Notice, for the following alleged traffic contravention:

&OFF11 &OFF12 &OFF13

In: &PLOCN
On: &DOFFC at &TOFFC

The alleged contravention was seen and recorded by a camera which was observing real time pictures at the time stated and has been recorded on digital storage media. This alleged contravention is supported by video evidence.

To view still photographs and the video evidence online please visit <https://suttonices.parkinguk.org/parking> or by giving notice in writing to parking.enquiries@sutton.gov.uk quoting the penalty charge number printed above and your vehicle registration number.

DO NOT IGNORE THIS NOTICE

The Penalty Charge is £&CFINE
To date we have received £&CPAID
Payment of £&CBALA is now due

The penalty charge must be paid before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the date the enforcement notice is served.

Please note that failure to pay the penalty charge may lead to an increased charge of £&CCBAL being payable and the Council may serve a Charge Certificate seeking payment of this increased amount.

PCN Number: &SERN0

HOW TO CHALLENGE AND MAKE REPRESENTATIONS

If you do not think you should have to pay this penalty charge, you may make representations, in writing, at <https://suttonlces.parkinguk.org/parking> or to London Borough of Sutton Parking Services Civic Offices St Nicholas Way Sutton SM1 1EA. The statutory grounds for making representations are listed below. Whether or not any of the grounds apply, you may also give any compelling reasons why you believe the PCN should be cancelled.

A ☐ I have never owned the vehicle – Please supply evidence or explain any connection with the vehicle

B ☐ I was not the owner of the vehicle at the time – if you sold the vehicle before the date of the contravention or bought it after the date, you must tell us the name and address of the person who bought it from you or sold it to you, if you know it. Please supply evidence of the sale/purchase (e.g. a sales receipt)

C ☐ There was no breach of the bus lane order or regulations – Please explain why you think the contravention did not occur

D ☐ At the time the alleged breach of such order or regulations took place the person who was in control of the vehicle was in control of the vehicle without the consent of the owner – if your vehicle was reported stolen please provide the crime reference number and the name of the police station where you reported the theft. Otherwise please provide details of why you believe this ground applies including the name and address of the person you believe to have been in charge of the vehicle at the time of the alleged breach.

Representations must be received by the Council before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the date the enforcement notice is served. Any representations received outside the 28 day period mentioned above may be disregarded.

After we have considered your representations, we will write to you with our decision. If we accept your representations, we will cancel this Enforcement Notice and the Penalty Charge Notice and you will not have to pay the penalty charge. If we do not accept them, we will serve on the person who made the representations a notice of rejection and that person may, before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the date of service of that notice (or such longer period as the adjudicator may allow) appeal to an adjudicator against our decision. We will tell you how to do this when we write to you.

PCN Number: &SERN0

DETAILS OF REPRESENTATIONS
(Continue on additional sheets if required)

DECLARATION - The following Declaration MUST be completed and signed for your representations to be considered

I confirm that the information contained in my representation is correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that making a false statement may result in prosecution and a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale.

Name:

Signature:

Date:

How to Pay

1. **By Automated Telephone (Touchtone)**

Contact the 24 hour touchtone service on 03300 884674.

You will need your Penalty Charge Number and Credit/Debit card details to complete the payment transaction.

2. **Via The Internet**

Safely & securely via our website <https://suttonices.parkinguk.org/parking> you will need your Penalty Charge Number and Credit/Debit card details to complete the payment transaction.

3. **Other forms of payment**

You may make payment by crossed cheque or postal order made payable to London Borough of Sutton. Please write the Penalty Charge Notice number, your Registration and your address on the reverse of the cheque. **PLEASE DO NOT SEND CASH in the post.** Cash payments can be made at 50 Grove Road, Sutton, SM1 1BT.

Do not pay this penalty charge if you wish to appeal as it is not possible to appeal after paying the penalty charge.

DATA PROTECTION STATEMENT

The London Borough of Sutton will use information, including personal information, collected through the issuing of this Penalty Charge Notice for the enforcement of traffic contraventions and it may also be used for compatible purposes. The information may be disclosed to London Councils, other enforcement agencies and third parties where it is necessary and lawful to do so e.g. for the prevention and detection of crime. All information will be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON
Parking Services

Head of Parking Services
Civic Offices St Nicholas Way Sutton SM1 1EA
Call Centre 020 8770 5000



&VNAME
&LINE2
&LINE3
&LINE4
&LINE5
&LINE6
&LINE7

Date of Charge Certificate
&PSTD

CHARGE CERTIFICATE
ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984 (as amended)
LONDON LOCAL AUTHORITIES ACT 1996 (as amended)

Penalty Charge Notice No: &SERNO
Vehicle Registration Number: ®NO
Contravention: &OFF11 &OFF12 &OFF13
Date of Contravention: &DOFFC
Location of Contravention: &PLOCN

An Enforcement Notice was sent to you on &DNTOS which explained that the penalty charge must be paid, or representations received by the Council, before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the date the enforcement notice is served.

This Charge Certificate has been served since the penalty charge has not been paid within the appropriate period and one of the following applies:

1. No representations were made in response to the Enforcement Notice
2. A Notice of Rejection of Representations, made against the Enforcement Notice, was issued and we have not been informed of an appeal having been made to the Adjudicator
3. A Notice of Rejection of Adjudicator's Recommendations was issued
4. An appeal was made to the Adjudicator and was either rejected or withdrawn

As a result, the penalty charge has now increased by 50%

Penalty Charge Amount: £&CFINE
Charge Certificate: £&CSURC
Full Charge Amount: £&CHARG

Amount Paid: £&CPAID
Payment Now Due: £&CBALA

If we do not receive the amount owed before the end of the period of 14 days beginning with the date on which the Charge Certificate is served, we may register the charge as a debt at the County Court (which incurs a further charge of £8.00) and ultimately, if the charge remains unpaid, a warrant may be issued to an Enforcement Agency to recover the debt.

You are strongly advised to deal with this matter now, as Enforcement Agents will add their costs, which may significantly increase the amount that will need to be paid.

How to Pay

1. By Automated Telephone (Touchtone)

Contact the 24 hour touchtone service on 03300 884674

You will need your Penalty Charge Number and Credit/Debit card details to complete the payment transaction.

2. Via The Internet

Safely & securely via our website <https://suttonices.parkinguk.org/parking> you will need your Penalty Charge Number and Credit/Debit card details to complete the payment transaction.

3. Other forms of payment

You may make payment by crossed cheque or postal order made payable to London Borough of Sutton. Please write the Penalty Charge Notice number, your Registration and your address on the reverse of the cheque. **PLEASE DO NOT SEND CASH in the post.** Cash payments can be made at 50 Grove Road, Sutton, SM1 1BT.

DATA PROTECTION STATEMENT

The London Borough of Sutton will use information, including personal information, collected through the issuing of this penalty charge notice for the enforcement of traffic contraventions and it may also be used for compatible purposes. The information may be disclosed to London Councils, other enforcement agencies and third parties where it is necessary and lawful to do so e.g. for the prevention and detection of crime. All information will be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

Taxicard Progress Report

Item No 09

Report by: Stephen Boon **Job title:** Chief Contracts Officer
Date: 23 March 2017
Contact Officer: Stephen Boon
Telephone: 020 7934 9951 **Email:** stephen.boon@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary This paper informs the Committee of the projected Taxicard spend for 2016/17 and the estimated budget requirements for 2017/18. It also provides an update on the re-letting of the Taxicard taxi supply contract.

Recommendations Members are asked to:

1. Note the projected Taxicard spend for 2016/17 and the estimated budget for 2017/18.

Introduction

Taxicard Budget Final Outturn 2016/17

1. The Taxicard trip budget for 2016/17 is £12.295 million, with £9.78million funded by Transport for London (TfL) and £2.51 million from the boroughs.
2. Taxicard journeys have increased by 4.22% between April 2016 and February 2017 compared to the same months in 2015/16, with 21 boroughs showing an increase and 12 showing a decrease. This has resulted in the following budget projections:
 - A spend of £11.536 million
 - An overall underspend of £758,732
 - 11 boroughs to overspend totalling £247,625
 - 12 boroughs to underspend totalling £803,096.
 - An underspend of the TfL budget of £203,261
3. All boroughs currently projected to overspend have confirmed they will fund any deficit at the end of the year, and those boroughs that underspend their budgets

will be refunded by London Councils. A summary of each borough's projected spend can be found in Appendix One.

4. There are two months' journeys still to factor into the budget, but the above figures give a reasonable indication of final spend.

Taxicard Budget estimates 2017/18

5. TfL has confirmed that they will fund Taxicard for a further year in 2017/18. This means boroughs will be allocated the current budget of £9.78million plus an increase equivalent to the annual TfL taxi tariff inflation rate, which is currently projected to be approx +2.75%. The TfL contribution will be apportioned to the boroughs on the basis of a formula previously agreed by this Committee.
6. London Councils has written to boroughs to inform them of their estimated financial contribution from TfL in 2017/18, and the minimum budgets they are likely to have to provide based on this year's projected spend and trip trends. They have also been asked to provide their trip limits and Taxicard member charges.

Taxicard Taxi Supply Contract Re-Let

7. Following the *Taxicard Update* report to this committee on 8 December 2016, London Councils continues to work with TfL in exploring the option for joint procurement.
8. Since the last TEC meeting, London Councils and TfL have launched a consultation with Taxicard members to obtain their views of potential changes to the scheme. The consultation was opened on 16 February and will close on 5 April. To date, over 2,000 responses have been received from a range of interested parties, including; Taxicard members, taxi drivers, and voluntary and community organisations.
9. In addition to the consultation with the public, London Councils and TfL have started market engagement with taxi and PHV suppliers. A prior information notice was published on the Official Journal of the European Union asking interested parties to register their interest in the tendering opportunity.
10. This has been supplemented by a market sounding questionnaire that seeks to elicit views from suppliers on the outline proposals. In addition, a bidder briefing is being held on 20 March 2017. This briefing will be an opportunity to open dialogue to inform the procurement strategy for this tendering exercise.
11. Officers expect to have analysed and responded to the results of both the consultation and the wider market engagement activities in time to submit a report for consideration by TEC in June 2017.

Financial Implications for London Councils

The Taxicard budget is forecast to underspend by a net figure of £758,732 in 2016/17, based on trips to February 2017, with refunds forecast to be made to 12 contributing boroughs and TfL, amounting to £1,006,357. 11 boroughs are forecast to overspend by a combined £247,625. All boroughs projected to overspend have given a commitment to cover the position once the actual year-end position has been determined.

Legal Implications for London Councils

London Councils will give due regard to the results of the consultation when making its recommendation to TEC.

Equalities Implications for London Councils

The Taxicard scheme provides subsidised trips in licensed taxis and private hire vehicles to London residents whose severe mobility or visual impairments make it very difficult for them to use mainstream public transport. The scheme plays an important role in reducing social exclusion.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

1. Note the projected Taxicard spend for 2016/17 and the estimated budget for 2017/18.

Background papers

Taxicard Update Report (8 December 2016, Item 10)

Taxicard Update - Budget Prediction - Appendix 1

BOROUGH	BOROUGH	TfL	TOTAL	PROJECTED	PROJECTED	PROJECTED	TOTAL	BOROUGH	TfL	Total	TfL
	BUDGET	BUDGET	AVAIL	OUTTURN	BOROUGH	TfL	OVER/UNDER	OVER/UNDER	UNDER	%	%
	2016-2017	2016-2017	2016-2017		SPEND	SPEND	SPEND	SPEND	SPEND		
Barking & Dagenham	£ 183,059	£ 344,898	£ 527,957	£ 344,898	£ -	£ 344,898	-£ 183,059	-£ 183,059	£ -	65.33%	100.00%
Barnet	£ -	£ 286,018	£ 286,018	£ 260,016	£ -	£ 271,952	-£ 14,066	£ -	-£ 14,066	90.91%	104.59%
Bexley	£ -	£ 144,479	£ 144,479	£ 131,345	£ -	£ 131,345	-£ 13,134	£ -	-£ 13,134	90.91%	100.00%
Brent	£ 55,706	£ 365,914	£ 421,620	£ 365,914	£ -	£ 365,914	-£ 55,706	-£ 55,706	£ -	86.79%	100.00%
Bromley	£ -	£ 184,271	£ 184,271	£ 167,519	£ -	£ 167,519	-£ 16,752	£ -	-£ 16,752	90.91%	100.00%
Camden	£ 295,219	£ 379,834	£ 675,053	£ 675,664	£ 295,830	£ 379,834	£ 611	£ 611	£ -	100.09%	56.22%
City London	£ 4,280	£ 15,029	£ 19,309	£ 18,172	£ 3,143	£ 15,029	-£ 1,137	-£ 1,137	£ -	94.11%	82.70%
Croydon	£ -	£ 321,930	£ 321,930	£ 292,664	£ -	£ 292,664	-£ 29,266	£ -	-£ 29,266	90.91%	100.00%
Ealing	£ -	£ 346,865	£ 346,865	£ 315,332	£ -	£ 315,332	-£ 31,533	£ -	-£ 31,533	90.91%	100.00%
Enfield	£ -	£ 125,035	£ 125,035	£ 113,668	£ -	£ 113,668	-£ 11,367	£ -	-£ 11,367	90.91%	100.00%
Greenwich	£ 179,623	£ 402,802	£ 582,425	£ 510,864	£ 108,062	£ 402,802	-£ 71,561	-£ 71,561	£ -	87.71%	78.85%
Hackney	£ 252,583	£ 366,624	£ 619,207	£ 487,256	£ 120,631	£ 366,624	-£ 131,952	-£ 131,952	£ -	78.69%	75.24%
Hammersmith & Fulham	£ 197,549	£ 267,021	£ 464,570	£ 328,465	£ 61,444	£ 267,021	-£ 136,105	-£ 136,105	£ -	70.70%	81.29%
Haringey	£ 26,881	£ 342,830	£ 369,711	£ 395,684	£ 52,854	£ 342,830	£ 25,973	£ 25,973	£ -	107.03%	86.64%
Harrow	£ -	£ 256,894	£ 256,894	£ 233,540	£ -	£ 233,540	-£ 23,354	£ -	-£ 23,354	90.91%	100.00%
Havering	£ 76,513	£ 469,578	£ 546,091	£ 537,949	£ 68,371	£ 469,578	-£ 8,142	-£ 8,142	£ -	98.51%	87.29%
Hillingdon	£ -	£ 143,794	£ 143,794	£ 130,722	£ -	£ 130,722	-£ 13,072	£ -	-£ 13,072	90.91%	100.00%
Hounslow	£ -	£ 282,932	£ 282,932	£ 272,182	£ -	£ 272,182	-£ 10,750	£ -	-£ 10,750	96.20%	100.00%
Islington	£ 217,000	£ 348,668	£ 565,668	£ 416,099	£ 67,431	£ 348,668	-£ 149,569	-£ 149,569	£ -	73.56%	83.79%
Kensington & Chelsea	£ 161,562	£ 261,422	£ 422,984	£ 456,747	£ 195,325	£ 261,422	£ 33,763	£ 33,763	£ -	107.98%	57.24%
Kingston Upon Thames	£ 164,404	£ 237,495	£ 401,899	£ 432,070	£ 194,575	£ 237,495	£ 30,171	£ 30,171	£ -	107.51%	54.97%
Lambeth	£ -	£ 360,547	£ 360,547	£ 368,424	£ 7,877	£ 360,547	£ 7,877	£ 7,877	£ -	102.18%	97.86%
Lewisham	£ 103,201	£ 369,032	£ 472,233	£ 500,311	£ 131,279	£ 369,032	£ 28,078	£ 28,078	£ -	105.95%	73.76%
Merton	£ 93,038	£ 285,279	£ 378,317	£ 385,329	£ 100,049	£ 285,279	£ 7,011	£ 7,011	£ -	101.85%	74.04%
Newham	£ 132,043	£ 426,098	£ 558,141	£ 531,654	£ 105,556	£ 426,098	-£ 26,487	-£ 26,487	£ -	95.25%	80.15%
Redbridge	£ 40,891	£ 441,039	£ 481,930	£ 457,137	£ 16,098	£ 441,039	-£ 24,793	-£ 24,793	£ -	94.86%	96.48%
Richmond	£ 73,644	£ 263,286	£ 336,930	£ 356,778	£ 93,493	£ 263,286	£ 19,849	£ 19,849	£ -	105.89%	73.80%
Southwark	£ 115,000	£ 409,516	£ 524,516	£ 557,047	£ 147,531	£ 409,516	£ 32,531	£ 32,531	£ -	106.20%	73.52%
Sutton	£ 25,298	£ 272,778	£ 298,076	£ 295,161	£ 22,383	£ 272,778	-£ 2,915	-£ 2,915	£ -	99.02%	92.42%
Tower Hamlets	£ 105,097	£ 294,179	£ 399,276	£ 446,381	£ 152,203	£ 294,179	£ 47,106	£ 47,106	£ -	111.80%	65.90%
Waltham Forest	£ 11,672	£ 196,943	£ 208,615	£ 179,039	£ -	£ 179,039	-£ 29,576	-£ 29,576	£ 17,904	85.82%	100.00%
Wandsworth	£ -	£ 242,682	£ 242,682	£ 220,620	£ -	£ 220,620	-£ 22,062	£ -	-£ 22,062	90.91%	100.00%
Westminster	£ -	£ 325,036	£ 325,036	£ 339,692	£ 14,656	£ 325,036	£ 14,656	£ 14,656	£ -	104.51%	95.69%
Totals	£ 2,514,263	£ 9,780,747	£ 12,295,010	£ 11,524,342	£ 1,958,792	£ 9,577,486	-£ 758,732	-£ 555,471	-£ 203,261	93.73%	83.11%
TRUE TRUE							£ 247,625	£ 247,625			
V:\Taxicard\TAXICARD STATISTICS 2016-17Taxicard Budgets and Parameters 2016-17							-£ 1,006,357	-£ 803,096			

BOROUGH BUDGETS 2016/17 £ 2,514,263
TfL BUDGET £ 9,780,747
COMBINED BUDGETS £ 12,295,010

PROJECTED TRIP SPEND £ 11,524,342
BARNET LC ADMIN £ 11,936
TOTAL PROJECTED SPEND £ 11,536,278
TfL SPEND £ 9,577,486
TfL UNDERSPEND £ 203,261
BOROUGH UNDERSPEND £ 803,096
COMBINED UNDERSPENDS £ 1,006,357
BOROUGH OVERSPEND £ 247,625
OVERALL UNDERSPEND £ 758,732

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

Freedom Pass Progress Report Item No: 10

Report by: Stephen Boon **Job titles:** Chief Contracts Officer
Date: 23 March 2017
Contact Officer: Stephen Boon
Telephone: 020 7934 9951 **Email:** stephen.boon@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary:

This report provides Members with information on two recent developments on the Freedom Pass scheme, namely customer service improvements to the Freedom Pass scheme and discussions with the Rail Delivery Group (formerly ATOC), regarding financial adjustments to account for rail service disruption.

Recommendations:

Members are asked to:

1. Note the contents of this report

Customer Service Improvements

1. In January 2017, London Councils launched the first phase of a new online service that allows passholders to create on-line accounts and make on-line payments for replacement Freedom Passes. This new service allows customers to transact with London Councils online, making their experience quicker and easier. In the longer term, London Councils should realise savings in administering the scheme.
2. The service improvements are being delivered in stages. The first stage, launched in January, allows passholders to log into an existing Freedom Pass account or create an on-line account. From their account, passholders have the option to make an on-line payment to replace a lost or damaged pass, and if stolen, provide a crime reference number to replace their pass free of charge.

3. The next stage of development, planned for spring/summer 2017, will allow passholders to log in to their on-line account to update their personal details and provide supporting evidence. This will also see benefits to the service offered to customers and cost savings in processing post and potentially fewer phone calls.
4. To date, London Councils has undertaken soft marketing of the new service, which has included information on the Freedom Pass website and a message on the call centre recorded message. As of 1 March 2017, 1,410 passholders had created a new account and replaced passes on-line. Of these, 1383 made an on-line payment to replace their pass, and the remainder replaced their pass free of charge. Between 16 January and 28 February, 15% of replaced passes were done on-line (as opposed to over the telephone).
5. London Councils expect to see uptake of the on-line service increase in the coming months as awareness of the option grows with the help of the Freedom Pass helpline messaging promoting this facility along with call agents endorsing it during calls. Once the second stage of development is complete London Councils will launch a wider publicity campaign using social media, borough channels and publications. London Councils aims to improve the uptake to 50% of passholders using the online service.

Rail Service Disruption

6. Following the severe disruption to rail services caused by the Southern Rail industrial dispute, on-going work to London Bridge station, and the derailment of a freight train near Lewisham station, a number of members, notably in Bexley and Sutton, have raised the question of compensation in relation to the Freedom Pass scheme.
7. Spencer Palmer, director, transport and mobility, has written to the Rail Delivery Group to open discussions. London Councils has proposed that an adjustment is made to the settlement for rail services that will compensate boroughs and their residents for the disruption they have experienced and offset costs transferred to other modes of transport.
8. London Councils will be meeting with the Rail Delivery Group on 21 March (before TEC, but after dispatch of papers) and will provide a verbal update to committee members on the outcome of this meeting.

Financial Implications for London Councils

None for London Councils, but boroughs could benefit from any compensation paid by the Rail Delivery Group for the journey disruptions outlined in paragraphs 6-8 above,

Legal Implications for London Councils

None

Equalities Implications for London Councils

None

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

1. Note the contents of this report

Background Papers

TEC – Freedom Pass Progress Report – 16 June 2016 (Item 14)

TEC – Freedom Pass Progress Report – 13 October 2016 (Item 8)

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

Item Considered Under Urgency Procedure

Item No: 11

Report by:	Alan Edwards	Job title:	Governance Manager
Date:	23 March 2017		
Contact Officer:	Alan Edwards		
Telephone:	020 7934 9911	Email:	Alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: The following report was sent to the TEC Elected Officers under the Urgency Procedure:

- Re-Appointment of an Environment & Traffic Adjudicator

The report was sent to TEC Elected Officers under Urgency, in order for the adjudicator to be re-appointed in time. The re-appointment of the adjudicator was omitted from the report that went to the full TEC meeting in December 2016.

Recommendations: TEC Members are asked to note the attached Urgency Procedure that was sent to TEC Elected Officers on 17 January 2017 on:

- **Appendix 1:** Re-Appointment of an Environment and Traffic Adjudicator for a period of five years.

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

Re-appointment of an Environment & Traffic Adjudicator Item No:

Report by: Caroline Hamilton

Job title: Chief Adjudicator ETA

Date: 10 January 2016
Contact

Officer: Caroline Hamilton

Telephone: 0207 520 7200

Email: caroline.hamilton@londontribunals.gov.uk

Summary

This report proposes the re-appointment of one Environment and Traffic Adjudicator.

Recommendation

1. That the following adjudicator be re re-appointed for a period of 5 years from 21st January 2017:

Joanne Oxlade.

Background

2. Under section 81 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the accompanying regulations, adjudicators are appointed for a term not exceeding five years, remaining eligible for re-appointment on expiry of that term.

An adjudicator may be removed from office only for misconduct or on the ground that that he is unable or unfit to discharge his function, but otherwise holds and vacates office in accordance with the terms of appointment.

The regulations provide that the relevant enforcement authorities shall appoint such number of adjudicators for the purpose of the 2004 Act on such terms as they may decide. Any decision by the authorities not to appoint shall not have effect without the consent of the Lord Chancellor and of the Lord Chief Justice.

Under the terms and conditions of appointment issued by the Committee, there are five grounds for non-renewal:

1. Misconduct.
2. being unable or unfit to discharge the function of an adjudicator.
3. Persistent failure to comply with the sitting commitment (without good reason).
4. Failure to comply with training requirements.
5. Part of a reduction in numbers because of changes in operational requirements.

A decision not to renew on ground 5 and the extent to which it will be used is taken after consultation with the Chief Adjudicator with the concurrence of the Lord Chief Justice.

The re-appointment will need to be approved by the Lord Chancellor.

3. Financial Implications

There are no financial implications for London Councils directly from this report.

4. Legal Implications

There are no legal implications for London Councils.

|

5. Equalities Implications

There are no significant equalities implications from this report.

6. Recommendation

That the following environment and traffic adjudicator be appointed for a period of 5 years from 21st January 2017:

Joanne Oxlade.

London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee

TEC Committee Dates 2017/18

Item No: 12

Report by: Alan Edwards **Job title:** Governance Manager

Date: 23 March 2017

Contact Officer: Alan Edwards

Telephone: 0207 934 9911 **Email:** Alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report notifies members of the proposed TEC and TEC Executive Sub Committee dates for the year 2017/18.

Recommendations: It is recommended that Members:

- Note and agree the dates for TEC and TEC Executive Sub Committee meetings for the year 2017/18 (subject to final confirmation at the Annual General Meeting).

TEC (Main) Committee Proposed Dates

- Thursday 15 June 2017 (AGM)
- Thursday 12 October 2017
- Thursday 7 December 2017
- Thursday 15 March 2018

All the above meetings start at 2.30pm, with a pre-meeting for political groups at 1.30pm. All TEC (Main) Committee meetings will be held at 59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL.

TEC Executive Sub Committee Proposed Dates

- Thursday 20 July 2017
- Thursday 14 September 2017
- Thursday 16 November 2017
- Thursday 8 February 2018

TEC Executive Sub Committee meetings start at 10:00am are held at the offices of the London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL

Recommendations

It is recommended that Members:

- Note and agree the dates for the TEC and TEC Executive Sub Committee meetings for the year 2017/18 (subject to final confirmation at the Annual General Meeting).

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.

LONDON COUNCILS' TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT EXECUTIVE SUB COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on **9 February 2017** 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 Claudia Webbe	LB Islington
Councillor Tim Coleridge	RB Kensington & Chelsea
Councillor Phil Doyle	RB Kingston-upon-Thames
Councillor Alan Smith	LB Lewisham
Councillor Jill Whitehead	LB Sutton
Councillor Caroline Usher	LB Wandsworth
Councillor Heather Acton	City of Westminster

1. Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies

An apology for absence had been received from Christopher Hayward (City of London). No deputies were present.

2. Declarations of Interest

The Declarations of Interest sheet had since been updated to include the previously declared interests: London Cycling Campaign - Councillor Julian Bell, (LB Ealing – Chair), Board of Trustees for Groundwork London - Councillor Alan Smith (LB Lewisham), and a trustee for the Wandle Valley Regional Park - Councillor Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton).

3. Green Infrastructure Paper

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a paper that provided 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.

Councillor Coleridge said that the recommendations in the report were correct. He said that it was not the right time for new partnerships to be created. Councillor Usher asked for the boroughs that responded to the green infrastructure in placemaking questions that were anonymised, to be named. Jennifer Sibley, Principal Policy Officer, London Councils, said that she would get this information and put it on record. *(Post meeting note: The following boroughs responded to the green infrastructure in placemaking questions – Barking & Dagenham, Barnet, Brent, Camden, City of London, Ealing, Enfield, Hackney, Hammersmith & Fulham, Harrow, Havering, Hounslow, Kensington & Chelsea, Kingston, Lambeth, Merton, Lewisham, Newham and Redbridge).*

Councillor Whitehead said that Wandle Valley was an existing park and not a future one, and did not benefit from any savings from the reduction in the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority precept. The Chair said that any boroughs that wanted to allocate savings realised from the Lee Valley precept to green infrastructure or other regional parks, were welcome to do so. However, most boroughs would probably want any savings to be returned to them.

Councillor Usher voiced concern that the map of central London's green roofs was outdated (paragraph 22 in the report) and should be removed from the GLA website.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed that London Councils officers would report members' request that the map of central London's green roofs was outdated and should be removed from the GLA website; and
- Discussed and noted the report.

4. Damage to Highways Update

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that provided members with an update on work undertaken on damage to highways, since the TEC Main meeting in June 2015.

Jennifer Sibley introduced the report. She informed members that further case studies would be put on London Councils' website. She asked boroughs to inform her of any other case studies they had. The Chair thanked the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea for providing TEC with details of their case study.

Councillor Anderson said that boroughs needed to have a mechanism to claim money back from companies that had damaged highways. He felt that this was a weakness in the existing legislation. The Chair said that this should be looked into.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed that further case studies would be placed on the London Councils' website (boroughs to let Jennifer Sibley know of any other case studies they had);
- Agreed to lobby Government as opportunities arose, with a view to changing existing legislation with regards to claiming back costs for any damages to highways; and
- Discussed and noted the report.

5. Transport & Mobility Services Performance Information – Quarters 2 and 3 in 2016/17

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the London Councils' Transport and Mobility Services performance information in Q2 and Q3 in 2016/17.

Spencer Palmer, Director of Transport and Mobility, London Councils, introduced the report. He informed members that there were the usual areas in "red" that did not meet the targets, owing to way that the chief adjudicators scheduled appointments

for appeals. The remainder of the performances were good and improving in most areas.

Councillor Coleridge queried why the adjudicators did not look to see how many postal appeals they had before they allocated them. Spencer Palmer said that that there were two chief adjudicators – one for traffic appeals and one for environment appeals. All work for the road charging appeals took place at the appeals centre and adjudicators had to be present for the personal appeals and then process the postal appeals. Councillor Usher suggested just changing the performance indicator targets in order to reflect the actual situation. Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Services, London Councils, said that the judicial process should not be interfered with as London Tribunals was independent from the boroughs and needed to remain autonomous. Spencer Palmer said that the best way forward was to look at reviewing the performance targets.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed to look at reviewing the performance indicator targets at the end of the financial year, especially the areas in “red” that consistently failed to meet the agreed targets (ie Road User Charging - the “number of days to decide appeals – postal, personal and combined); and
- Noted the report.

6. Month 9 TEC Revenue Forecast 2016/17

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that outlined actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of December 2016 for TEC and provided a forecast of the outturn position for 2016/17. A surplus of £868,000 was forecast over the budget figure. In addition, total expenditure in respect of Taxicard trips taken by scheme members was forecast to underspend by a net figure of £621,000, if current trip volumes continued for the remainder of the year. The net borough proportion of this underspend was projected to be £424,000 with £197,000 accruing to TfL. However, as reported separately on the agenda, some boroughs were forecast to overspend their Taxicard budget and were required to action accordingly.

Frank Smith introduced the report. He informed members that the underspend was due to the usual volatility in trading services and the lower number of environmental and traffic appeals that had been made (10,966 less than the budgeted figure of 52,885). Frank Smith said that there were two new areas to note (a) a projected underspend of £20,000 in respect of the TEC research budget, and (b) a projected further underspend of £50,000 (out of £100,000) in respect of the IT systems development budget.

Frank Smith informed members that TEC reserves were marginally on the upper end of the benchmark of 10 to 15% for reserves (Table 2). Councillor Coleridge asked why there was such a large projected underspend of almost a third on the Freedom Pass. Spencer Palmer said that there was a smaller Freedom Pass renewal for the current year, although the budget had been kept at the same amount. There had also been a reduced number of calls to the call centre, as more people were using the online paying portal.

Councillor Coleridge asked whether the Freedom Pass budget would be reduced next year. It was pointed out that the budget for 2017/18 had already been approved by TEC, and that this specific budget would remain at the same level. Spencer Palmer said that a number of the outsourced contracts that provided a range of services to this area would be up for retender over the next 12 months, and indicators were that prices would increase for the next contract period. A report would be going to the next meeting of TEC regarding the retendering. Spencer Palmer also said that any underspends on this particular budget would be transferred to the specific reserve and put towards the cost of the next bulk pass renewal.

Frank Smith said that London Councils would be duty bound to reduce budgets and offer a reduction to borough contributions, should trends continue to show a reduction in the need to spend.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that the variances against the TEC reserve benchmark of between 10 to 15% would be reported back to Committee on a quarterly basis;
- Agreed to wait and see what the year-end outturn was for the current year before considering the impact of the underspends on the overall level of reserves;
- Noted the projected surplus of £868,000 for the year, and the forecast net underspend of £621,000 for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in the report; and
- Noted the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraph 5 of the report and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee included in paragraphs 6-8.

7. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 21 July 2016 (for agreeing)

The Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 21 July 2016 were agreed as an accurate record.

8. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 8 December 2016

The minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 8 December 2016 were noted.

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2016 were agreed as an accurate record.

9. Any Other Business

The Chair gave thanks to Councillor Heather Acton (City of Westminster) for all her work on TEC. This was Councillor Acton's last TEC Executive meeting, owing to portfolio holder changes at Westminster.

It was noted that the costs to insure electric vehicles (EVs) was high, owing to the lack of qualified engineers available to repair them.

It was noted that the London Assembly Environment Committee had a list of the 8 most critical incidents that had been listed by Thames Water.

Councillor Usher asked whether there was a role for TEC with regards to the third runway being built at Heathrow and air pollution around the area. The Chair informed members that extensive talks had taken place on this at Leaders' Committee, although no common view could be found as positions were so diverse. The issues regarding air and noise pollution were challenging, especially in west London.

Councillor Whitehead asked whether there had been any progress on the situation regarding Southern trains. It was agreed to take the ongoing problems with Southern Rail and the problems and delays on the Gospel Oak/Barking line to the meeting with the Transport Commissioner on 16 February 2017, before any further action was taken by TEC on these issues.

The meeting finished at 10.44am

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