

# Leaders' Committee

## Summaries and Minutes

Item no: 12

**Report by:** Derek Gadd      **Job title:** Head of Governance  
**Date:** 5<sup>th</sup> December 2017  
**Contact Officer:** Derek Gadd  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9505      **Email:** [Derek.gadd@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:Derek.gadd@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

**Summary**      Summaries of the minutes of London Councils

**Recommendations**      Leader's Committee is recommended to note the attached minutes:

- Grants – Leadership in the Third Sector – 12 September 2017
- CAB – 18 October 2017
- Executive – 14 November 2017



# Meeting of the Grants Sub Committee: Third Sector Leadership

**Tuesday 12 September 2017 2pm**

**London Councils, Room 7, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL**

## **Members**

Cllr Paul McGlone  
Cllr Forhad Hussain  
Cllr Yasemin Brett  
Cllr Joan Millbank  
Cllr Bob Littlewood  
Cllr Paul Ellis  
Cllr Don Massey  
Alderman Alison Gowman

## **Borough**

LB Lambeth (Chair)  
LB Newham  
L B Enfield  
LB Lewisham  
LB Redbridge  
LB Wandsworth  
LB Bexley  
City of London

## **London Councils**

Yolande Burgess  
Simon Courage  
Katy Makepeace-Gray  
Feria Henry  
Jade Appleton  
Mehboob Khan

Strategy Director  
Head of Grants and Community Services  
Principal Programme Manager  
Priority Manager  
Conservative Group Adviser  
Labour Group Adviser

## **Board Secretariat**

David Dent

Principal Corporate Governance Officer

## **London Hub**

Sharon Long

Interim Hub Director

## **London Funders**

Geraldine Blake

Interim Projects Director

## **Rocket Science**

John Griffiths

Consultant

## **1. Declarations of Interest**

1.2 Cllr Joan Millbank declared an interest as an employee of City Bridge Trust.

## **2. Apologies for absence**

2.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Stephen Carr (LB Bromley), Cllr Comer-Schwarz (LB Islington), Cllr Sue Anderson (LB Harrow), Alderman Alison Gowman (City of Westminster), and Cllr Simon Wales (LB Sutton)

## **3. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 18<sup>th</sup> July 2017**

3.1 The minutes of this meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.

3.2 The Chair wanted to ensure that for future minutes the actions arising from the meeting could be clearly tracked, including those from the 18<sup>th</sup> July meeting. Yolande Burgess, London Councils Strategy Director, confirmed that this would be done.

## **4. London Councils' Survey of Boroughs on Third Sector Infrastructure: Update and Publication.**

- 4.1 Although this was item 5 on the agenda, the Sub Committee agreed to take the item at this point on the agenda.
- 4.2 Katy Makepeace-Gray, Principal Programme Manager, provided the background to the report and thanked participating boroughs for their participation in the survey, which showed clearly that local authorities were providing a vital role in terms of the Third Sector.
- 4.3 Feria Henry, London Councils Priority Manager, confirmed that following the presentation of the initial survey results to the previous meeting, a further four responses had been received, bringing the total to 28. The additional responses had not made any material change to the findings. The Priority Manager now sought sub-committee's approval to publicise the results.
- 4.4 The Chair felt it important when publicising the results to be clear about how the results were going to be used.
- 4.5 Cllr Millbank asked that the boroughs who did not respond should be brought to the relevant members' attention. The Chair agreed that this could be done when reporting back to the Grants Committee.
- 4.6 Members noted the updated survey findings, and agreed to the publication of the findings, subject to:
- The publicity including detail about how the results will be used and
  - That details of the non- participating boroughs be reported back to Grants Committee

## **5. Infrastructure Support Change Implementation**

- 5.1 Although this was item 4 on the agenda the sub committee agreed to take the item at this point on the agenda.
- 5.2 The Chair suggested that Geraldine Blake from London Funders should first provide an update on The Way Ahead implementation.
- 5.3 Ms Blake introduced the final draft of the Change Plan (pages 21 – 34 of the sub-committee report) , which had been discussed at the Systems Change Group (SCG) on 7<sup>th</sup> September, and included feedback given at this sub-committee's July meeting. Ms Blake felt that the local 'flavour' hadn't been fully brought out in the plan, but hoped that further work with the sub-committee would assist this.
- 5.4 It was reported that the SCG would now be meeting quarterly and acting as a high level group, and that a number of 'task and finish' groups would now be established, including Cornerstone Fund, London Hub and Equalities Groups. A Co-Production Group would also be set up. Ms Blake welcomed the involvement of Members in these groups. The SCG members would be responsible for consultation within their own constituencies.
- 5.5 Ms Blake took questions from Members. The Chair asked whether the SCG was time limited and it was confirmed that the Group had a two year life. Ms Blake also confirmed that the Plan, although being published on line at the end of the week, would be constantly reviewed. In response to a question from Cllr Hussain, Ms Blake commented that the brief for the GLA work on Civil Society was informed by The Way Ahead. Cllr Millbank was concerned that it was difficult for one document to be able to 'talk' to different audiences, and that a Communications Plan would be useful here. The Chair asked that such a plan should be considered and a report made back to the sub-committee's next meeting.
- 5.6 The sub-committee discussed the four principles underpinning The Way Ahead work, namely:

- Pragmatic co-production
- Building community strength and self-reliance
- Incorporating values of transparency, fairness, equality, openness, trust and accountability
- Building in the Review's theory of change

Cllr Ellis was concerned that, in terms of the first principle, it was not easy to see the outcomes from the document and Cllr Ellis felt that the Plan was too concentrated on process. Ms Blake responded that while the Plan was a high level document, the proposed Theory of Change would create a measurement framework that would allow outcomes to be assessed. The Chair also felt that in the measurement work the Grants Committee would want to see specific outcomes, and that the framework should show specific outcome 'exemplars.'

- 5.7 Some concern was expressed by Cllr Brett and Cllr Littlewood in the second principle that the 'deprivation' indicators used for needs assessment did not sufficiently take account of the issues in outer London boroughs. The Chair suggested that the substitution of alternative words here, for example 'intelligence led funding strategies' might be useful.
- 5.8 Cllr Massey felt that in terms of the fourth principle, the financial sustainability of any new arrangements was vital to this work, and that any such solutions needed to be affordable.
- 5.9 It was agreed by the sub-committee that the Strategy Director would continue to work with Ms Blake to refine the principles, and provide a report back at the next meeting.
- 5.10 The sub committee then welcomed Sharon Long, Interim Director of The London Hub, to talk about the work of establishing the new organisation.
- 5.11 Ms Long reported that a draft paper on the formation of the London Hub had been presented to The Way Ahead conference in June 2017, and more detail on this was now being reported to this sub-committee (pages 13 – 20 of the report). One of the main issues was that the Hub did not have a lot of resources and as such focused on four areas: promoting positive change; unleashing potential; improving systems of support; and real time intelligence. Ms Long felt that while the Hub could be flexible it couldn't be 'all things to all people,' particularly in that it would have only five members of staff. It was also concerned to reduce duplication of work, was seen as a brokering tool, and was also concerned with outcomes – the project was dependent on money from the City Bridge Trust, with the accountable body being the Greater London Volunteering Board.
- 5.12 Members were concerned as to how the Hub would be able to publicise itself so people would want to go to them? Also, that small voluntary organisations, often working at a micro level, may not be able to tap into the resource? Ms Long responded that the Hub would not duplicate what was already being provided, but rather would build on existing information and the sharing of that information and intelligence, which was often collected in duplicate because organisations were working in isolation. Cllr Brett thought it would be useful for the Hub to develop its own information database, but it was felt that because of the complexities of data sharing the Hub should concentrate on managing data rather than collecting it themselves.
- 5.13 The sub-committee thanked Ms Long for her presentation.

**Members resolved to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the exempt part of the meeting.**

The meeting finished at 15:25

# Meeting of the Capital Ambition Board

**Wednesday 18 October 2017, 10.30am**

**London Councils, Conference Suite, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL**

## **Members**

Edward Lord OBE JP  
Cllr Stephen Alambritis  
Cllr Fiona Colley  
Cllr Kevin Davis

## **Local Authority**

City of London (Chair)  
LB Merton  
LB Southwark  
RB Kingston upon Thames

## **London Councils**

Frank Smith  
Guy Ware  
Thomas Man  
Lisa Henry

## **Role**

Director of Corporate Resources  
Director, Finance, Performance and Procurement  
Head of Capital Ambition  
Capital Ambition Programme Manager

## **Advisers**

James Rolfe

Executive Director of Finance, Resources and  
Customer Services, LB Enfield

## **Board Secretariat**

David Dent

Principal Corporate Governance Officer

## **EY**

Neil Sartorio  
Shu Fei Wong

Partner, Local Public Services  
Manager, Local Public Services

## **Behavioural Insights Team – for item 5**

Tim Pearce

Head of Local Government, BIT

## **Targeted Ventures**

Mark Baigent

Divisional Director Housing and Regeneration, LB  
Tower Hamlets

### **1. Declarations of Interest**

1.2 There were no declarations of interest.

### **2. Apologies for absence**

2.1 Apologies were received from Cllr David Simmonds (LB Hillingdon), Cllr Nicholas Paget-Brown (RB Kensington & Chelsea) and Paul Najsarek (LB Ealing).

2.2 It was also noted that John Hooton from LB Barnet would be joining CAB as a Chief Executive Adviser for future meetings but was unable to make this meeting.

### **3. Minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2017**

3.1 The minutes of the non-exempt part of the meeting held on 11 July 2017 were agreed as an accurate record.

3.2 CAB noted that Cllr Davis's apologies had been recorded for the meeting although he is a Conservative group substitute member for CAB and hadn't expected to attend on 11 July.

#### **4. Capital Ambition - Director's Report**

- 4.1 The report was noted by CAB. The Chair noted within the report that the majority of the original Capital Ambition fund has been allocated and spent.

#### **5. Behavioural Insights Report on Trials**

- 5.1 The Chair welcomed Tim Pearce from the Behavioural Insights team to report back on the results of the recent BI trials.
- 5.2 Mr Pearce confirmed that two pilots had been undertaken in the borough of Croydon relating to improving recycling rates and recovery of Housing Benefit overpayments.
- 5.3 In terms of the recycling pilot, the driver for this was that household recycling rates were below the national target, with rates in London typically lower. The pilot was challenging because they were trying to create changes in household behaviours, the motivation for which is not always clear, or easy to shift and sustain. An additional challenge was in measuring the full impact as individual bins are not weighed, so only aggregate changes in recycling versus landfill could be measured. However the letters sent to households who didn't regularly recycle had a marginal impact, with those households 6% less likely to miss a recycling round in subsequent weeks as a result of the communication.
- 5.4 Mr Pearce informed CAB that the recovery of Housing Benefit overpayment pilot was relevant because of the £2 billion outstanding HB debt nationally. The pilot addressed the issue in Croydon by altering the wording in the letters sent to those who had received overpayments, and providing options for repayment depending upon the level of overpayment. The pilot had achieved success by increasing repayment of debt within 45 days by 14%, with the total amount repaid increased by 42%. If this were rolled out it was estimated that £212,000 could be brought forward per year.
- 5.5 Cllr Alambritis questioned the low level of the 6% figure for increased recycling. Mr Pearce commented that the way to improve recycling rates was to address issues of habits and behaviours which were long term activities, but felt that in this trial there was a small improvement.
- 5.6 In response to a question from Cllr Colley as to whether the successes of the HB pilot could be applied to other forms of debt, Mr Pearce agreed. Guy Ware, Director, Finance, Performance and Procurement mentioned a similar scheme run at the London Borough of Lambeth in relation to Council Tax which had been similarly effective. James Rolfe also commented that Enfield had run similar initiatives related to Council Tax debt, which also had the broader benefit of reducing demand on their Customer Services team.
- 5.7 Cllr Davis felt that the improvements in the recycling pilot might be short term, and that to establish effectiveness a repetition of the exercise would be necessary. Mr Pearce again felt that recycling was a behavioural issue. Cllr Davis also raised the issue as to whether there were cultural factors around recycling, and Mr Pearce agreed, and also stated that much of the success of recycling could also be linked to social norms within areas of boroughs i.e. whether or not other households on the same street recycled.
- 5.8 The Chair thanked Mr Pearce for his presentation, and now felt it important to communicate the results. Lisa Henry, Capital Ambition Programme Manager, informed CAB that there were plans to utilise the existing professional networks for this, and also to link up with the work recently carried out by Lambeth and the LGA.
- 5.9 On this basis CAB noted the presentation and the results of the trials, and agreed to the dissemination of the results through the professional networks.

## **6. London Ventures Progress Report**

- 6.1. Thomas Man, Head of Capital Ambition, introduced the report, informing CAB that since the July Board meeting the team had been very active in promoting the programme to networks, boroughs, national conferences with high levels of interest and engagement across all stakeholders. Reflecting on the targeted ventures process and development the Head of Capital Ambition reflected on the fact that one of key new elements of the London Ventures programme had now created feasible innovative concepts and the entire process had been predicated on the engagement and involvement of boroughs, central Government agencies and charities. The targeted ventures process had been tested against one of the biggest challenges facing London and had proven to be very challenging, but also a successful way to channel stakeholders into creating new ideas and opportunities.
- 6.2. In terms of the London Ventures programme, CAB were informed that the position was healthy in that London boroughs were actively approaching the London Ventures team to get involved, and understand more about the opportunities, products and services offered through the programme. Given the nature of the programme and its offer it was noted that boroughs had different levels and types of engagement with the programme.
- 6.3. With the award of the new London Ventures contract last year, Neil Sartorio from EY reminded CAB that the London Ventures programme had been 'reset' 12 months previously to seek wider engagement and establish a broader network. There had also been some initial engagement with venture capitalists and social investors, although this was at an early stage. EY were aware of the financial objectives and were aiming to achieve a financially stable programme position.
- 6.4. In response to a question from Cllr Alambritis regarding potential venture capitalist involvement, Mr Sartorio commented that there was interest around some of the venture partner projects where there was capacity for greater involvement. However these discussions had not been progressed pending a steer from CAB, and also taking into account the governance implications.
- 6.5. Cllr Colley asked about the level of member awareness, particularly around Leaders and lead Members, as she felt that understanding and awareness of the programme was still inconsistent across local government. Mr Sartorio responded that awareness could vary from borough to borough as well as within the authority itself. Cllr Coley wondered whether the London Councils summit might be a good opportunity for engagement, as well as London Councils briefings. The Head of Capital Ambition informed CAB that the London Ventures team would have a stand at the event. He also mentioned that he was soon to carry out a stakeholder survey, including Cabinet Members, which would inform future communications activities, but that a lot of work had been done at officer level on this issue. The Director, Finance, Performance and Procurement pointed out that it was sometimes difficult to identify programme successes directly as capturing the benefits and savings achieved within boroughs as a result of London Ventures could be difficult. The London Ventures team had created social media packs for members to use through their own existing social media channels. Officers were advised to provide appropriate content as and when necessary for members to utilise.
- 6.6. In response to a question from the Director of Corporate Services, Mr Sartorio explained to CAB that although there was likely to be little immediate return on investment, venture capitalists were interested in seed funding low cost ideas because the initial risk was low, and there was the future potential to capitalise and invest which made it an attractive longer term opportunity. Also, some companies' involvement was in line with their own social impact aims, and there was the added attraction of being able to work through London Councils rather than making approaches to each individual London Borough.



6.7. CAB noted the London Ventures progress report.

**7. Any Other Business**

7.1 None.

**Members resolved to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the exempt part of the meeting.**

The meeting finished at 11.40

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive  
Tuesday 14 November 2017 9:30 am**

**Cllr Claire Kober OBE was in the chair**

**Present**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Position</b>
Cllr Claire Kober OBE	Chair
Cllr Peter John OBE	Deputy chair
Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE	Vice chair
Ms Catherine McGuinness	Vice chair
Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE	Vice chair
Mayor Sir Steve Bullock	
Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE	
Cllr Lib Peck	
Cllr Julian Bell	
Cllr Kevin Davis	

London Councils officers and Sir Rodney Brooke CBE DL were in attendance.

**1. Apologies for absence and announcement of deputies**

Apologies were received from Cllr Darren Rodwell.

**2. Declaration of interest**

Ms Catherine McGuinness declared a non-pecuniary interest in the budget items 6 - 9 as the Chair of the City of London's Policy and Resources Committee in relation to contracts with the City of London held by London Councils.

Apart from that no interests were declared

**3. Minutes of the Executive Meeting held on 12 September 2017**

The minutes of the Executive meeting held on 12 September 2017 were agreed.

#### **4. Independent Panel on the Remuneration of Councillors**

The Chair welcomed Sir Rodney Brooke CBE DL, chair of the Independent Panel on the Remuneration of Councillors to the meeting and asked him and the Chief Executive to introduce the report.

The Chief Executive:

- Legislation required a local authority to have regard to the report of an independent panel when deciding its remuneration scheme for members.
- London boroughs can have regard to a single report applied collectively and the Independent Panel on the Remuneration of Councillors, chaired by Sir Rodney Brooke, had produced such a report at four-yearly intervals in 2006, 2010 and 2014
- In July London Councils agreed to reconvene the panel, comprising Sir Rodney Brooke CBE DL, Mr Steve Bundred and Ms Anne Watts CBE

Sir Rodney Brooke CBE DL

- This was the latest of the panel's four-yearly reviews
- On the Borough Scheme, boroughs were consulted and their comments taken into account by the panel
- The panel was recommending the same overall level of remuneration as last time
- The recommendations on basic allowance had been largely adopted but there were discrepancies in the convergence of special responsibility allowances
- The panel's research suggested an increased workload for councilors due to:
  - Digital media both making them more accessible to constituents and creating an expectation around speed of response
  - Greater involvement in new bodies – sub-regional groups, partnerships etc
- Use of an MP's salary as a benchmark for the remuneration of a council leader remained
- MP's salaries had been increased considerably since the panel's last review, while a council leader's had gone up only in line with the officers' pay award, which was significantly less

- In a different financial climate the panel would have liked to have recommended an increase for a council leader comparable to that brought forward by IPSA for MPs but this had to remain an aspiration for this or another panel to pick up in the future
- In some cases borough schemes depart from the relativities recommended by the panel and it was happy to insert a sentence into its report to reflect this, viz:

*Councils can organise their functioning in very different ways and we recognise that flexibility in applying the scheme is necessary.*

- On the London Councils Scheme it was generally considered fit-for-purpose and had been left largely unchanged.

The Chair thanked the panel members: Sir Rodney Brooke CBE DL, Mr Steve Bundred and Ms Anne Watts CBE and asked members of the Executive for comments.

Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE commented that the inability of the panel to recommend a greater increase, that would have been justified by legitimate comparability with an MP's salary, was indicative of the situation local government found itself in.

Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE referred to the recommendation in the report that asked whether the reports should be submitted to Leaders' Committee in December and proposed that it should.

The Executive agreed:

- That the reports should be submitted to Leaders' Committee on 5 December 2017
- Sir Rodney Brooke CBE DL should be invited to attend Leaders' Committee on 5 December to introduce the reports.

## **5. London Business Rates Pilot Pool**

The Chair introduced the item saying:

- That she had met the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the previous week and he remained supportive of the proposal for a 100% business rate retention pool pilot in London
- The next step was for the government to prepare a designation order establishing the pool. However, if any authority were then to decide to opt out within the following 28 days, by mid-January, the pool would not proceed.

She invited the Interim Director: Finance, Performance & Procurement to add anything else he considered necessary and he reported that a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) had been drafted and was being discussed with civil servants. Legal advice on the decisions councils needed to make was being sent out.

In response to a question from Cllr O'Neill about whether council meetings would be needed he replied that that depended on a council's own scheme of delegation and decision-making processes.

Ms Catherine McGuinness pointed out that the City had an issue with the incentive for growth element and she needed to seek further approval from members.

In response to a question from Cllr Julian Bell about the strategic investment pot, officers confirmed that Government would like this to be higher but there was a recognition that the arrangement reached would sustain for 2018/19.

## **6. Devolution and Public Service Reform**

The Chair also introduced this report saying that it was a general update and the MoU was due to be signed off on Thursday 16 November. Jules Pipe, Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills at the GLA would attend Leaders' Committee in December to discuss skills devolution and the Draft London Plan.

The Executive agreed to note the report.

## **7. Audited Accounts 2016/17**

The Director of Corporate Resources introduced the report saying it represented the final piece of the jigsaw for 2016/17 and compared the results to the pre-audited position reported to the Executive at their meeting held on 20 June 2017.

Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE commended the report saying that the narrative that accompanied the accounts showed the breadth of activity that London Councils was responsible for.

The Executive agreed formally to adopt each of the three statutory accounts attached as appendices to the report.

## **8. Month 6 Revenue Forecast 2017/18**

The Director of Corporate Resources also introduced this report saying it highlighted the projected outturn position for the current year, based on existing transactions, together with known future developments and a forecast underspend of £2.302 million was projected for 2017/18, across the three funding streams.

The Executive agreed to note the overall forecast surplus as at 30 September 2017 (Month 6) of £2.302 million and noted the position on reserves as detailed in the report.

## **9. Proposed Revenue Budget and Borough Subscriptions and Charges 2018/19**

This was the third and last report introduced by the Director of Corporate Resources:

- The report proposed the level of borough subscriptions and charges to be levied in 2018/19, which would be submitted to the Leaders' Committee meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> December for final consideration and approval
- Inflation would now make a material difference to London Councils' budget particularly in the areas of pay and the contracts held with the City. In the past, such pressures may have required a corresponding increase in subscriptions but next year, it was proposed that this be managed without calling on boroughs for an increase
- After taking into account the budget proposals outlined in the report and the recommended use of reserves of £2.296 million, the level of uncommitted reserves reduced to £5.854 million which was considered a healthy position
- The proposals being submitted to Leaders' Committee in December involved:
  - Containing all budgetary pressures in 2018/19, including the rent review at Southwark Street, the officer pay award, GDPR preparatory work and other contract and general running cost increases, from within the 2017/18 approved budgetary resources, which would allow the three core subscriptions to remain at the current year's level
  - A £1 million reduction in the borough contribution towards the S.48 ESF programme as the three-year borough funding commitment expired at the end of 2017/18. However, as the programme had slipped by roughly 16 months, accumulated funds held in Grants Committee reserves would be applied to fund the programme, along with ESF grant, up until the current stated project end-date of March 2019 and
  - The continuation of the Challenge Implementation Fund of £525,000, funded from any underspent funds carried forward from the current year, replenished by uncommitted joint committee reserves.

The Executive agreed to recommend that Leaders' Committee approve at their meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2017 the following borough subscription and charges:

- The proposed Joint Committee subscription for boroughs of £161,958 per borough for 2018/19, no change on the charge of £161,958 for 2017/18
- The proposed Joint Committee subscription for the MOPAC and the LFEPA of £15,410 for 2018/19, no change on the charge of £15,410 for 2017/18

- An overall level of expenditure of £8.668 million for the Grants Scheme in 2018/19 (inclusive of £2 million gross ESF programme), the same level as for 2017/18 and
- That taking into account the application of £1 million ESF grant and £1 million from earmarked Grants Committee reserves, net borough contributions for 2018/19 should be £6.668 million, compared to £7.668 million for 2017/18.

The Executive also agreed to recommend that the Leaders' Committee endorse the following subscription and charges for 2018/19 for TEC, which would be considered by the TEC Executive Sub-Committee on 16<sup>th</sup> November, before being presented to the main meeting of TEC on 7<sup>th</sup> December for final approval:

- The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2017/18 - £1,500)
- No charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass Administration Charge, which is covered by replacement Freedom Pass income (2017/18 – no charge)
- The net Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,182 in total (2017/18 - £338,182)
- No charge to boroughs and TfL in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which was fully covered by estimated PCN income (2017/18 – no charge)
- The Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.4226 per PCN, which would be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with the number of PCNs issued in 2016/17 (2017/18 - £0.4915 per PCN)
- The Parking and Traffic Appeals Charge of £30.63 per appeal or £27.02 per appeal where electronic evidence was provided by the enforcing authority (2017/18 - £32.00/£28.50 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £25.21 for hard copy submissions and £23.53 for electronic submissions (2017/18 - £26.74/£26.06 per SD)
- Congestion Charging Appeals – to be recovered on a full cost recovery basis, as for 2017/18, under the new contract arrangement with the GLA



- The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2017/18 - £7.31)
- The TRACE (Fax) Charge of £7.70 per transaction (2017/18 - £7.48) and
- The PEC Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2017/18 - £0.17)

On the basis of the above proposed level of subscriptions and charges, the Executive agreed to recommend to the Leaders' Committee:

- The provisional consolidated revenue expenditure budget for 2018/19 for London Councils of £386.609 million
- The provisional consolidated revenue income budget for 2018/19 for London Councils of £384.313 million
- Within the total income requirement, the use of London Council reserves of £2.296 million in 2018/19

The Executive also agreed to recommend that the Leaders' Committee note:

- The position in respect of forecast uncommitted London Council reserves as at 31 March 2018
- The positive statement on the adequacy of the residual London Councils reserves issued by the Director of Corporate Resources

Cllr Puddifoot proposed, and the Executive agreed, to thank the Director of Corporate Resource for his work on the budget and that balances have been properly managed.

## **AOB**

The Chair reminded the Executive of:

- The breakfast meeting with the Minister for London, Greg Hands MP on the following Friday and
- The London Councils Summit on the following Saturday.

The meeting ended at 10:00am.

# Leaders' Committee

## Summaries and Minutes – 2<sup>nd</sup> dispatch Item no: 12

**Report by:** Derek Gadd      **Job title:** Head of Governance

**Date:** 5<sup>th</sup> December 2017

**Contact Officer:** Derek Gadd

**Telephone:** 020 7934 9505      **Email:** [Derek.gadd@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:Derek.gadd@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

**Summary**      Summaries of the minutes of London Councils

**Recommendations**      Leader's Committee is recommended to note the attached minutes:

- Audit Committee Minutes on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2017
- TEC Minutes on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2017



# **Minutes of the Meeting of the Audit Committee**

## **21 September 2017**

Cllr Roger Ramsey was in the Chair

### **Members Present:**

Cllr Roger Ramsey (LB Havering)  
Cllr Stephen Alambritis (LB Merton)  
Cllr Fiona Colley (LB Southwark)  
Cllr Mukesh Malhotra (LB Hounslow)

### **In Attendance:**

Jerry Mullins, Audit Manager, City of London  
Martha Franco-Murillo, Senior Auditor, City of London  
Neil Hewitson, Director, KPMG LLP  
Stephen Lucas, Senior Manager, KPMG LLP

London Councils' officers were in attendance.

Introductions were made around the table for the benefit of any new members of London Councils' Audit Committee.

### **1. Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Simon Wales (LB Sutton).

### **2. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Alambritis declared an interest in being on the London Pensions Fund Authority (LPFA) Board.

### **3. Minutes of the Audit Committee meeting held on 22 June 2017**

The minutes of the Audit Committee meeting held on 22 June 2017 were agreed as being an accurate record.

### **4. Draft Annual Audit Report 2016/17**

The Audit Committee received a report that presented the annual audit report to those charged with governance (ISA260) prepared by KPMG, London Councils' external auditor, in respect of the 2016/17 financial year.

David Sanni, Head of Financial Accounting, London Councils, introduced the report. He informed members that the draft Management Letter at Appendix B (page 25) was a standard letter which would be signed by Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Resources, once it was approved. There was a letter to go with each set of accounts.

Neil Hewitson, Director, KPMG LLP, said that KPMG issued an unqualified opinion on each set of accounts. With regards to key audit risks (page 8), he said that the review of the risks across all three committee accounts did not reveal any issues. The judgements made in the financial statements (accruals and pensions liability, page 10) represented a balanced view and were within the acceptable range. The recommendations (page 12) from the previous year had both been implemented and there were no new recommendations in 2016/17.

Councillor Malhotra asked if London Councils' disaster recovery and Business Continuity Plan (BCP) had been reviewed during the course of the audit. Neil Hewitson said that the review of business continuity arrangements fell outside of KPMG's remit. The Chair confirmed that business continuity had been discussed at the previous Audit Committee meeting. Frank Smith said that the BCP had been reviewed a year ago. The BCP and cascade process was invoked by London Councils following the terrible events that occurred on Saturday, 3 June 2017 at London Bridge. The cascade process was initiated on the following day via telephone, text messaging and email informing staff that the London Councils' building at Southwark Street was open for business as usual. Frank Smith confirmed that 92% of London Councils' staff had received the message. The Chair said that details of this could be found on page 3 (2<sup>nd</sup> para) of the minutes from the last meeting.

Councillor Malhotra asked if he could have further details with regards to the pensions liability (£29.99mm) in the Financial Statements on page 10 (page 16 handwritten) of the report. Stephen Lucas, Senior Manager, KPMG LLP, said that KPMG used actuarial experts to ascertain whether the assumptions used by London Councils' actuary were within an acceptable range. Frank Smith said that the pension scheme funding level had increased from 96% as at 31 March 2016 to the current position of 104%, making it currently fully funded. Councillor Malhotra asked whether this was under the London Pensions Fund Authority (LPFA). Frank Smith confirmed that it was; London Councils having attained Admitted Body status back in 2000. The Chair said that details of this were set out in the Statement of Accounts.

Councillor Colley noted that the pensions deficit was growing and she asked what benchmarks KPMG were using for comparison. Stephen Lucas said that actuarial experts looked at a range of assumptions used by a number of actuaries in order to determine an acceptable range. KPMG would investigate any assumptions that fell outside the acceptable ranges. Neil Hewitson confirmed that the assumptions used in London Councils' accounts were within the acceptable range.

The Audit Committee:

- Noted the contents of the annual audit report included at Appendix A; and
- Approved the draft letter of representation included at Appendix B.

## **5. Financial Accounts 2016/17**

The Audit Committee received a report that presented the audited statement of accounts for 2016/17, for approval. The accounts to be approved comprised of London Councils' Consolidated Statement of Accounts for 2016/17, London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee Statement of Accounts for 2016/17 and London Councils' Grants Committee Statement of Accounts for 2016/17

David Sanni introduced the report and informed members that there was an audited surplus for 2016/17 of £1.764 million for the provisional consolidated accounts. He said that Table 3 (page 34) showed the adjusted position for the 2016/17 statutory accounts, incorporating actuarial losses on pension assets/liabilities. David Sanni informed members that Table 5 (page 36) showed the audited position on usable reserves as at 31 March 2017 - £12.510 million over the three funding streams.

Councillor Colley asked what was planned and unplanned with regards to the use of reserves. David Sanni said that transfers from usable reserves were used for balancing the budget and were approved by members during the annual budget setting process each December. The transfers from unusable reserves are not included in the budget but are derived from accounting adjustments resulting from the movements on the Pension Reserve and Accumulated Absence Liability.

Councillor Colley asked if there were any concerns regarding figures in the “analysis of revenue account surplus” in Table 4 (page 35). Frank Smith said this was reported to Committee on a quarterly basis. He said that TEC surpluses and overspends were harder to assess as they related to trading services, such as concessionary fares and parking services and were demand led by service users. Grants included an underspend on the current European Social Fund (ESF) matched funded programme. On the Joint Committee, there was a surplus on central recharges and an underspend on research and commissioning, which was expected and reported to the Executive during the course of the year. Frank Smith said that the ESF budget would catch-up this year. The Chair said that the budget was agreed by London Councils’ Leaders Committee and the outturn reported to the Executive before it was presented to Audit Committee. Councillor Colley asked if there were any risks going forward. She said that she was unable to find the funding ratio of the pension scheme in the accounts. It was agreed that the funding ratio would be included in future accounts.

Councillor Malhotra asked if London Councils had any contingency plans in place for not receiving the £940,000 co-financing contribution from the ESF after Brexit (page 71, para 29, Consolidated Statement of Accounts). Frank Smith confirmed that the ESF programme was scheduled to end before Brexit. He said that the ESF grant would continue until the programme ended. The programme had now slipped until December 2018 and a further extension had now been sought to mid-2019. The Chair asked when the current S.48 Grants programme ended. Frank Smith confirmed that the current Grants programme ran up to March 2021.

The Audit Committee:

- Approved the statement of accounts, as detailed at Appendices A to C of the report; and
- Agreed that the funding ratio would be included in future financial accounts.

## **6. London Councils’ Corporate Risk Register**

The Audit Committee received a report on the Corporate Risk Register that was presented to the Audit Committee on an annual basis

Christiane Jenkins, Director of Corporate Governance, London Councils, introduced the report. She informed members that the Corporate Risk Register was presented to the Audit Committee every September. It was reviewed quarterly by the Corporate Governance Group and twice a year by the Corporate Management Board (CMB). Christiane Jenkins informed members that there had been no changes to the register from the previous year, with the exception of Corporate Risks 7, 8 and 9 where the appropriate London Councils’ responsible officer(s) had changed as a result of the previous officer responsible, Nick Lester-Davis, leaving the organisation.

Councillor Colley asked whether the loss of borough support varied over time (Corporate Risk 1, page 44). John O’Brien said no authority were currently in a period of notice in respect of leaving London Councils, but the Register rating took account of the potential for this position to change, particularly in periods of heightened sensitivity.

Councillor Malhotra asked what progress London Councils was making with regards to complying with the new General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) framework being enacted on 25 May 2018. He said that plans for the regulators needed to be in place by January 2018. Frank Smith said that London Councils had an experienced officer, Emily Salinger, carrying out this work. He informed members that there were two main risks for London Councils, namely (a) consent, and (b) contractual (London Councils was responsible for third party contracts and clauses needed to be put in to clarify responsibilities of contractors with regards to the new regulations). With regards to the Taxicard Scheme, Frank Smith said that all 65,000 members would potentially need to be written to in order to gain their consent for use and retention of their personal data. He reassured the Committee that work was in hand and that London Councils already had a GDPR project plan. Frank Smith said that regular meetings were also taking place with Christiane Jenkins, Emily Salinger and himself and any potential risks would be identified by the end of the year. Councillor

Malhotra asked if progress for implementing the GDPR could be a standard item on the Audit Committee agenda going forward.

Neil Hewitson said that there was a great deal of work that needed to be carried out across the Local Government sector before the new GDPR was implemented in May 2018. Christiane Jenkins said that an internal audit on information governance had taken place at London Councils. She confirmed that 119 staff (out of 120 staff) had undertaken mandatory classroom based training and that London Councils had also signed up to an online training module which was mandatory for all staff ("Bob's Business eLearning"). An asset register was also being put together and this work was being made a priority.

Frank Smith informed members that London Councils had three main contracts where personal data was used, namely (a) Parking Managed Services, (b) Taxicard contract, and (c) the administration of the Freedom Pass (outsourced to call centres). London Councils had been in contact with all three of these contractors. Frank Smith said that the Grants programme also contained a large amount of personal data and robust controls needed to be in place to manage this information, particularly in respect of the ESF programme.

Councillor Malhotra asked what was being carried out to ensure that London Councils would be GDPR compliant with regards to its payroll and pensions. Frank Smith said that the LPFA, which manages London Councils pension, was currently taking measures at the moment. He said that the City of London undertook the payroll functions on behalf of London Councils, via an SLA. Jerry Mullins, Audit Manager, City of London, said that work on this was ongoing and was in the internal audit plan for the City. He said that payroll, including the employee pension deductions were being looked at on a regular basis.

Councillor Malhotra asked what London Councils' plans were to bolster IT transitional issues, in light of the recent breaches in cyber security. Frank Smith said that the City of London provided the IT for London Councils, through Agilisys, and regular meetings took place with them. He confirmed that London Councils had not suffered from any threats during these recent breaches in IT security. London Councils' IT strategy was approved by CMB, and London Councils operated some of its services in the Cloud.

Councillor Malhotra asked whether any reviews had taken place to ensure that the London Councils' building was fit for purpose. Frank Smith said that there was currently a ten year lease on the premises which expired in 2021. He confirmed that the building was fit for the services that London Councils provided at the moment. Frank Smith said that London Councils was responsible for the repairs and maintenance of the building and employed various contractors to deal with any issues that arose. John O'Brien, Chief Executive, London Councils, said that the building was in a good location for members, although it had certain limitations with regards to meeting rooms/layout.

The Audit Committee:

- Agreed that progress on implementing the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) would be a standard item on future Audit Committee agendas; and
- Noted the London Councils Corporate Risk Register for 2017/18, which was attached at Appendix 2 of the report.

## **7. Internal Audit Reviews Update**

The Audit Committee received a report that provided members with an update of internal audit work that had been undertaken since the last meeting held in June 2017.

David Sanni introduced the report, which was a regular item on the agenda and provided an update from the last Audit Committee meeting held on 22 June 2017. The Recruitment and Payroll Administration audit had been completed and could be found at Appendix A of the report. David

Sanni informed Committee that Recommendation 1, regarding the “use of payroll exception reports” to help identify payroll errors, had been rejected by Management on the account that London Councils was a relatively small organisation that only employs 120 staff. It was deemed that obtaining such reports would outweigh any available benefits. Also, checks could be carried out using the existing software packages.

Jerry Mullins said that the 2016/17 the draft report on information management and security had been issued and was the final review included in the 2016/17 audit plan. He said that work on this year’s audit plan had now started. The Chair said that work on a number of reviews in the 2017/18 audit plan had been slower than anticipated (Appendix B, page 63). Jerry Mullins said that there was an issue of finding the right time to carry out an audit review (eg around IT work). However, he reassured members that all work would be completed by the 31 March 2018 and nothing would be carried over to the following year.

The Audit Committee:

- Noted and commented on the internal audit report on Recruitment and Payroll Adjustments attached at Appendix A of the report;
- Noted the Internal Audit Progress Report for 2017/18 attached at Appendix B of the report; and
- Noted that there were no significant control weaknesses identified in the reviews completed during the period.

## 8. Dates of Audit Committee Meetings for 2018/19

The Audit Committee received a report that notified members of the proposed Audit Committee meeting dates for 2018/19.

Councillor Malhotra said that the next meeting of the Audit Committee was not until March 2018 and that it would be beneficial if the Committee could receive updates on the GDPR prior to this meeting. The Chair said that it was probably more appropriate if a report went to the London Councils’ Executive meeting which next met on 16 January 2018, and, subject to the agreement of the Chair of London Councils, an update on GDPR could go to the Executive and then be shared with the respective Audit Committee members.

The Audit Committee agreed the meeting dates for 2018/19.

**The meeting finished at 11:25am**

## Action Points

	Action	Progress
<i>Item 5. Financial Accounts 2016/17</i>	<i>Agreed to include funding ratio in future financial accounts</i>	<b>Ongoing</b>
<i>Item 6. Risk Management Corporate Risk Register</i>	<i>Agreed that progress on implementing the GDPR would be a standard item on The Audit Committee agenda</i>	<b>On AC agenda for 22 March 2018</b>
<i>Item 8. Dates of Audit Committee</i>	<i>Agreed that an update on GDPR would, subject to the Chair’s approval, go to the London Councils’ Executive Committee and then onto the Audit Committee</i>	



# Leaders' Committee

## Report from the Transport & Environment Committee – 12 October 2017

Item no:

**Report by:** Alan Edwards      **Job title:** Governance Manager  
**Date:** 5 December 2017  
**Contact Officer:** Alan Edwards  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9911      **Email:** Alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

---

**Summary:** Summary of the minutes of the London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee held on 12 October 2017

**Recommendations:** For information.

**1. Attendance:** Cllr Lynda Rice (LB Barking & Dagenham), Cllr Colin Tandy (LB Bexley - Deputy), Cllr Tim Stevens (LB Bromley – Deputy), Cllr Stuart King (LB Croydon), Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing, Chair), Cllr Vicki Pite (LB Enfield - Deputy), Cllr Sizwe James (RB Greenwich), Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney), Cllr Larry Culhane (LB Hammersmith & Fulham - Deputy), Cllr Graham Henson (LB Harrow), Cllr Jason Frost (LB Havering), Cllr Douglas Mills (LB Hillingdon – Deputy), Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington), Cllr Will Pascall (RB Kensington & Chelsea), Cllr Phil Doyle (RB Kingston-upon-Thames), Cllr Nick Draper (LB Merton - Deputy), Cllr Pat Murphy (LB Newham), Cllr John Howard (LB Redbridge), Cllr Peter Buckwell (LB Richmond-upon-Thames), Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton), Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Tower Hamlets), Cllr Caroline Usher (LB Wandsworth), and Alex Williams (Transport for London).

**2. Apologies for Absence:** Cllr Dean Cohen (LB Barnet), Cllr Alex Sawyer (LB Bexley), Cllr Colin Smith (LB Bromley), Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield), Cllr Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr Keith Burrows (LB Hillingdon), Cllr Amrit Mann (LB Hounslow) and Cllr Martin Whelton (LB Merton).

**3. Mayor's Environment Strategy – Introduction by Shirley Rodrigues, Deputy Mayor for Environment & Energy, GLA**

Shirley Rodrigues introduced the Mayor's draft London Environment Strategy and made the following comments:

- The Environment Strategy would cover areas like air quality, climate change and waste, and would be aligned with the Transport Strategy being undertaken by Val Shawcross, Deputy Mayor for Transport, GLA.
- It was an ambitious strategy to 2050 and aims to provide certainty in the long-term.
- The Mayor's aim was to improve the environment now through implementing policies for air quality, green infrastructure, energy efficiencies and fuel poverty.
- A new "T-Charge" (Toxicity Charge) would come in to force on 23 October 2017 and would have wide reaching implications for health. The introduction of the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) would improve air quality further.

- Part of plans for increasing green infrastructure was to make London a “National Park City” by 2050. Green belt land would continue to be protected. A “Green Spaces Commission” would be set-up to look at parks and open spaces.
- The Environment Strategy included targets for waste and recycling (65% recycling rate by 2030).

A “Q and A” session took place where members asked questions regarding recycling rates and air pollution. Shirley Rodrigues also informed members that a “cleaner vehicle checker” had also been introduced, where a person could check how clean the vehicle they were planning to buy was.

#### **4. Response to Mayor’s Draft Transport Strategy – Presentation by Val Shawcross, Deputy Mayor for Transport, GLA**

Val Shawcross added the following comments:

- London Councils’ draft response to the Mayor’s Transport Strategy was very substantial and was very welcomed.
- 350 detailed submissions had been received from stakeholders, along with 6000 individual submissions.
- A large number of seminars, workshops and public focus groups had convened and this had helped to develop a stronger transport strategy. There might also be an Annual Conference Programme, something that would continue to be explored with the Chair and officers at London Councils.
- A lot more work would be carried out on freight which included the “Vision Zero” road safety policies.
- A change to modal shift in outer London needed to take place, facilitated by more public transport.
- On the draft LIP 3 Guidance, it was recognised that this needed to be more policy led and TfL and London Councils’ officers were starting to work on this jointly.

A “Q and A” session took place where members asked questions regarding public transport, Crossrail 2, Local Transport Funding and the tramlink.

#### **5. Local Implementation Plan Guidance Response**

The Committee received a report that summarised the development process of London Councils’ draft Local Implementation Plan (LIP) Guidance and sought member approval for its contents. This item had already been discussed in conjunction with agenda item 4.

**Decision:** The Committee **(i)** noted and discussed the report and draft response to the draft LIP Guidance at Appendix 1; and **(ii)** agreed to submit the draft response to the draft LIP Guidance as outlined at Appendix 1.

#### **6. Flooding Investment in London & Introduction of the New Chair of the Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee**

The Committee considered a report that provided members with the annual update from the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (Thames RFCC) on its work and progress on the six-year capital programme to improve flood defence. The report included a business case presented by the Environment Agency on behalf of the Thames RFCC for an increase in local levy.

Robert Van de Noort, the new Chair of the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (Thames RFCC), introduced the report and the following comments were made:

- Robert Van de Noort was new to the role and had been Chair of the Thames RFCC for only three weeks. He works at the University of Reading. He had previously chaired the South West RFCC for four years.
- One million people were currently at risk from flooding in London.
- A 25-year approach to flooding had been agreed this year by the Thames RFCC.
- The Thames RFCC was working on a number of “themes”, including:
  - (1) Slowing the flow – keeping water further upstream to help prevent flooding. A grant of £500k had been received for this;

- (2) Reducing surface flooding and sewage flooding – work was taking place with Thames Water on this;
- (3) Promoting the value of flood plains;
- (4) Reducing the tidal flow risk in the Thames Estuary – this was ongoing;
- (5) Empowering communities to become more resilient to flooding;
- (6) Delivering forward-looking, integrated schemes, including major projects; and
- (7) Promoting maintenance and the need for contingency plans.

The Committee **(i)** agreed that the steer to the TEC members who sit on the Thames RFCC would be to increase the levy by 1.99% for 2018/19, **(ii)** noted the new Chair of the Thames RFCC was Robert Van de Noort, and **(iii)** noted that “Beverly Park Flood Scheme” page 35 of the report) was in the borough of Merton and Sutton, and not the borough of Richmond.

## **7. Chair’s Report**

The Committee received a report that updated members on transport and environment policy since the last TEC meeting on 15 June 2017 and provided a forward look until the next TEC meeting on 7 December 2017.

The Committee **(i)** agreed that the Healthy Streets Board would become an official advisory board to which London Councils’ TEC would nominate members annually at its June AGM; and **(ii)** agreed that an email would be circulated to the boroughs that had not yet returned their delegated authority forms for GULCS (ie to give authority for London Councils to potentially undertake the operational management of the Go Ultra Low City Scheme).

## **8. GLC Parks Byelaws – Setting Penalty Levels**

The Committee considered a report that provided members with the results of the GLC Parks Byelaws consultation which was run over the summer on behalf of TEC.

The Committee **(i)** noted the consultation outcome, **(ii)** agreed to set a fixed penalty level of £80 for breaches to the GLC Parks Byelaws, and **(iii)** agreed to set the level of reduced payment at £50 if the fixed penalty was paid within 14 days from the date of the notice.

## **9. Proposed Freedom Pas Settlement Adjustment for Rail Network Disruption**

This report was withdrawn.

## **10. Direct Vision Standard for Heavy Goods Vehicles**

The Committee received a report that gave members an update on Transport for London’s (TfL) work on using a Direct Vision Standard (DVS) for Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) to deliver the Mayoral commitment to ban or restrict the most unsafe (zero star) HGVs from London by 2020, and ensure that only HGVs suitable for urban environments (three star and above) were used in London from 2024.

The Committee **(i)** noted the progress made in developing the Direct Vision Standard and proposals to ban or restrict the most unsafe HGVs from London’s roads, **(ii)** noted and supported TfL’s intention to carry out a policy consultation on a HGV Safety Standard Permit scheme proposal in autumn 2017, **(iii)** noted TfL’s work with London Councils to explore the existing London Lorry Control Scheme as the implementation mechanism for any permit scheme, and **(iv)** noted that Alex Williams would let Councillor Usher have the information regarding the tests carried out on HGVs and poor visibility.

## **11. Assisted Transport Allowances**

The Committee received a report that informed the Committee of the outcome of a recent Assembly investigation into improving door-to-door transport services in London and the recommendations made by the Assembly in their subsequent report “Door-to-Door Transport in London – Delivering a User-Led Service”.

The Committee **(i)** endorsed the outline proposed objectives and scope for a pilot of Assisted Transport Allowances in two London boroughs, **(ii)** proposed that one of the pilots would be an inner London and the other an outer London borough, **(iii)** agreed to the participation of London Councils in a joint steering group with TfL, to develop the detailed scope of the proposed pilot during October and November 2017,

(iv) noted that TfL would provide the majority of resources required to undertake the analysis and modelling required to scope the pilot with subject matter expertise provided by London Councils' staff, and (v) noted that an update on the proposed pilot, together with a more detailed proposal, would be presented to members at the TEC meeting in December 2017.

## **12. Code of Practice for Parking Enforcement Part 2**

The Committee considered a report that updated members on the Code of Practice for Parking Enforcement in London. The code was being updated in two parts. The revised Part 1 was agreed at TEC in December 2016. This report sought approval of Part 2 of the revised Code of Practice relating to back office functions.

The Committee (i) noted the contents of the revised Part 2 of the Code of Practice and agree that it should replace of the existing part of the Code relating the back office functions, and (ii) recommended the adoption of Part 2 of the Code of Practice by all London authorities that carried out civil parking enforcement of parking regulations.

## **13. TfL Consultation on Penalty Charge Levels**

The Committee received and noted a report that contained details of TfL's consultation on plans to increase Penalty Charge notices (PCNs) on their network and outlined the reasons why London Councils was not undertaking a similar consultation for PCN levels on borough roads at this time.

## **14. Re-appointment of Environment & Traffic Adjudicators**

The Committee considered a report that proposed the re-appointment of nine environment and traffic adjudicators under the terms of the Traffic Management Act 2004.

The Committee agreed that the following adjudicators be appointed for a period of 5 years from 10 December 2017: Neeti Haria, Caroline Hamilton, John Hamilton, Mamta Parekh, Sean Stanton-Dunne Carl Teper, and Timothy Thorne. Michel Aslangul to be appointed until 26<sup>th</sup> July 2020 and Francis Lloyd to be appointed until 13<sup>th</sup> March 2021.

## **15. Environment & Traffic Adjudicators' Annual Report 2016/17**

The Committee received and noted a joint Annual Report by the Environment and Traffic Adjudicators for the reporting year 2016/17.

## **16. TEC Constitutional Matters**

The Committee received and noted a report that summarised the key changes to constitutional documents agreed by the Leaders' Committee AGM on 11 July 2017. Changes were being recommended for the following documents: (a) London Councils' Standing Orders, (b) London Councils' Scheme of Delegation to Officers, (c) Terms of Reference for Sub-Committees, and (d) Financial Regulations.

## **17. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 15 September 2017 (for noting)**

*Item 3: Air Pollution & Smart Mobility, Q and As (page 2, end of para 4) – agreed to replace "car" pollution with "air" pollution, (re sentence by Councillor Rice). Subject to this minor amendment, the minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 15 September 2017 were noted.*

## **18. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 15 June 2017 (for agreeing)**

The Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 15 June were agreed as an accurate record.

**The meeting finished at 16:30pm**