

# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

**Thursday 8 February 2018**

10:00am in Meeting Room 1, London Councils, 1st Floor,  
59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL

**Contact Officer:**

Alan Edwards

**Tel:**

020 7934 9911

**Email:**

Alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Agenda item	Pages
1 Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies	-
2 Declarations of Interests*	
3 Transport & Mobility Performance Information 2017/18 – Quarters 2 & 3	
4 Draft Consultation Responses to Phase 3b of Mayor's Air Quality Consultation	
5 TEC Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2017/18	
6 Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 7 December 2017 (for noting)	
7 Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 16 November 2017 (for agreeing)	

## Declarations of Interests

If you are present at a meeting of London Councils' or any of its associated joint committees or their sub-committees and you have a disclosable pecuniary interest\* relating to any business that is or will be considered at the meeting you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your disclosable pecuniary interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

It is a matter for each member to decide whether they should leave the room while an item that they have an interest in is being discussed. In arriving at a decision as to whether to leave the room they may wish to have regard to their home authority's code of conduct and/or the Seven (Nolan) Principles of Public Life.

\*as defined by the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012

If you have any queries regarding this agenda or are unable to attend this meeting, please contact:

Alan Edwards  
Governance Manager  
Corporate Governance Division  
Tel: 020 7934 9911  
Email: [alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

## **Declarations of Interest – TEC Executive Sub Committee 8 February 2018**

### Freedom Pass Holders/60+ Oyster Cards:

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 Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield), Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney) and Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington)

### South London Waste Partnership

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

### East London Waste Authority

Cllr Lynda Rice (LB Barking & Dagenham)

### Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (RFCC)

Cllr Lynda Rice (LB Barking & Dagenham) and Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield)

### Car Club:

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

### London Cycling Campaign

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing – Chair)

### London Waste & Recycling Board (LWARB)

Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney)

### Wandle Valley Regional Park

Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton)

### Dockless Bike Scheme

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

# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

## Transport & Mobility Services Performance Information

Item no: 03

**Report by:** Tony O'Connor **Job title:** Mobility Services Manager

**Date:** 08 February 2018

**Contact Officer:** Tony O'Connor

**Telephone:** 020 7934 9501 **Email:** [tony.o'connor@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:tony.o'connor@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

**Summary:** This report details the London Councils Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Q2 and Q3 in 2017/18

**Recommendation:** Members are asked to note the report.

### Performance Monitoring and Reporting

1. London Councils provides a number of transport and mobility services on behalf of the London boroughs. These include London Tribunals, Freedom Pass, Taxicard, the London European Partnership for Transport, the London Lorry Control Scheme, the Health Emergency Badge scheme and providing a range of parking services and advice to authorities and the public.
2. Appendix 1 sets out the latest position against key performance indicators for each of the main services. This report covers Quarters 2 and 3 in 2017/18, and provides complete figures for 2016/17.

### Equalities Considerations

None.

### Financial Implications

None.

# APPENDIX 1: TRANSPORT & MOBILITY SERVICES: PERFORMANCE QUARTER 1

## LONDON TRIBUNALS

	Target (where appropriate)	2016/17 Full Year	2017/18 Q2	2017/18 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
<b>Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA)</b>					
No. of appeals received	N/A	43,219	10,235	10,322	N/A
No. of appeals decided	N/A	38,678	9,832	8,005	N/A
% allowed	N/A	48%	50%	49%	N/A
% Did Not Contest	N/A	21%	26%	28%	N/A
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time	80%	87%	88%	87%	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	36 days	27 days	27 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	42 days	44 days	41 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	38 days	32 days	31 days	Green
<b>Road User Charging Adjudicators (RUCA)</b>					
No. of appeals received	N/A	6,876	3,168	2,640	N/A
No. of appeals decided	N/A	6,331	2,482	3,377	N/A
% allowed	N/A	28%	38%	31%	N/A
% Did Not Contest	N/A	24%	27%	20%	N/A
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time	80%	84%	82%	84%	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	56 days	54 days	54 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	48 days	59 days	49 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	55 days	56 days	55 days	Green
<b>Overall service</b>					
Notice of Appeal acknowledgments issued within 2 days of receipt	97%	99%	100%	99%	Green
Hearing dates to be issued to appellants within 5 working days of receipt	100%	99%	100%	100%	Green
Number of telephone calls to London Tribunals	N/A	35,778	10,888	9,353	N/A
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	99%	99%	100%	Green

## FREEDOM PASS

	Target (where appropriate)	2016/17 Full Year	2017/18 Q2	2017/18 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of active passes at end of period	N/A	1,238,168	1,229,760	1,227,398	N/A
Number of new passes issued (BAU)	N/A	40,380	10,644	12,347	N/A
Number of passes issued (Renewal)	N/A	12,062	0	0	N/A
Number of replacement passes issued	N/A	83,638	20,618	18,243	N/A
Number of phone calls answered (BAU)	N/A	191,810	49,997	46,009	N/A
% Answered within 30 seconds (BAU) (45 seconds in Q3)	85%	84%	73%	86%*	Green
Number of phone calls answered (Renewal)	N/A	3,753	0	0	N/A
% Answered within 30 seconds (Renewal)	85%	83%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of letters, emails and faxes answered	N/A	37,001	12,364	13,844	N/A
Number of emails answered (Renewal)	N/A	5,823	0	N/A	N/A

BAU = Business as Usual

### Comment:

\*The percentage of calls answered within target improved in Q3, but this was partly due to a change in the target in the new contract from 85% answered within 30 seconds to 85% answered within 45 seconds.

## TAXICARD

	Target (where appropriate)	2016/17 Full Year	2017/18 Q2	2017/18 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of active passes at end of period	N/A	64,451	67,244	60,694*	N/A
Number of new passes issued	N/A	8,309	2,205	2,074	N/A
Number of replacement cards issued	N/A	4,214	1,053	1,024	N/A
Number of phone calls answered at London Councils	N/A	36,374	7,226	7,741	N/A
% Answered within 30 seconds	85%	96.71%	98.12%	95.42%	Green
Number of journeys using Taxicard	N/A	1,276,481	323,817	306,733	N/A
% in private hire vehicles	N/A	12%	10%	10%	N/A
% of vehicles arriving within 15 minutes (advance booking)	95%	96.61%	96.12%	95.51%	Green

% of vehicles arriving within 30 minutes (on demand)	95%	97.18%	96.98%	97.05%	Green
--	-----	--------	--------	--------	-------

**Comment:**

\*The number of Taxicard members has reduced following the annual stop of cards not used in the previous 2 years. After a 4% increase in trip numbers in 2016/17, they are currently 0.46% down on periods 1-3 in 2016/17.

**TRACE (TOWAWAY, RECOVERY AND CLAMPING ENQUIRY SERVICE)**

	Target (where appropriate)	2016/17 Full Year	2017/18 Q2	2017/18 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of vehicles notified to database	N/A	44,612	10,601	10,666	N/A
Number of phone calls answered	N/A	17,430	3,444	3,633	N/A
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	97%	93%	94%	Green

**LONDON LORRY CONTROL SCHEME**

	Target (where appropriate)	2016/17 Full Year	2017/18 Q2	2017/18 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of permits on issue at end of period	N/A	70,292	67,344	66,021	N/A
Number of permits issued in period	N/A	26,952	6,172	5,310	N/A
Number of vehicle observations made	10,800 per year 2,700 per quarter	14,459	3,298	3,013	Green
Number of penalty charge notices issued	N/A	6,033	1,017	2,254	N/A
Number of appeals considered by ETA	N/A	91	13	37	N/A
% of appeals allowed	Less than 40%	57%	61%	48%	Amber

**Comment:**

\*The relatively low number of appeals means performance against this objective can fluctuate greatly. Allowed appeals include those that are not contested by London Councils as the enforcement authority. Appellants often do not provide evidence that vehicles were not in contravention until the appeal stage rather than at enquiry stage as they should do.

**TRANSACTIONAL SERVICES: DEBT REGISTRATIONS AND WARRANTS**

	Target (where appropriate)	2016/17 Full Year	2017/18 Q2	2017/18 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of debt registrations	N/A	532,353	182,044	141,508	N/A
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of warrants	N/A	438,378	145,281	111,483	N/A
Traffic Enforcement Court: % registered in 1 day	97%	100%	N/A*	N/A	N/A*

**Comment:**

\*The Traffic Enforcement Centre (TEC) updated their validation rules in April 2017 without advance notification to London Councils or the boroughs, causing batch files sent by London Councils to TEC to fail. System development is required to resume business as usual. Files are being processed manually whilst the changes are agreed, scoped and implemented so the SLA has been suspended. However, files submitted by the boroughs by the 12:00 midday cut-off each day are generally still being registered with TEC within 1 working day and, in the minority of cases where they are not submitted within 1 working day, definitely the next working day.

**HEALTH EMERGENCY BADGES**

	Target (where appropriate)	2016/17 Full Year	2017/18 Q2	2017/18 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of badges on issue at end of period	N/A	3,848	3,726	3,960	N/A
Number of badges issued in period	N/A	3,797	443	520	N/A

**LONDON EUROPEAN PARTNERSHIP FOR TRANSPORT**

	Target (where appropriate)	2016/17 Full Year	2017/18 Q2	2017/18 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of Boroughs participating in EU transport funding projects	7	8	5	5*	Amber

**Comment:**

\*The number of suitable funding calls and borough bid proposals has limited the ability for the target to be met to date.



# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

## Draft Consultation Responses to Phase 3b of Mayor's Air Quality Consultation

Item no:04

**Report by:** Katharina Winbeck    **Job title:** Head of Transport, Environment and Infrastructure  
**Date:** 08 February 2018  
**Contact Officer:** Owain Mortimer  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9832    **Email:** Owain.mortimer@londoncouncils.gov.uk

---

### Summary

The Mayor of London is currently consulting on two proposals:

- 1) Extending the Ultra Low Emission Zone from central London up to the North and South Circular Roads for light vehicles (cars, vans, minibuses, motorcycles and other light vehicles) from 25 October 2021;
- 2) Introducing a Euro VI requirement (matching the current ULEZ standard) London-wide for heavy vehicles (HGVs, buses, coaches and other specialist vehicles) from 26 October 2020 through changes to the current London-wide LEZ.

This report discusses the draft London Councils consultation response.

### Recommendations

- Note and comment on the report
- Note that London Councils has organised an additional member event to discuss this draft consultation response for 22 February, where all TEC members have been invited
- Agree that TEC chair and vice chairs will sign off the final response, taking comments made on 22 February into account, before submitting it by 28 February 2018

## **Draft consultation response to Phase 3 of Mayor's air quality consultation**

1. Phase 3b of the Mayor's air quality consultation was published in November 2017. This phase of the consultation sets out plans to expand the already confirmed ULEZ to the north south circular roads in October 2021. The consultation also seeks to tighten the Low Emission Zone (LEZ) standards to include Euro VI Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), also for commencing in October 2021.
2. London Councils officers have engaged with borough officers to draft a response to this consultation, which is at Appendix A. The main points are replicated here:
  - a. London Councils highlights the key concerns from boroughs with the current details of the scheme; regarding the proposed boundary, including:
    - With the proposed boundary, many boroughs are concerned about potential traffic displacement, including traffic displacement which might see more people use the north south circular roads and/or more traffic on smaller roads around the boundary;
    - The potential displacement of traffic on a broader level from inner to outer London including the second hand car market, taxis and PHVs and also TfL moving the older, dirtier buses from inner to outer London;
    - There are concerns with the impact the north and south circular boundary will have on traffic using the Woolwich Ferry, given the ULEZ will be 24/7 and the ferry is not. This is a particular issue due to the lack of alternative east London river crossings;
  - b. London Councils would like to see fully funded low/zero emission zones established within those boroughs who would like to have one in their areas;
  - c. London Councils supports the proposal to strengthen the LEZ standards in 2020, but is worried about proposals to maintain a Euro 3 PM standard for large vans;
  - d. London Councils asks for more detailed modelling on the impact of the expanded boundary in local areas, not just for central, inner and outer London and for cost modelling of implementing the ULEZ for the whole of London;
  - e. London Councils calls for the Mayor to conduct more detailed and meaningful engagement with the boroughs to implement measures of this nature now and in the future.
3. The deadline for the ULEZ consultation is 28 February 2018. London Councils is holding an engagement event for TEC members on this, on 22 February 2018, to which all TEC members have been invited to ensure that all views can be expressed and represented within the final response.

## **Recommendations**

- Note and comment on the report
- Note that London Councils has organised an additional member event to discuss this draft consultation response for 22 February, where all TEC members have been invited
- Agree that TEC chair and vice chairs will sign off the final response, taking comments made on 22 February into account, before submitting it by 28 February 2018

## **Financial Implications**

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

**Legal Implications**

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

**Equalities Implications**

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

## ► Air Quality

### ► Cleaning up London's air pollution consultation Phase 3b - London Councils' response

**London Councils represents London's 32 borough councils and the City of London. It is a cross-party organisation that works on behalf of all of its member authorities regardless of political persuasion.**

Please find London Councils' comments on a number of the questions and issues posed in the online survey. Please note that a number of the boroughs will also submit their own individual responses.

#### Introduction

UK air pollution is a public health emergency. In London, nearly 9,500 people die each year due to long-term exposure to air pollution<sup>1</sup>. It is urgent that this issue is addressed, and will require ambitious action. According to public polling conducted by London Councils, 76 per cent of London residents believe tackling air pollution should be a priority. London Councils supports the publicity and importance the Mayor has given to this issue. But it is also essential that further education and awareness campaigns are run to ensure the seriousness of poor air quality is recognised by all Londoners, and to gain further support from the public for ambitious measures to tackle this. London should aim to be an exemplar in dealing with air pollution, and this will require a convincing narrative on how any proposals would work on a practical level.

Throughout the different phases of the Mayor's consultation we have sought to highlight the important role that boroughs play in achieving these aims, and the central role they must play in shaping the solutions for the future.

<sup>1</sup> King's College London (2015) Understanding the health impacts of air pollution in London

## Proposal 1: Expanding the ULEZ

With the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) now confirmed to be launching in the Congestion Charge Zone in April 2019, the Mayor is proposing to expand this up to but not including the north-south circular roads on 25 October 2021. The expanded zone will apply to the same vehicle standards as the central London ULEZ, which are:

- Euro 4 for petrol;
- Euro 6 for diesel.

There is a growing consensus amongst the London boroughs that air pollution is a critical issue that must be tackled. However, a large number of boroughs do not believe that the north south circular roads are an appropriate boundary for an expanded ULEZ given that it intersects a significant number of them. This would see an inequitable impact on those borough's residents, which is unacceptable to them. There is also the issue that air pollution is a problem in a number of outer London locations, and the north south circular boundary will not address these. Making more funding available for low/zero emission zones could help to ensure that air pollution is addressed more fairly across all of London.

### Concerns about the current proposal

London boroughs have been at the forefront of action to tackle air pollution for years, and have supported a number of the Mayor's initiatives to do this. The main concern a number of boroughs have with the current proposal relates to the boundary.

#### Displacement

The proposed boundary dissects 14 boroughs who are all very concerned about the displacement of vehicles, and do not feel that sufficient modelling and cost data has been made available to make an informed decision. We therefore ask TfL to work further with borough officers on the type of information that is required to enable boroughs to make well informed decisions on behalf of their residents. Boroughs have been informed that TfL's modelling does not show significant issues with displacement as the north south circular is the quickest route to get around central London anyway. However, there is little to no data available on displacement in localised areas on a borough specific basis. We would ask that TfL continues to engage with the boroughs on this issue in order to allay any fears they may have about displacement.

The 14 boroughs that are dissected by the proposed boundary are worried about making a large portion of their residents worse-off with regard to air pollution and financially. Again, boroughs need robust

modelling to show that there will not be significant negative effects, before they will be able to support the proposed boundary.

There is also a concern regarding displacement of older vehicles from central to outer London, both in the second hand car market, but also in the bus, taxi and freight fleets. London Councils seeks assurances from the Mayor and TfL that once the older, dirtier buses and taxis are replaced by cleaner vehicles in central and inner London they will not simply be moved to outer London. This would be counter-productive and go against the Mayor's air quality and fairness objectives.

### Cost

The Mayor recently published an indicative cost of implementing the ULEZ expansion of £130m<sup>2</sup>. This comes from the five-year £800m plan to improve London's air quality. Boroughs need to be sighted on the potential cost of installing the network of cameras, road signs and road markings and when TfL estimates the revenue will have paid for itself, to make an informed decision. Any significant funding pressures have a direct effect on borough budgets, as has recently been shown through the unplanned LIP cuts.

### Woolwich Ferry/anomalies

There is a specific issue with the north/south circular boundary and the Woolwich Ferry. The ULEZ is proposed to run 24/7 whilst the Woolwich Ferry does not – it runs between 6:10am to 20:00pm (11:30am to 19:30pm Sundays and not at all on Christmas Day, Boxing Day and New Year's Day). Outside the operating hours of the Ferry, traffic will have to divert either via the Blackwall Tunnel, and therefore will be liable to the ULEZ charge, or drive to the Dartford Crossing (a round trip of nearly 30 miles) and liable to pay a toll to cross the Thames. Additionally the ferry service has a lower capacity than a fixed road crossing in terms of vehicle-carrying capacity, with a capacity around 5% of that of the Blackwall Tunnel<sup>3</sup>. This can lead to a significant wait to access the Ferry and the extra traffic will make that wait longer. It is possible that rather than wait to board the ferry, which could take a long time, drivers may choose to pay the ULEZ charge and use the Blackwall Tunnel and this would be a problem for boroughs on the access roads leading to the tunnel and reduce the impacts of the ULEZ itself.

### Fully funded low/zero emission zones

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/mayoral/londons-air-quality-still-within-legal-limits>

<sup>3</sup> <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR010021/TR010021-001022-TfL%208.51%20Woolwich%20Ferry%20Waiting%20Area%20Improvement%20Study.pdf>

London Councils believes that the Mayor, in collaboration with willing boroughs, should start developing the local low/zero emission zones in areas of high concentrations of air pollution across London mentioned in the draft Mayor's Transport Strategy immediately. This could transform local town centres in line with the Mayor's Healthy Streets approach, helping to promote modal shift, encourage use of electric and/or hydrogen vehicles and install green infrastructure. This would allow boroughs flexibility in reducing their local air pollution concentrations, whilst providing marked benefits across the whole of London.

We believe that there needs to be more meaningful engagement with the boroughs on this issue in the future to collaboratively develop solutions that work for all stakeholders and clean up London's dirty air. The boroughs are the key delivery agents for innovative air quality projects, and have shown their willingness and effectiveness in this area for years.

Air quality has risen up the political agenda in recent years. To ensure this momentum is not lost and to grasp the public's willingness to act, there needs to be coordinated awareness raising and behaviour change campaigns alongside hard measures to improve air quality. London Councils' public polling on air quality issues showed that 48 per cent of people were willing to walk and cycle more, with 42 per cent willing to use public transport more and 34 per cent willing to buy a cleaner model of car in order to tackle air pollution.

## **Proposal 2: Strengthening the LEZ standards**

The consultation also proposes tightening the existing Low Emission Zone standards for heavy vehicles. This would introduce a Euro VI requirement (matching the current ULEZ standard) London-wide for heavy vehicles (HGVs, buses, coaches and other specialist vehicles) from 26 October 2020.

London Councils supports the moves to strengthen the LEZ standards given the pollution that is currently emitted by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) in London (21 per cent of NO<sub>x</sub> in greater London in 2013).

There is one area that is a cause for concern. The existing London-wide LEZ sets a Euro 3 PM emission standard for large diesel vans (vans between 1.205 tonnes unladen and 3.5 tonnes gross vehicle weight). This consultation is proposing to maintain that standard. We do not believe that this is fair, nor do we believe that it is in-keeping with the Mayor's stated ambitions of making London's air the cleanest of any major city. The consultation documents do not provide enough information as to why the Mayor is proposing to maintain this standard at Euro 3 PM for large diesel vans when it is ten times

weaker than Euro 6. We believe that the Mayor should tighten this standard in line with other increases (to Euro 6) to improve the air quality impact from all vehicles.

## Additional comments

### Modelling

In our previous responses we asked TfL to undertake and share more detail of their modelling work behind the proposals being made. We welcome TfL's willingness to engage on this issue and recognise that more detailed modelling has been shared with the boroughs prior and during this stage of the consultation. However the focus of the modelling isn't particularly helpful to individual boroughs as it focuses on central, inner and outer London. The boroughs are keen to understand more about the impact around the boundary areas within their own local authority areas. The documents aren't clear on whether there are any areas in London (particularly on the boundary) where the introduction of the ULEZ would delay compliance with national objectives. The Jacobs environmental impact study reviewed impacts in terms of 'central' 'inner' & 'outer', and should have more of a focus on the areas around the border.

As stated above, the London-wide boundary option has not been explored in enough detail. This work has been requested for four years now, ever since the idea of an ULEZ has been on the table for London. London Councils, through regular meetings with the TfL Commissioner had received a number of assurances that this would be undertaken.

### Long term plans

We welcome the information provided by the Mayor of his long term plans for improving air quality in London in the draft Mayor's Transport Strategy published in June 2017. However there is still a lack of clarity around the practical implications of meeting certain targets and how this is going to be done. For example there is a target for Local Zero Emission Zones to be introduced in 2025 but there is no information about where or how this would be done. The boroughs are the key delivery agents for such a policy, and therefore need to be engaged and supported to do this in their areas as appropriate as soon as possible. We ask for the Mayor to begin developing a detailed long-term roadmap with the boroughs immediately.

Other than the Mayor's actions on buses, taxis and PHVs there isn't much information about how TfL is going to reduce pollution from the wider Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) which often contributes the most to local air pollution concentrations.



# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub-Committee

## Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2017/18      Item no: 05

**Report by:** Frank Smith      **Job title:** Director of Corporate Resources  
**Date:** 8 February 2018  
**Contact Officer:** Frank Smith  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9700      **Email:** Frank.smith@londoncouncils.gov.uk

---

### Summary

This report outlines actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of December 2017 for TEC and provides a forecast of the outturn position for 2017/18. At this stage, a surplus of £1.059 million is forecast over the budget figure, compared to £1.001 million at the half-year point. In addition, total expenditure in respect of Taxicard trips taken by scheme members is forecast to underspend by a net figure of £891,000, if current trip volumes continue for the remainder of the year. The net borough proportion of this underspend is projected to be £693,000, with £198,000 accruing to TfL.

### Recommendations

The Executive Sub-Committee is asked to:

- note the projected surplus of £1.059 million for the year, plus the forecast net underspend of £891,000 for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in this report; and
  - note the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraph 5 of this report and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee included in paragraphs 6-9.
-

## Report

1. This is the final budget monitoring report to be presented to the Committee during the current financial year. The next report will be the provisional outturn figures for the year, which will be reported to the July 2018 meeting of this Committee.
2. The London Councils Transport and Environment Committee's income and expenditure revenue budget for 2017/18, as approved by the Full Committee in December 2016, is set out in Appendix A (Expenditure) and Appendix B (Income), as adjusted for the confirmation of borough funding and TfL funding for the Taxicard scheme for the year. In addition, carried forward sums from 2016/17 of £227,000 approved by this Sub-Committee in July 2017 have also been added to the revised budget for the current year, funded by additional transfers from reserves. The appendices show the actual income and expenditure at 30 September 2017 and a projection of the forecast outturn for the year, together with the projected variance from the approved budget.

## Variance from Budget

3. The current figures indicate that the Committee is projected to underspend gross expenditure budgets by £639,000 and achieve a surplus of income of £420,000 over the approved budget target for the year. These figures include offsetting amounts of £891,000 relating to payments and income for taxicard trips, plus additional payments and income for the registration of parking debt of £800,000, making an overall projected surplus of £1.059 million. Table 1 below summarises the forecast position, with commentary that details the trends that have began to emerge during the year to date and provides explanations for the variances that are projected.

**Table 1 –Summary Forecast as at 31 December 2017**

	<b>M9 Actual</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Forecast</b>	<b>Variance</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
Employee Costs	465	675	617	(58)
Running Costs	179	387	360	(27)
Central Recharges	-	90	90	-
<b>Total Operating Expenditure</b>	<b>644</b>	<b>1,152</b>	<b>1,067</b>	<b>(85)</b>
Direct Services	6,777	8,211	9,000	789
Research	3	40	40	-
Payments in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	266,018	359,781	358,438	(1,343)
One-off payment to boroughs	-	340	340	-
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>273,442</b>	<b>369,524</b>	<b>368,885</b>	<b>(639)</b>
<b>Income</b>				
Contributions in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	(268,001)	(359,838)	(359,115)	723
Income for direct services	(5,886)	(8,650)	(9,789)	(1,139)
Core Member Subscriptions	(97)	(97)	(97)	-
Government Grants	-	-	-	-

Interest on Investments	(11)	-	(11)	(11)
Other Income	(66)	(84)	(77)	7
Transfer from Reserves	-	(855)	(855)	-
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>(274,061)</b>	<b>(369,524)</b>	<b>(369,944)</b>	<b>(420)</b>
<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>(619)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(1,059)</b>	<b>(1,059)</b>

4. The projected surplus of £1.059 million is made up broadly of the following:

- A projected overall surplus of £245,000 in respect of TEC parking traded services, after considering an estimate of the level of borough/TfL/GLA usage volumes during the year to date. This is attributable to a number of areas.
  - Firstly, there is a projected net surplus of £221,000 in respect of parking and traffic appeals. The estimated number of notice of appeals and statutory declarations received to date amounts to 31,330, giving a projected number for the year of 41,773, marginally above the budgeted figure of 40,586. The current indicative throughput of appeals is 3.59 appeals per hour, compared to a budget figure of 2.7.
  - Secondly, the transaction volumes for other parking systems used by boroughs and TfL to date are projected to result in a net deficit of £15,000; and
  - Finally, the fixed cost element of the RUCA contract with the GLA/TfL is projected to generate additional income of £42,000, due to an increased share of the rechargeable costs of Chancery Exchange attributable to RUCA activities.
- A projected marginal underspend of £7,000 in respect of employee costs. The cost of staff providing direct services (included within the direct services administration charge) is estimated to overspend by £21,000, although this is offset by an underspend on staffing costs attributable to non-operational and policy staff of £28,000. In addition, the maternity cover budget is estimated to be underspent by £30,000.
- A reduction of £34,000 in respect of the estimated Business Rates payable in respect of the hearing centre at Chancery Exchange, arising from the actual bill for 2017/18 being less than the projected increase calculated at the budget setting stage in November 2016.
- A £27,000 underspend in respect of the IT systems development budget for 2017/18, for which this Executive Sub-Committee will be asked to carry forward into 2018/19 when the provisional financial results for 2017/18 are presented in July 2018;
- A projected underspend of £400,000 in respect of the £1.7 million budget for payments to independent bus operators, which is based on claims to date and a forecast of 4% increase on average fares. In addition, four of the current operators are new and although there is an assumed 1% increase in journeys on these routes, it is difficult to accurately predict future trends as it takes time for the new operators to build up patronage. However, there is an overall underlying reduction in bus ridership.
- A projected underspend of £67,000 in respect of the £1.518 million budget for the issuing/reissuing costs of Freedom Passes and undertaking the mid-term eligibility review during 2017/18.

- Based on income collected to date, receipts from Lorry Control PCN income are forecast to generate an additional £75,000 in excess of the budget of £800,000.
- Based on income collected to date, income receipts from replacement Freedom Passes are forecast to exceed the budget of £600,000 by £173,000. For replacement Taxicards, there is a projected deficit on the £24,000 income budget of £5,000 for the year.

## Committee Reserves

5. Table 2 below updates the Committee on the projected level of reserves as at 31 March 2018, if all current known liabilities and commitments are considered:

**Table 2– Analysis of Projected Uncommitted Reserves as at 31 March 2018**

	<b>General Reserve</b>	<b>Specific Reserve</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
<b>Audited reserves at 1 April 2017</b>	<b>3,341</b>	<b>1,734</b>	<b>5,075</b>
Transfer between reserves	(1,000)	1,000	-
One-off payments to boroughs 2017/18	(340)	-	(340)
Approved in setting 2017/18 budget (December 2016)	(288)	-	(288)
Carried forward amounts from 2016/17	(227)	-	(227)
Projected Budget Surplus 2017/18	819	240	1,059
<b>Estimated Residual Balances at 31 March 2018</b>	<b>2,305</b>	<b>2,974</b>	<b>5,279</b>
Committed in 2018/19 budget setting process	(289)	-	(289)
Transfer between reserves agreed during 2018/19 budget setting process	(140)	140	-
Provisional carry forward into 2018/19	(27)	-	(27)
<b>Indicative reserves 1 April 2018</b>	<b>1,849</b>	<b>3,114</b>	<b>4,963</b>

## Conclusions

6. This report reflects the position at the mid-point stage in the current financial year and forecasts a surplus position of £1.059 million for the year. In addition taxicard trips are forecast to underspend by £891,000, with the borough proportion of this underspend projected to be £693,000, with £198,000 accruing to TfL. This compares against a projected underspend of £1.001 million at the half-year stage.
7. The majority of the projected surplus is attributable to a projected net surplus on trading operations based on transaction volumes to date, an underspend on Freedom Pass issue costs and a reduction in bus ridership plus additional projected income from both replacement Freedom Passes and Lorry Control PCNs.
8. After taking into account the forecast surplus and known commitments, general reserves are forecast to be £1.849 million after approved commitments for 2018/19 are considered, which equates to 15.8% of budgeted operating and trading expenditure of £11.705 million for 2018/19. This figure marginally exceeds the Committee's formal policy on reserves, agreed in November 2015 that reserves should equate to between 10-15% of annual operating expenditure.
9. In addition, a sum of £3.114 million is projected to be held in the specific reserve - £2.774 million in respect of the 2020 freedom Pass issue and £340,000 in respect of TEC special projects to be prioritized by the main Committee. The projected position on reserves takes

into account the decision of the main Committee when setting the budget for 2018/19 at its December 2017 meeting, following recommendation from this Committee.

## **Recommendations**

10. Members are asked to :

- note the projected surplus of £1.059 million for the year, plus the forecast underspend of £891,000 for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in this report; and
- note the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraph 5 of this report and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee included in paragraphs 6-9.

---

## **Financial Implications for London Councils**

As detailed in report

## **Legal Implications for London Councils**

None

## **Equalities Implications for London Councils**

None

## **Appendices**

Appendix A (Expenditure), Appendix B (Income)

## **Background Papers**

London Councils-TEC Budget working papers 2017/18

London Councils Income and Expenditure Forecast File 2017/18

## London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee – 7 December 2017

Minutes of a meeting of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee held on Thursday 7 December 2017 at 3:00pm in the Conference Suite, London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL.

### Present:

Council	Councillor
Barking and Dagenham	Cllr Lynda Rice
Barnet	<b>Apologies</b>
Bexley	<b>Apologies</b>
Brent	<b>Apologies</b>
Bromley	Cllr William Huntington-Thresher
Camden	<b>Apologies</b>
Croydon	Cllr Stuart King
Ealing	Cllr Julian Bell (Chair)
Enfield	Cllr Daniel Anderson
Greenwich	
Hackney	Cllr Feryal Demirci
Hammersmith and Fulham	Cllr Wesley Harcourt
Haringey	
Harrow	Cllr Graham Henson
Havering	Cllr Jason Frost
Hillingdon	<b>Apologies</b>
Hounslow	<b>Apologies</b>
Islington	Cllr Claudia Webbe
Kensington and Chelsea	<b>Apologies</b>
Kingston Upon Thames	Cllr Phil Doyle
Lambeth	<b>Apologies</b>
Lewisham	
Merton	Cllr Nick Draper (Deputy)
Newham	<b>Apologies</b>
Redbridge	<b>Apologies</b>
Richmond Upon Thames	Cllr Peter Buckwell
Southwark	Cllr Ian Wingfield
Sutton	Cllr Jill Whitehead
Tower Hamlets	Cllr Amina Ali
Waltham Forest	Cllr Clyde Loakes
Wandsworth	<b>Apologies</b>
City of Westminster	<b>Apologies</b>
City of London	
Transport for London	Alex Williams

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

### Apologies:

Cllr Dean Cohen (LB Barnet)  
Cllr Alex Sawyer (LB Bexley)  
Cllr Eleanor Southwood (LB Brent)  
Cllr Adam Harrison (LB Camden)  
Cllr Keith Burrows (LB Hillingdon)  
Cllr Amrit Mann (LB Hounslow)  
Cllr Gerard Hargreaves (RB Kensington & Chelsea)  
Cllr Jennifer Brathwaite (LB Lambeth)  
Cllr Martin Whelton (LB Merton)  
Cllr Pat Murphy (LB Newham)  
Cllr John Howard (LB Redbridge)  
Cllr Caroline Usher (LB Wandsworth)  
Cllr Will Pascall (City of Westminster)

### Deputies:

Cllr Nick Draper (LB Merton)

## **2. Declaration of Interests**

### Freedom Pass Holders/60+ Oyster Cards

Cllr Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr Phil Doyle (RB Kingston), Cllr Nick Draper (LB Merton), Cllr Peter Buckwell (LB Richmond) and Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton).

### North London Waste Authority

Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield), Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney), Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington), and Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Waltham Forest).

### East London Waste Authority

Cllr Lynda Rice (LB Barking & Dagenham)

### South London Waste Partnership

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

### Western Riverside Waste Authority

Cllr Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham)

### West London Waste

Cllr Graham Henson (LB Harrow)

### London Waste & Recycling Board

Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney)

#### Car Club

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

#### Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (Thames RFCC)

Cllr Lynda Rice (LB Barking & Dagenham)

Cllr Nick Draper (LB Merton)

Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield)

#### London Cycling Campaign

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing - Chair)

#### Wandle Valley Regional Park

Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton)

#### London Road Safety Council

Cllr William Huntington-Thresher (LB Bromley)

#### Dockless Bike Scheme

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing – Chair), Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney) and Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Waltham Forest)

*It was agreed to take item 5 “Chair’s Report” (addendum) first*

### **5. Chair’s Report**

The Committee received a report that updated members on transport and environment policy since the last TEC meeting on 12 October 2017 and provided a forward look until the next TEC meeting on 22 March 2018. The report also contained an addendum that gave details of recently announced cuts to Local Implementation Plans (LIP) funding.

The Chair said that the boroughs were very unhappy with the recently announced cuts in the TfL Business Plan to Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding, and the Taxicard Scheme (Addendum to item 5 “Chair’s Report”). He said that London Councils had received reassurances that the cuts to Taxicard will be reviewed and that services to users should not suffer. Some savings will be made through joint procurement between London Councils and TfL.

Alex Williams said that a letter had been sent to TEC members yesterday, by Val Shawcross, informing them of why there was a reduction to the LIPs and Taxicard budgets. Councillor Loakes said that Val Shawcross had given reassurances to the boroughs with regards to maintaining the current levels of LIP funding, with a number of borough schemes already being signed-off with TfL. He felt that this had led to a breakdown in trust between the boroughs and TfL. Councillor Loakes voiced concern that millions of pounds were being taken out of borough budgets, along with cuts to other funding at a time when the boroughs were halfway through their schemes.



Councillor Loakes said that TfL had had the goodwill from the boroughs, and then slipped through cuts to bus services as well. He said that TfL had not approached the boroughs about these cuts until the very last minute, with the bus cuts being discovered through a campaigning authority. Councillor Anderson said that the borough of Enfield had lost one million pounds, including road maintenance funding. He said that TfL must have been aware that these cuts were coming and should have informed boroughs sooner. Councillor Anderson said that this was now a question of trust, as many boroughs had already started various projects and signed contracts with TfL on these schemes.

Councillor Doyle thanked TfL for the letter from Val Shawcross. He said that there were two main points, (a) roads that could no longer be maintained adequately would have a detrimental effect on cyclists and motorcyclists, and (b) clarity was needed on larger capital grant. Councillor Whitehead said that although the boroughs would be given back £100,000 per borough to spend on local transport priorities, millions more were being taken away in cuts. She felt that it was also unfair that TfL were retaining enforcement income on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), and not giving the boroughs back that money. Councillor Whitehead also asked what was happening with regards to Quietways and whether the bidding process was the same.

Councillor Demirci questioned how boroughs were expected to go forward with cuts to the LIP budget and principal road maintenance funding. She said that Hackney's main mode of transport was buses. Councillor Demirci also voiced concern about not finding out about the cuts until the very last minute. She said that urgent funding to upgrade Hackney Central Station had been requested, although this did not appear to be in the TfL Business Plan.

Councillor Webbe said that the borough of Islington was less affected by the funding formula for LIPs, although the borough would still lose approximately £150,000 of LIP funding. She said that Islington was at a traffic intersection and a fairer LIP formula was needed going forward. Councillor Webbe said that Val Shawcross had promised the boroughs that LIP funding would be protected, which was no longer the case. She asked what these cuts would mean to cycling in general, and cuts to the "Mini Holland" programme.

Councillor Rice said that she was disappointed with the cuts to LIP funding and loss of priority road maintenance, which would lead to further deterioration of roads. She also voiced concern over the cuts to "Corridors" funding and Liveable Neighbourhoods.

Councillor Frost said that the borough of Havering had been asked to increase its house building and additional infrastructure would be needed to serve this. However, with these new cuts, Havering would struggle to meet these demands. Councillor Frost said that the borough had presented goodwill to deliver on this, but would no longer be able to carry on with this.

Alex Williams said that he recognised the mood of the boroughs and disappointment of the settlement. He said, however, that TfL was still investing, although not as much as it would have liked to. Alex Williams said that the TfL Business Plan had to be amended for 2017/18. He said that TfL had lobbied Government to get some more money for roads, but this had been declined. There had been a reduction in revenue subsidies to zero and a downturn in ridership in fares income (which was continuing to decline).

Alex William said that the timing of the announcement was down to the annual cycle of the TfL Business Plan. Councillor Loakes said that TfL could have spoken to the boroughs about these cuts sooner. Alex Williams said that this was the first time LIP funding had gone down (£1.05 billion to £1 billion). He said that each borough, as requested by London Councils, was receiving £100,000 to spend on local transport priorities. Alex Williams said that he was not aware of cuts to bus services and that TfL was unable to give capital funding to boroughs [post meeting note – this has since been clarified - REFCUS (Revenue Expenditure Funded by Capital Under Statute) provides this accounting mechanism]. Councillor Doyle said that capital money now came from London Business Rates and therefore did not need to be treated as capital to the boroughs. The Chair said that he thought the issue of capital money versus revenue from TfL to the boroughs had already been dealt with. He said that this would need to be revisited if this was no longer the case. Alex Williams said that, even if the capital budget was available, it would still not be a large enough sum of money to reduce shortfalls in funding.

Alex Williams confirmed that TfL was operating the same bidding process and formula as over the past six years, although TfL would be reviewing the formula after the Mayor's Transport Strategy. Alex Williams said that, with regards to Hackney Central Station upgrade, not every station was listed in the Business Plan. He said that, although this was a funding challenge, the station upgrade was being discussed with officers at Hackney.

Alex Williams said that the total budget for cycling was increasing. Councillor Anderson said that the borough of Enfield had already committed to the Mini-Holland scheme, although TfL had now withdrawn from the scheme. The Chair said that a breakdown was needed on the funding for Mini-Holland, Cycle Superhighways, Quietways and Liveable Neighbourhoods. Councillor Anderson said that the borough of Enfield would be unable to deliver projects it had committed to without the funding that was promised by TfL.

Alex Williams confirmed that seven boroughs had been approved for the Liveable Neighbourhoods scheme, including the boroughs of Ealing and Hackney. He confirmed that the bidding for bus priority came out of a separate (bidding) budget. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that Bromley was promised a meeting regarding bus routes in the borough, which had not taken place. He said that a number of bus routes had been removed in Kent and this had resulted in a number of parents being unable to reach schools. Councillor Huntington-Thresher felt that the Taxicard scheme should be linked to residency.

Councillor Demirci said that TfL should look at reversing the cuts to buses. Councillor Henson said that the MTS talked about changing the modal shift in the outer London boroughs like Harrow. He said that Harrow had already set its budget and had now found out that it would lose £700,000 in road maintenance. Councillor Henson said that it would be difficult to encourage the uptake in public transport in the borough when it was being removed. He said that there were significant upfront cuts to the budget and these cuts would contribute to the deterioration of roads over the next couple of years. The new electric buses also weighed a great deal more and this would damage the roads further. Councillor Henson asked how his borough would be expected to meet demands if it was unsuccessful in all its bids.

Councillor Draper voiced disappointment that TfL had not given the boroughs the funding that they had originally budgeted for. He said that TfL had not informed the boroughs of the cuts until the last minute. Councillor Draper said that Merton planned ahead 4-years in advance and schemes would now have to be dropped as a

consequence of these cuts. Councillor King voiced concern about how these cuts had come about and said that the engagement that had taken place on this seemed insincere now.

Alex Williams said that the reduction of bus services would be offset by redistributing services from inner London to outer London. With regards to bidding at Harrow, Alex Williams said that he had liaised with officers in the borough and they were capable of giving high quality bids. Councillor Henson said that officers at Harrow put in a number of bids, but they kept being turned down.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Agreed to circulate the recent letter from Val Shawcross, regarding the LIPs budget, to TEC members, which set out the reasons why there was a reduction in the LIPs and Taxicard budgets;
- Agreed to revisit the issue of capital versus revenue from TfL to the boroughs;
- Agreed that a breakdown was needed on funding for “Mini-Holland”, Cycle Superhighways, Quietways and Liveable Neighbourhoods;
- Agreed that the Chair would write a response to the letter from Val Shawcross; and
- Agreed to request a meeting with Val Shawcross and a representation of TEC members before Christmas to discuss the issue of LIP funding.

### **3. Choosing a Future for London’s Transport in the Digital Age – Presentation from Laurie Laybourn-Langton, Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR)**

Laurie Laybourn-Langton, Institute for Policy Research (IPPR) introduced the report and made the following comments:

- The IPPR was looking at new transport technologies in London known as “Crossroads”.
- Transport-related problems in London included air pollution, congestion, carbon emissions and road safety.
- The current policy approach sought to achieve a reduction in the total number of vehicles, greater efficiency, phasing out unsustainable fuels and accelerating the modal shift.
- Emerging new transport technologies included journey planner platforms, car clubs and on-demand taxis and private hire services. New mobility services made possible by digital technology could affect the number, efficiency, reliability and affordability of journeys, along with the number of vehicles on the road.
- There were positive and negative network effects – new mobility services could complement existing efforts to achieve more sustainable transport. A negative effect could be to undermine efforts to realise more sustainable travelling behaviours.
- London’s response would be to agree with key policy areas and goals covered by the MTS and London Plan. The window of opportunity for action was closing.
- The Mayor of London should incorporate a vision and framework for new transport technologies into the MTS. This framework should include an urgent audit of new mobility markets and future effects upon key transport-related outcomes.

- Car Clubs should be a key part of the Mayor's vision for London's transport system and the MTS should include measures for how car clubs could help achieve key transport objectives.
- TfL should become the central intermediary for mobility data in London (ie to be in public hands not private).
- TfL should assess the potential for a mobility as a service (MaaS) platform market in London.
- London has always been a leader in transport innovation and the cost of inaction was too high.

#### Q and As

Councillor Whitehead felt that "one size did not fit all". She said that the transport options in the borough of Sutton were very limited. A large number of residents were using Uber regularly owing to the continuing disruptions to Southern Rail. Councillor Whitehead said that a car club pilot carried out five years ago had a negative effect by causing an increase in car usage in the borough. She said that Sutton was in need of more public transport.

Councillor Demirci said that she had spoken to "Citymapper" and asked to run "on demand" bus routes. She said that the private sector was acting faster in response to transport on demand. Councillor Doyle said that he was against road pricing, as this was a double taxation that would hit the poor the most. Councillor Huntington-Thresher voiced concern that a set number of providers would end up with a London-wide monopoly. Councillor Buckwell said that public health issues were very important and needed to be emphasised. London was a 24-hour city and the role of public/private sector would change over the course of the 24-hours.

Councillor Demirci felt that the MTS was not clear about saying whether car clubs would deliver a more sustainable target. Councillor Webbe said that growth in digital technology was welcomed and was moving at a rapid pace. She voiced concern that London could get left behind as this technology advanced.

Laurie Laybourn-Langton said that it was difficult to keep innovation at the forefront. There was also the issue of the aggregation process and the potential for others to do this. He said that TfL had the power to do this. Laurie Laybourn-Langton said that the effects of road pricing needed to be thought about. With regards to a 24-hour city, TfL had an aggregated app to balance these things. He said that the private sector was currently acting faster with regards to new technologies and issues around monopolisation needed to be considered. The Chair thanked Laurie Laybourn-Langton for his presentation to TEC.

**Decision:** Members noted and commented on the "Transport in the Digital Age" presentation.

#### **4. Smart Mobility and the Role of Car Clubs**

The Committee received a report that suggested a more active role for London Councils' TEC in contributing to smart mobility, Mobility as a Service (MaaS) and car clubs to assist in tackling the air pollution problem in London.

The Chair said that this report had been covered in item 3 of the agenda. He said that an email needed to be sent to TEC members to let them know how a car club working group would operate and to ask for some volunteers to be on the group.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Agreed to set-up a car club working group with political oversight through London Councils' TEC; and
- Agreed to email TEC members, outlining how the role of London Councils and smart mobility/car clubs would work and would ask for volunteers to join the car club working group.

## **6. Ultra Low Emission Zone**

The Committee considered a report that summarised the Mayor's fourth air quality consultation. This was a statutory consultation on proposals for tightening emissions standards for heavy goods vehicles London-wide and expanding the area of the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) up to the North and South Circular roads, so that all vehicles were subject to emissions standards in this inner London area.

Councillor Doyle asked how the public could check to see their individual vehicle impact on the ULEZ. Alex Williams said that there was a tool on the TfL website known as a "Vehicle Compliance Checker". He informed members that over half a million people had looked at this website since it was set up. Alex Williams said that Appendix A of the report detailed the road transport emissions in 2012, borough by borough.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher felt that there were problems with the timings for extending the ULEZ going forward. He said that the borough's waste contract was over the next eight years and based on the life of refuse vehicles. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that there would be major cost implications if the vehicles needed to be updated. He said that although he supported the need to reduce emissions, there was a need to buy vehicles without getting taxed further and restrictions needed to be reduced.

Councillor Webbe said that the borough of Islington wanted to work beyond the ULEZ and phase out diesel vehicles altogether, especially diesel refuse vehicles. Councillor Buckwell said that the borough of Richmond had the problem of being cut by the ULEZ boundary.

Alex Williams said that any contracts that boroughs entered into needed to say that only EU6 vehicles should be purchased. He said that TfL was hoping to phase out diesel and shift to zero emissions in London by 2025. Any new black cabs would need to have zero emissions by January 2018. Alex Williams said that areas that were not in the ULEZ also benefited from a 33 percent reduction in NO<sub>2</sub>.

**Decision:** The Committee noted the report and agreed that TEC would issue a response to the consultation in due course.

## **7. Go Ultra Low City Scheme (GULCS) Update**

The Committee received a report that updated members on the delivery of Phase 1 for the residential and car club element of the GULCS, including the development of the agreement and procurement plan and the Phase 2 work.

The Chair asked members that had not already done so, to send back their funding agreement by January 2018. Katharina Winbeck, Head of Transport, Environment & Infrastructure, London Councils, said that amending the TEC Agreement would take longer, although members were advised to let London Councils know the time frame for which boroughs could do this. All boroughs needed to sign-up to amend the TEC Agreement. Spencer Palmer, Director of Transport and Mobility, London Councils, confirmed that a letter had now been sent to members clarifying the funding agreement terms and conditions.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Agreed that boroughs would return the funding agreement letter for GULCS by the end of January 2018; and
- Agreed that boroughs would begin to identify locations for the installations of Electric Vehicle Charging Points (ECVPs) to meet project deadlines by the end of March 2018.

## **8. Assisted Transport Allowances**

The Committee considered a report that informed members of the main areas of progress in defining a pilot for Assisted Transport Allowances, stakeholder engagement, customer research and data modelling. The update included a high level customer proposition to be presented for discussion at small focus groups in early 2018.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Endorsed the proposed customer proposition for a pilot of Assisted Transport Allowances;
- Agreed to the ongoing engagement with partner boroughs - Southwark and Hounslow;
- Agreed to the ongoing participation of London Councils in a joint steering group with TfL to develop the detailed scope of the proposed pilot and support further customer research planned for early 2018; and
- Agreed that, due to the next full TEC meeting not taking place until March 2018, the TEC Executive meeting in February 2018 would be asked to endorse the launch of the pilot, in order for the pilot to be able to commence at the start of the next financial year.

## **9. Concessionary Fares Settlement and Apportionment 2018/19**

The Committee received a report that informed members of the outcome of negotiations with transport operators (Transport for London, the Rail Delivery Group and independent bus operators) regarding compensation for carrying concessionary passengers in 2018/19. The report also sought member approval to the proposed settlement and apportionment.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher asked whether TfL would be running an advertising campaign to advise people to “touch out” at the end of a Network Rail journey. Stephen Boon, Chief Contracts Officer, London Councils, said that London Councils were in the process of undergoing a new settlement with the Rail Delivery Group, who would start encouraging people to tap out at the end of their journeys.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Agreed the TfL settlement of £322.924 million for 2018/19;
- Agreed to the RDG settlement of £19.552 million for 2018/19;
- Agreed a budget for non-TfL bus services of £1.5 million;
- Agreed the reissue budget for 2018/19 of £1.518 million;
- Agreed the borough payments for 2018/19 of £345.494 million;
- Agreed the payment profile and dates on which boroughs' contributions are paid as 7 June 2018, 6 September 2018, 6 December 2018 and 7 March 2019;
- Agreed the 2018-2019 London Service Permit (LSP) bus operators (non-TfL buses) Concessionary Scheme; and
- *Post meeting note – the original report recommended that the dates on which boroughs' contributions were paid stated one on the 8 September 2018, which should have read 6 September 2018.*

**10. Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) Contravention Codes Update**

The Committee received a report that sought member approval for amendments to the standard list of parking, traffic and environmental contravention codes and descriptions.

**Decision:** The Committee agreed the revisions to the contravention code list as outlined in the report.

**11. Proposed Revenue Budget and Borough Charges 2018/19**

The Committee received a report that detailed the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2018/19.

Frank Smith informed members that the budget proposals had already been considered by the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 16 November 2018, and had also been endorsed by London Councils' Leaders' Committee. He said that there was a recommendation to transfer the sum of £140,000 from the general reserve to the specific reserve, which would be used for priority projects as determined by TEC (paragraph 53 of the report).

**Decision:** The Committee approved:

- The proposed individual levies and charges for 2018/19 as follows:
  - The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2017/18 - £1,500; paragraph 38);
  - The Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.4226 per PCN which would be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2016/17 (2017/18 - £0.4915 per PCN; paragraphs 36-37);
  - No charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass Administration Charge, which was covered by replacement Freedom Pass income (2017/18 – nil charge; paragraph 15);
  - The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,182 in total (2017/18 - £338,182; paragraphs 17).

- No charge to boroughs in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which was fully covered by estimated PCN income (2017/18 – nil charge; paragraphs 19-20);
  - Road User Charging Appeals (RUCA) – to be recovered on a full cost recovery basis under the new contract arrangements with the GLA (paragraph 28);
  - A unit charge of £12 for the replacement of a lost or damaged Freedom Pass (2017/18 - £10; paragraphs 4 and 10);
  - Environment and Traffic Appeals (ETA) 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) (paragraphs 4 and 27);
  - The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2017/18 - £7.31; paragraphs 4, 29-35);
  - The TRACE (Fax/Email) Charge of £7.70 per transaction, which from 1 April 2018 would be levied, in addition to the electronic charge of £7.53 per transaction, making a total of £15.23 (2017/18 - £7.48; paragraphs 4, 29-35);
  - The TEC<sup>1</sup> Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2017/18 - £0.17; paragraphs 4, 29-35).
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £368.382 million for 2018/19, as detailed in Appendix A;
  - On the basis of the agreement of all the above proposed charges as outlined in this report, the provisional gross revenue income budget of £368.093 million for 2018/19, with a recommended transfer of £289,000 from uncommitted Committee reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B; and
  - A transfer of a sum of £140,000 from the general reserve to the specific reserve, to be used for priority projects as determined by this Committee (paragraph 53).

The Committee also noted:

- the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 52-55 and Table 9 of this report; and
- the estimated total charges to individual boroughs for 2018/19, as set out in Appendix C.1.

## **12. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 16 November 2017 (for noting)**

*Item 3. "London Councils' Response to the draft Mayor's Environment Strategy", page 2, (paragraph 1).*

Councillor Whitehead asked for the following amendments to be made:

---

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



Replace "the borough of Sutton" with "the South London Waste Partnership of four boroughs".

Replace the sentence that begins "Councillor Whitehead said that Planning Inspectors..", with "Councillor Whitehead said that the Local Plan Inspector, following the recent Planning Inquiry in Sutton, had asked the Borough to release some Metropolitan Open Land for Industrial use, despite protection for this space in the draft Local Plan, and in the draft Mayor's Strategy. This represented a conflict where national planning inspectors could overrule local/regional policies."

Subject to the above amendments, the minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting held on 16 November 2017 were noted.

### **13. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 12 October 2017**

The minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 12 October were agreed as an accurate record.

**The meeting finished at 16:50pm**

## **LONDON COUNCILS' TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT EXECUTIVE SUB COMMITTEE**

Minutes of a meeting of the London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on **16 November 2017** at 10:00am, at London Councils, Meeting Room 4, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, 59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL

### **Present:**

Councillor Julian Bell	LB Ealing (Chair)
Councillor Lynda Rice	LB Barking & Dagenham
Councillor Stuart King	LB Croydon
Councillor Daniel Anderson	LB Enfield
Councillor Feryal Demirci	LB Hackney
Councillor Claudia Webbe	LB Islington
Councillor Peter Buckwell	LB Richmond
Councillor Jill Whitehead	LB Sutton

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

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Phil Doyle (RB Kingston) and Councillor Caroline Usher (LB Wandsworth). No deputies were present.

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

Councillor Demirci and Councillor Julian Bell declared an interest in being members of a dockless bike scheme.

### **3. London Councils' Response to the Draft Mayor's Environment Strategy Consultation**

The Committee received a report that summarised the development process of the London Councils' draft response to the draft London Environment Strategy (LES) and sought member approval for its contents.

Owain Mortimer, Principal Policy Officer, Transport, Infrastructure & Environment, London Councils, introduced the report. He made the following comments:

- Deadline for responses to the draft Mayor's London Environment Strategy (LES) Consultation was 17 November 2017;
- London Councils engagement process to produce its response involved three elements, including two large scale events (13 April 2017 – a pre-consultation event with the GLA, for borough input, and 31 October 2017 – over 50 attendees, members and officers);
- Also, a Task and Finish Group met twice on 8 September and 30 October 2017, with borough representatives from all the environment policy areas covered in the draft LES. This fed into the final response;
- Key message in the London Councils response was the ambitiousness of the Strategy. The Strategy was welcomed and the main aims were supported (eg zero carbon emissions and zero waste);

- One of the key themes was the financial pressure boroughs are under, lack of costings (eg for tree maintenance) and concern that offsetting mechanisms be used as a last resort. The Mayor needed to use his convening and influencing powers;
- London Councils wanted to see the circular economy woven more through the LES and the impact of Brexit (ie lack of clarity at moment).

Councillor Whitehead asked whether the boroughs or the GLA would be monitoring the KPIs. She said that there was also the assumption that areas like waste would be undertaken Londonwide, whereas the South London Waste Partnership of four boroughs undertook its own waste programme and had its own contractual arrangements. Councillor Whitehead said that the Local Plan Inspector, following the recent Planning Inquiry in Sutton, had asked the borough to release some Metropolitan Open Land for industrial use, despite protection for this space in the draft Local Plan, and in the draft Mayor's Environment Strategy. This represented a conflict where national planning inspectors could overrule local/regional policies.

Councillor Anderson said that the Strategy had a lot of ambition, but not much detail on how it would be achieved. He felt that there was a great deal of expectation on the boroughs, which had cost implications attached, especially with regards to transport issues. Councillor Anderson said that outer London boroughs were more car dependent. He felt that there was a lack of interim targets in the Strategy. The Mayor also had a shortfall in funding. Councillor Anderson said that the waste recycling target of 65% was unrealistic. There also appeared to be a lack of real awareness in the Strategy regarding businesses and packaging.

Councillor Demirci said that the 65% waste target included commercial waste as well as residential waste. She voiced concern at the lack of enforcement powers boroughs had with regards to requiring residents to recycle and felt that the paragraph in the response (125, page 26) needed to be strengthened.

Councillor King felt that the zero emissions paragraph (26, page 6) for buses by 2037 needed to be strengthened. Katharina Winbeck, Head of Transport, Environment and Infrastructure, London Councils, said that it would be problematic to change this at this stage of the consultation as the response aligned with the response to the Mayor's Transport Strategy.

Councillor Anderson said that the Mayor's Environment Strategy needed to overlap with the Transport Strategy, and should not be seen as separate. Owain Mortimer said that London Councils had been developing both responses with reference to each other, especially with regards to air quality. Councillor Anderson said that many elements of the Transport Strategy fitted with the Environment Strategy. Katharina Winbeck said that the GLA Act stated that there needed to be two separate strategies (Environment and Transport). She said that London Councils had been cross-referencing both strategies. Owain Mortimer said that this would be fed in to the London Plan when it came out at in December 2017. Councillor Whitehead asked how the issue of planning inspectors would be dealt with. Katharina Winbeck said that this was national policy.

Katharina Winbeck asked members if they felt that the expectations on boroughs and implications on funding needed strengthening in London Councils' response. Councillor Anderson said that the draft LES was aspirational and dependent on the boroughs, and this needed to be recognised. Katharina Winbeck said that it was an expectation of the Mayor at the moment to measure KPIs.

The Chair said that further clarification was needed in the section that referenced the government's Litter Strategy, including fly-tipping (page 28, paragraph 139).

Katharina Winbeck said this section of the report could be strengthened. Jennifer Sibley, Principal Policy Officer, London Councils, said that fly-tipping was a borough responsibility. The Chair said that more powers were needed to enforce fly-tipping. Councillor Whitehead voiced concern about the amount of packaging that was being produced. She said that national and regional action was required to address this. Councillor Rice said that the borough of Barking and Dagenham was developing an app for the reporting of fly-tipping. She said that the enforcement side had to work as well though, along with a change in the public's behaviour. Katharina Winbeck said that the public needed to be engaged with this.

The Chair suggested that the minor changes to the response be made and then circulated to himself and the vice chairs of TEC.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted and discussed the draft response to the draft London Environment Strategy at Appendix 1;
- Agreed that the following minor changes to the response would be made and sent to the Chair and vice chairs of TEC's for final sign-off:
  - (i) to strengthen the paragraph regarding the lack of effective borough powers to enforce residential recycling rates;
  - (ii) to strengthen the issue of expectations and costs in delivering the Environment Strategy; and
  - (iii) more clarification was needed on the Government's litter strategy and fly-tipping and this should be mentioned in the specific section on this in the response (page 28/para 139).
- Agreed to submit the draft response to the draft London Environment Strategy as outlined at Appendix A, subject to the above minor amendments being made.

#### **4. Transport and Mobility Services Performance Information 2017/18 (Q2)**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that detailed the London Councils' Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Q1 and Q2 in 2017.

Spencer Palmer, Director of Transport and Mobility, London Councils, introduced the performance report. He said that the "amber" rating for the "average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals" under Road User Charging Adjudicators (RUCA) was due to an increase in personal and postal appeals. TfL had also changed contractors at the beginning of the year resulting in many more appeals being produced. Spencer Palmer informed members that there was no real cause for concern regarding this.

Spencer Palmer explained that the “red” rating for the decline in the “percentage of calls answered within 30 seconds (BAU)” for the Freedom Pass in Q2 was due to resource issues with the contractor, and an increase in calls in general. He said that the new contract had started on 1 October 2017 and there were signs of improvements already. There had also been no increase in customer complaints during this period. Spencer Palmer informed members that the “red” rating for the “percentage of appeals allowed” for the London Lorry Control Scheme was due to the relatively low number of appeals received, along with the number of allowed appeals that were not contested by London Councils.

Spencer Palmer informed members that the “amber” rating given to the “number of boroughs participating in EU transport funding projects” under the London European Partnership for Transport (LEPT) was given because only 5 out of the target of 7 boroughs were participating. He said that the first stage of a bid had been submitted on 25 January 2017 and the results of the second bid submitted would be known in May 2018.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the performance information report for Q1 and Q2 in 2017.

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

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that outlined actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of September 2017 for TEC and provided a forecast of the outturn position for 2017/18.

Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, introduced the report. He informed members that there was a projected surplus of £1.01 million for the year. During the course of discussion on the main variances projected for the year, he said that income collected for the month of October alone for lost or damaged Freedom passes had generated £65,000, which equated to over £700,000 annually.

Councillor Buckwell asked whether any of the £1.001 million projected surplus would be returned to the boroughs. Frank Smith informed members that the London Councils’ Executive currently wanted to maintain a healthy balance of reserves, in light of the recent increases in inflation and the projected effect this would have on London Councils’ budgets and would not be recommending any return to boroughs from reserves for 2018/19. This would continue to be monitored over the next twelve months. Following a question from the Chair, Frank Smith stated that a projected net deficit of £23,000 in respect of transaction volumes generated by boroughs for other parking systems was also forecast.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted the projected surplus of £1.001 million for the year, plus the forecasted net underspend of £809,000 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 6-9.

## **6. Draft Revenue Budget and Borough Charges 2018/19**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2018/19. The Executive Sub Committee was also asked to comment on these outline proposals, with particular consideration to the three specific proposals detailed at paragraph 4, in order that any comments could be consolidated in the further report for the TEC Main meeting in December 2017.

Frank Smith informed members that the budget report would be presented to London Councils' Leaders Committee on 5 December and then to TEC for final approval on 7 December 2017. He said that there were no current proposals to return funds to the boroughs, as London Councils was facing a number of budgetary pressures during 2018/19, including a rent review for the Southwark Street site, along with the new requirement to providing access to a pension scheme for the adjudicators.

Frank Smith said that paragraph 4 in the report highlighted three specific proposals for 2018/19 that the Sub-Committee were being asked to consider in order to balance the budget. Councillor Buckwell felt that a 20% rise in the unit cost of a replacement Freedom Pass (from £10 to £12) was quite high. Frank Smith said that there had not been an increase in this charge since it had been introduced in November 2012. Spencer Palmer said that the increase was still more or less in keeping with other concessionary travel schemes across the country. He said that the increase would also encourage people to look after their passes more. Councillor Anderson said that more frequent reviews needed to be built in, and the time between future reviews needed to be fixed.

Spencer Palmer informed members that the first Freedom Pass was issued free of charge. If the pass was faulty it would be replaced free of charge. A stolen pass would also be replaced free of charge, as long as the passholder had a relevant crime number. If the pass was physically damaged, then the passholder would be charged £12 for a replacement from 2018/19. Councillor Anderson asked how many passes were replaced each year. Spencer Palmer confirmed that based on income collected in October 2017, 6,500 lost passes were replaced in that month. Councillor Anderson asked if this was typical. Frank Smith said that up to 5% of passes were replaced, on average, in a year. Councillor Anderson asked what determined a pass to be damaged. Spencer Palmer said that the passes had a 5-year lifespan. The type of damage would be determined when the passes were sent back.

Councillor Webbe asked whether passes would be made contactless in the future, and whether the need for the separate part of the pass would be eliminated. Spencer Palmer said that the Freedom Pass had to be compatible with the Oyster Scheme (chip), as Freedom Pass journeys needed to be recorded. The pass needed to carry an ITSO chip for the national scheme. Spencer Palmer said that the ID element was

also required, although London Councils was looking into the use of smart phone technology.

Councillor Buckwell asked what costs were involved regarding stolen passes. Spencer Palmer said that he did not know what the total costs for this were. He informed members that the police would become involved if cards were being used fraudulently.

Frank Smith informed members that the second bullet point in paragraph 4 related to top slicing the forecast reductions in the unit costs of all Environment and Traffic appeals (ETAs) and statutory declarations by £1. The third bullet point proposed a 3% increase in the charge to boroughs for TEC and TRACE electronic transactions and the phasing out of TRACE fax and email charges. Spencer Palmer said that this would only affect some local authorities. Councillor Buckwell suggested giving a specific date for when faxes would no longer be used. Spencer Palmer said that plans were in place to increase the charge, although faxes could stop altogether at a later date. Frank Smith said that if boroughs were mandatorily required to use the electronic TRACE link at some point in the future, they would require assurances that third parties would not have access to borough systems, especially in light of the requirements of the forthcoming General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which come into effect in May 2018.

Frank Smith said that the projected reserves as at 1 April 2018 would marginally exceed the upper limit of the agreed 10%-15% benchmark, although an additional recommendation could be added to the report going to the main TEC meeting in December to transfer £140,000 from uncommitted reserves to the specific reserve. The Chair agreed that this was a reasonable strategy that would allow the level of uncommitted reserves to be brought back to within the 15% benchmark. The Sub-Committee, therefore, agreed that this additional recommendation should be put before the main TEC meeting for approval.

Councillor King asked whether the ONS figures used to determine potential borough contributions influenced the enforcement of the London Lorry Control Scheme (LLCS). Spencer Palmer said that this was not the case. In addition, he commented that boroughs, in fact, had not contributed to the scheme for three years owing to the level of receipts collected from Lorry Control PCNs.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee approved the proposed individual levies and charges for 2018/19 as follows:

- The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2017/18 - £1,500; paragraph 36);
- The total Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.4226 which would be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2016/17 (2017/18 - £0.4915 per PCN; paragraphs 34-35);
- No charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass Administration Charge, which was covered by replacement Freedom Pass income (2017/18 – nil charge; paragraph 15);
- The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,182 in total (2017/18 - £338,182; paragraphs 17).

- No charge to boroughs in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which was fully covered by estimated PCN income (2017/18 – nil charge; paragraphs 19-20);
- Road User Charging Appeals (RUCA) – to be recovered on a full cost recovery basis under the new contract arrangements with the GLA (paragraph 28);
- In addition, after considering the specific proposals outlined at paragraph 4, the Executive-Sub Committee was also asked to recommend that the Full Committee approve at their meeting on 7 December:
  - A unit charge of £12 for the replacement of a lost or damaged Freedom Pass (2017/18 - £10; paragraph 10);
  - Environment and Traffic Appeals (ETA) 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) (paragraph 27);
  - The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2017/18 - £7.31; paragraphs 29-33);
  - The TRACE (Fax) Charge of £7.70 per transaction, in addition to the electronic charge of £7.53 per transaction (2017/18 - £7.48; paragraphs 29-33);
  - The TEC<sup>1</sup> Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2017/18 - £0.17; paragraphs 29-33);
  - Agreed to transfer £140,000 from uncommitted general reserves into the specific reserve to ensure the Committee's formal policy on reserves of between 10 to 15% of annual operating expenditure was adhered to.
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £368.775 million for 2018/19, as detailed in Appendix A; and
- On the basis of the agreement of all the above proposed charges as outlined in this report (including those at paragraph 4), the provisional gross revenue income budget of £368.486 million for 2018/19, with a recommended transfer of £289,000 from uncommitted Committee reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B.

The Executive-Sub Committee was also asked to note:

- the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 52-55 and Table 8 of this report; and
- the estimated total charges to individual boroughs for 2018/19, as set out in Appendix C.1.

---

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



## **7. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 12 October 2017 (for noting)**

Councillor Whitehead made the following amendments to the draft TEC Main minutes:

*Item 3 Mayor's Environment Strategy Q & As (page 4, 1<sup>st</sup> para)* – Noted that the rate of recycling in the borough of Sutton had averaged between 51% to 53% each month, since April, since the introduction of the new South London Waste Partnership contract (and not 55%, as stated in the minutes).

*Item 6 Flooding Investment in London Q & As (page 8, 1<sup>st</sup> para)* – noted that the “Beverley Brook Flood Scheme” covered Sutton and Merton, and not the borough of Richmond. This needed to be amended in the “Decision” part at the bottom of page 8 as well.

Subject to the above minor changes being made, the minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 12 October 2017 were noted.

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

The minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 15 September 2017 were agreed as an accurate record.

## **9. Any Other Business**

Councillor Webbe asked whether the boroughs would be given more time to return their forms to give delegated authority of Go Ultra Low City Scheme (GULCS). The Chair said that the official body had not been established yet so more time could be given to boroughs who had not yet returned their forms. Spencer Palmer confirmed that a written reminder would be sent out to the boroughs regarding this and a copy would be sent to TEC members, as well as borough officers.

Spencer Palmer said that a presentation would be taking place on protective security and hostile vehicle mitigation at 2pm in the Conference Suite on 7 December 2017. The TEC party group meetings would convene at 1:15pm (instead of 1:30pm) and the Main TEC meeting would take place at 3pm (instead of 2:30pm). Alan Edwards would email TEC members with the details nearer the time.

**The meeting finished at 11:15am**