

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Thursday 14 November 2019

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*	1
3 Funding of the EV and Car Club Coordination Function and Climate Change policy co-ordination and research function	3
4 Future Mobility Agenda: Task & Finish Group on Smart Mobility & Mobility as a Service (MaaS) Update	2 nd dispatch
5 Transport & Mobility Performance Information	21
6 Freedom Pass Eligibility Documentation and processes	27
7 HGV Safety Permit Scheme: Update	35
8 TEC Month 6 Revenue Forecast 2019/20	51
9 TEC Draft Revenue Budget & Borough Charges 2020/21	61
10 Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 10 October 2019 (for noting)	91
11 Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee Meeting held on 12 September 2019 (for agreeing)	103

<p>Part Two: Exclusion of the Press & Public (Exempt)</p> <p>TEC will be invited by the Chair to agree to the removal of the press and public since the following items of business are closed to the public pursuant to Part 5 and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended):</p> <p>Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial and business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information), it being considered that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.</p>	
<p>E1 Exempt Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 10 October 2019</p>	

Declarations of Interests

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

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

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

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

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

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

Alan Edwards
Governance Manager
Corporate Governance Division
Tel: 020 7934 9911
Email: alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Declarations of Interest – TEC Executive Sub Committee
14 November 2019

Freedom Pass & 60+ Oyster Card

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing – Chair), Cllr Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr Richard Field (LB Wandsworth) and Cllr Tim Mitchell (City of Westminster)

North London Waste Authority

Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington)

South London Waste Partnership

Cllr Stuart King (LB Croydon) and Cllr Manuel Abellan (LB Sutton)

Western Riverside Waste Authority

Cllr Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham) and Cllr Claire Holland (LB Lambeth)

Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (RFCC)

Cllr Denise Scott-McDonald (RB Greenwich) and Cllr Richard Livingstone (LB Southwark)

London Road Safety Council

Cllr Denise Scott-McDonald (RB Greenwich), Cllr Richard Livingstone (LB Southwark), and Cllr Tim Mitchell (City of Westminster)

Car Club

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing – Chair), Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington) and Cllr Tim Mitchell (City of Westminster)

London Cycling Campaign

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing – Chair)

South East Waste Disposal Group

Cllr Denise Scott-McDonald (RB Greenwich)

Environmental Protection UK

Cllr Denise Scott-McDonald (RB Greenwich)

Dockless Bike Scheme

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

London Sustainable Development Commission (LSDC)

Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington)

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Funding of the EV and car club coordination function and climate change policy coordination and research function Item no: 3

Report by: Katharina Winbeck **Job Title:** Strategic Lead, Transport and Environment

Date: 14 November 2019

Contact Officer: Katharina Winbeck

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

Summary: This report requests Committee approval to allocate funds from the TEC Special Projects specific reserve for the provision of an electric vehicle (EV) and car club policy coordination function and climate change policy coordination and research function, for a fixed term of two years.

Allocation of the funding requested for the EV coordination policy function will be subject to receiving all of the LC TEC delegations by all London boroughs and the City of London.

The climate change policy work, subject to agreement by London Councils Leaders' Committee, can be funded from uncommitted resources held in a specific reserve within the TEC funding stream.

Recommendations: The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report;
- Approve the request to allocate a maximum sum of £217,923 from the TEC Special Projects specific reserve for the delivery of the proposed EV and car club coordination policy function in London Councils from April 2020 for a period of two years.
- Approve the request to allocate a maximum sum of £289,369 from the TEC Special Projects specific reserve for the delivery of climate change policy coordination and research function for a period of two years.

Funding of the EV and car club coordination function and climate change policy coordination and research function

Introduction

1. This paper outlines the case to fund three members of staff for a period of two years to deliver three key areas of the Committee's work and contribute to London Councils' pledges to Londoners:
 - Electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure coordination
 - Car club policy coordination
 - Climate change policy coordination and research
2. Since there is a strong link between the EV infrastructure and car club coordination and activities, these have been grouped together into two overall FTE posts – one lead and one policy officer. TfL has committed to support this function and contribute 50 per cent of the total cost. This is subject to final sign off of the TfL business plan in December 2019.
3. For the climate change work, a lead officer, with a project budget is proposed to take this work forward. However, as climate change related activities are not within the functions delegated to TEC in the TEC Agreement, a decision is required by London Councils Leaders' Committee to undertake this work.

Background

EV Infrastructure and car club policy coordination

4. On 19 February 2019 TEC Executive members received a report¹ outlining the proposed structure for the Task & Finish Group on Car Clubs. Members agreed with the proposals and the Task & Finish Group on Car Clubs was brought together. The purpose of the Group was to provide an in-depth analysis of the current state of car clubs in London and to identify ways in which car sharing could contribute in responding to environmental, population growth and congestion challenges. At the TEC Executive meeting on 12 September 2019, members received the final report of the Task & Finish Group on Car Clubs and agreed with all recommendations put forward by the Group.
5. Given the lack of resources available at the borough level, the group discussed different options that could potentially result in overall cost savings and better pan-London coordination. At the meeting on 18 July 2019, TEC Executive requested London Councils officers to explore the possibility of developing a new officer role together with the GLA and TfL. Following further conversations and an agreement between officers from the GLA, TfL and London Councils in September 2019, the group recommends that a new part-time role is created.
6. The agreed tasks and responsibilities for this role are outlined in Appendix 1 and span the activities of knowledge sharing, operational arrangements and data & monitoring. The equivalent of 0.5FTE is proposed for this role.

¹ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/35118>

7. On 10 October 2019 TEC members received a report² setting out a proposal for London Councils to provide an EV coordination function for London. The report set out the background to the proposal, and sought feedback on the proposed activities of the function. These are outlined in Appendix 2. The equivalent of 1.5FTE is proposed for this role. It was agreed that this follow-on report would be submitted to TEC Executive Sub Committee to request funding to progress delivery in 2020.
8. The proposal to deliver an EV coordination function is to enable the continuation and expansion of the GULCS programme in coordinating and supporting EV infrastructure in London. It is recognised that there is a need for London Councils to continue to do this when GULCS funding ends in March 2020. With its previous experience, London Councils already has the relationships and communication channels to deliver this function.
9. This is supported by the findings of the Mayor's EV Infrastructure Taskforce, which has recommended that a new pan-London EV coordination function is created to facilitate and oversee charge point installation. London Councils has committed to lead on this recommendation in the London Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Taskforce Delivery Plan³, published in June 2019.
10. Approval of TEC reserve funding for the EV coordination function in London Councils will be subject to all London boroughs and the City of London agreeing the proposed delegation of responsibility to TEC, which has been in circulation since June 2017. Where it has not already been signed, TEC members have agreed to progress sign-off within their borough by the end of 2019.
11. Total funding required to deliver the EV and car club coordination function is estimated to be in the range of £388,413 - £435,846. Approval is sought for a maximum of 50 per cent of the total cost, up to £217,923, to be allocated from the TEC Special Projects specific reserve. The remaining 50 per cent will be provided by TfL, subject to final sign off of the business plan in December 2019.

Climate Change policy co-ordination

12. There has recently been an increase in public focus on the role of local authority action on climate change. In July and September 2019 LC TEC Executive considered and discussed climate change policy and charged officers to develop a list of potential activities where London Councils could usefully support individual and collective action on climate change in the interest of value for money and efficiencies. On 10 October 2019, TEC considered a report outlining a programme of activities based on the responses received.
13. TEC endorsed the report and agreed that additional resources should be identified. The list of potential activities is grouped into three main strands, as summarised below. Full details can be found in Appendix 3.
 - Boroughs: Support boroughs to put in place climate action plans that are effectively structured, resourced, governed and supported (within and outside the council), based on robust evidence and accompanied by ongoing monitoring.

² <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/36290>

³ <http://lruc.content.tfl.gov.uk/london-electric-vehicle-infrastructure-taskforce-delivery-plan.pdf> pages 92-

- Sub-regional and London-wide: Work with boroughs to identify and deliver shared projects that are needed at a sub-regional or London-wide scale to support our collective climate targets.
- National action: Understand the barriers to delivery, and what package of investment, powers and leadership can unlock delivery of climate targets. Work with boroughs, the GLA and national partners to identify and advocate for these.

14. Overall funding requested for this strand of work is a maximum of £289,369. There will be no contribution from any other parties for this work.

Proposal

EV Infrastructure and car club policy coordination

15. To deliver the proposed EV and car club coordination policy function, it is proposed that a similar resource structure to that currently in place to deliver the GULCS programme is continued. This is based on the provision of dedicated resource based at London Councils, supported by procurement, legal and project management from Transport for London (TfL).
16. Based on the identification of responsibilities and actions for the coordination function, it is proposed that the current role of the GULCS Senior Lead is funded to continue after March 2020, as 'EV infrastructure and car club coordination lead officer' with the addition of a supporting policy officer.
17. Estimated annual costs to provide the officer resource required plus a small annual budget for deliverables including, for example, customer research, delivery and maintenance of an online platform for EV information and coordination of events are provided in the table below:

EV infrastructure and car club policy coordination function estimated costs

	Lower range (£000)	Higher range (£000)
Total salary costs over two years	338	386
Research and other support costs	50	50
Total costs	388	436
TfL contribution @ 50%	194	218
<u>Contribution sought from TEC Specific Reserves</u>	<u>194</u>	<u>218</u>

18. It is proposed that funding is allocated for the provision of this resource for two financial years, 2020/21 and 2021/22, subject to an annual review of requirements and workload. Workload for the coordination function may, for example, increase if further opportunities to apply for, and distribute funding for the delivery of charge points is identified. A two-year period is expected to provide sufficient time for the coordination function to engage stakeholders, gain momentum and meet the public commitments made in the EV taskforce delivery plan.

19. The EV and car club policy coordination function is directly contributing to two of London Councils Pledges:

- Support the promotion of a new Clean Air Act and the introduction of ULEZ across much of London to protect Londoners from harmful polluted air.
- Deliver at least 2500 charging points for electric vehicles by 2022, including the option for 20 rapid charge points in each borough.

20. The EV and car club policy coordination function is expected to deliver the following potential financial benefits:

- *Lower resource requirements for local authorities in London that plan to deliver EV charge points and/or have active car sharing operations.* These savings are a result of centralised coordination and the sharing of information and facilitation of knowledge sharing in addition to procurement, legal and project support. The coordination function will also analyse relevant data, and share key findings with stakeholders to inform future planning and delivery across the capital, removing the requirement for individual boroughs to provide separate resource to do this.
- *Social, environmental and health benefits.* The delivery of the EV and car club coordination function aims to coordinate and support the delivery of charging infrastructure in London and enable the positive contribution car clubs can make to the sustainable travel agenda. Lack of charging infrastructure is one of the key barriers to Ultra Low Emissions Vehicle (ULEV) uptake in the capital, particularly one voiced very strongly by car club operators. If the delivery of charging infrastructure is successful in supporting the uptake of ULEVs, this can have significant potential financial benefits. Ecorys has calculated the social and environmental benefits of securing wider uptake of ULEVs in London to be nearly £30 million by 2025, including health benefits due to reduced pollutant emissions worth around £10 million by 2025.

21. In addition to the potential financial benefits expected from the delivery of the EV and car club coordination function, the following potential non-financial benefits have been identified:

- *Air quality improvements.* As set out in the government's air quality plan, the UK will end the sale of new conventional petrol and diesel cars and vans by 2040. The Mayor of London has an ambition for every new car or van registered in London to be zero emission from 2030, meeting the ambition of the Committee on Climate Change and sooner than the national goal of 2040. This will require the delivery of a significant amount of infrastructure, not currently being delivered by the private sector. The EV and car club coordination function will ensure momentum to continue delivery of EV infrastructure in London and seek funding opportunities for London borough delivery.
- *A consistent approach to the delivery of EV charging infrastructure and car club policies.* It is important that charging infrastructure is delivered as consistently as possible across London to provide confidence to existing and prospective EV drivers. Similarly, boroughs have expressed the need for more consistent approaches and therefore guidance with regards to car club operations in London, to ensure a good overall user experience and ensure that car club cars are the cleanest vehicles they can be. Whilst there have been a significant number of charge points delivered to

date, London still has a long way to go to ensure that the infrastructure needed to support EV drivers is in place over the next few years.

- *Retain existing in-house experience.* London Councils has the skills, knowledge and experience required to lead on the delivery of the EV and car club coordination function, built up through delivery of the GULCS programme and the car clubs Task and Finish Group, as well as previous work on the car club coalition. Boroughs have been supported to deliver over 1,500 on-street EV charge points to date, and will provide funding for the delivery of more than 2,000 charge points in total. London Councils is also a trusted entity amongst key stakeholders, including the boroughs (both members and officers) and charge point operators. The delivery of the EV and car club coordination function in a similar structure to the delivery of the GULCS programme will ensure that experience, skills and knowledge are retained.
- *Oversee delivery of the GULCS programme.* The EV and car club coordination function will oversee borough delivery of charge points through the GULCS programme after March 2020. Without this in place there is no allocated resource to ensure funding is spent by the end of 2020, and that lessons learnt are captured and shared.

22. If TEC reserve funding is not approved for allocation to the delivery of the EV and car club coordination function, there is a risk that London Councils will not be able to deliver on the public commitment made in the London EV Infrastructure Taskforce Delivery Plan. Nor will London Councils be able to deliver the recommendations from the Task and Finish Groups on car clubs. This may have a reputational impact for the organisation and impact delivery of charge points in London, and reduce the potential benefits outlined above.

Climate Change policy coordination

23. To deliver the proposed activities around climate change, it is proposed that a lead officer will be employed to coordinate activity amongst the many officer networks in London, carry out research on behalf of the boroughs as detailed in Appendix 3, including sub-regional and pan-London support, and deliver national policy and advocacy work.

24. The total funding requested for this function is for a maximum of £289,369, including a communications budget to enable the role to undertake some specific and targeted communications activities in the run up to two events. It is proposed that recruitment starts as soon as possible after sign off. This is illustrated in the table below:

Climate change policy coordination and research costs

	Lower range (£000)	Higher range (£000)
Total salary costs over two years	188	219
Research and other support costs	70	70
Total costs sought from TEC Specific reserves	258	289

25. It is proposed that funding is allocated for the provision of this resource for two financial years, starting as soon as possible in 2020, given the urgency of this policy area. With the governance processes required, the assumption is that a person will not be in post before February 2020, which means an end date of January 2022. A two-year period is expected to provide sufficient time for the post to deliver the necessary policy products and research required for COP 26 (see paragraph 26 below), which will take place in the UK in 2020, and make sufficient progress on identifying the right projects to support at borough, sub-regional and London-wide level and their delivery mechanisms. Once the right projects have been identified, further delegations of powers, and/or the need for individual boroughs to take on lead roles may be required. Two years is also considered sufficient to deliver a strong advocacy campaign to national government on behalf of the boroughs and to attract a suitable candidate to the role.
26. The Conference of Parties (COP), an annual UN event which reviews the national communications and emissions of parties to the UN Convention on Climate Change, will take place in the Glasgow in November 2020. Hosting COP26 in the UK represents a great opportunity to showcase the actions London's boroughs are taking to address climate change and it is London Councils' intention to run events that support the COP next year.
27. The climate change policy and research function will indirectly contribute to a number of London Councils Pledges:
- Support the promotion of a new Clean Air Act and the introduction of ULEZ across much of London to protect Londoners from harmful polluted air.
 - Work towards including a target of one tree for every Londoner in our local plans.
 - Hold TfL to account for improving the bus route network in every London borough.
 - Lobby for improved certainty and levels of local road funding through TfL's LIP process.
 - Create, cost and lobby for a programme of local transport infrastructure delivery; addressing enhanced connectivity, platform extensions and related responses to growing demand.
 - Lobby for the delivery of major transport investment including CR2, HS2, Euston redevelopment, Bakerloo Line extension, West London Orbital and Tram network.
 - Work to agree new forms of London borough influence on the specification, management and award of rail franchises so that the borough voice is at the heart of commissioning; and argue for further devolution to London.
28. The climate change policy and research function is expected to deliver the following potential financial benefits:
- *Lower resource requirements for local authorities in London that plan to deliver climate change action plans.* These potential benefits are a result of centralised coordination and the sharing of information and facilitation of knowledge sharing in addition to the identification of suitable projects at borough, sub-regional and pan-London level and their appropriate delivery mechanisms, as well as national advocacy for additional powers and resources for boroughs. The lead officer will most likely also analyse relevant data, and share key findings with stakeholders to inform future planning and delivery across the capital, removing the requirement for individual boroughs to provide separate resource to do this.

- *Social, environmental and health benefits.* The climate change lead officer role will aim to coordinate and support the delivery of boroughs individual climate change action plans, which will have a positive impact on sustainable travel, fuel poverty and environmental enhancements, including adaptation to climate change impacts such as overheating and flooding.
29. In addition to the potential financial benefits expected from the climate change policy and research function, the following potential non-financial benefits have been identified:
- *Air quality improvements.* As set out in the government's air quality plan, the UK will end the sale of new conventional petrol and diesel cars and vans by 2040. The Mayor of London has an ambition for every new car or van registered in London to be zero emission from 2030, meeting the ambition of the Committee on Climate Change and sooner than the national goal of 2040. The climate change resource will work closely with the policy team at London Councils to contribute to this policy goal and ensure holistic policy development to avoid unintended consequences.
 - *Reputational benefits.* Addressing climate change is one of the biggest challenges society faces, and boroughs are demonstrating their recognition of and support for climate action through, for example, climate emergency declarations. London Councils must be seen to be treating this issue with the same seriousness of purpose as boroughs, otherwise we risk reputational damage.
30. *Public health benefits.* If London Councils can support boroughs to deliver the projects to address climate change outlined in the TEC paper of 10 October, similar to the air pollution challenge, this would provide numerous public health benefits. For example, the shift to non-combustible sources of power will reduce not only carbon emissions, but other emissions that have negative impacts on public health, such as NO₂ and Particulate Matter. The move to more sustainable forms of travel will also reduce emissions, and lead to better public health outcomes such as an increase in the proportion of people walking and cycling. Similarly, if TEC reserve funding is not approved for allocation to the delivery of the climate change policy and research function, there is a risk that many boroughs procure research and consultancy advice individually that would have provided much better value for money if done centrally. Additionally, there is the risk that boroughs use different data sets and London comes across as patch-work and may not be able to deliver the promises made in individual climate emergency declarations or action plans. London Councils has a tangible opportunity to make a real difference to a policy area that has experienced significant public support very recently, which is matched with member and officer interest at all levels.

Timescales

31. If funding is approved, recruitment for a resource to undertake the climate change policy and research function will begin as soon as approval has been confirmed from both Leaders' Committee and Transport and Environment Committee.

Recommendations

The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report;

- Approve the request to allocate a maximum of £436,000 of TEC reserve funding for the delivery of the proposed EV and car club coordination policy function in London Councils from April 2020.
- Approve the request to allocate a maximum of £289,369 for the delivery of climate change policy function to support boroughs as well as pan-London projects and national advocacy.

Financial Implications

The Director of Corporate Resources reports that the financial implications are clearly laid out in the body of the report and are summarised as follows. A maximum of sum £507,292 is requested from the TEC Special Projects specific reserve to cover the two year period. This request is based on the assumption that a 50% contribution to funding will be provided by TfL in respect of the EV infrastructure/Car Club policy coordination function, amounting to £217,923. These figures are the current 'worst case' scenario and could potentially reduce slightly as the precise roles are defined.

The EV infrastructure and car club policy coordination function will be funded directly from the TEC Special Projects specific reserves that has been accumulated by the Committee in recent years. This represents a maximum of £217,923 and will be transferred directly into the TEC revenue budget over the two-year period.

For the climate change policy coordination function, subject to approval by both Leaders' and Transport and Environment Committees, a sum up to a maximum of £289,369 will be transferred from the TEC Special Projects specific reserve to the Joint Committee to enable London Councils to have sufficient resources available to undertake this policy work.

Legal Implications

Electric Vehicle Coordination Work:

As TEC members are aware, for London Councils to play a direct role in the delivery of EV charging infrastructure the London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee Agreement (LC TEC Agreement) needs to be amended. The reason the Agreement needs to be amended is because none of the local authorities' functions relating to EV charging points are currently delegated as functions of LC TEC and the Committee therefore does not currently have the legal authority to undertake this function on behalf of the London local authorities.

An amendment has been circulated for the London boroughs to sign and to date, this has been signed by seventeen London boroughs (the amendment has been signed by: Barking & Dagenham, Barnet, Camden, Croydon, Ealing, Enfield, Hackney, Hammersmith & Fulham, Harrow, Hounslow, Islington, Kingston, Lewisham, Merton, Redbridge, Richmond, Wandsworth, Westminster). Without all authorities signing the variation to the TEC Agreement LC TEC will be unable to take on this new role in leading the EV coordination function.

The proposed variation does not provide LC TEC with the power to act as a decision maker on behalf of the London local authorities and does not put any borough under any obligation to take part in any proposed activity in this area. It simply allows LC TEC to take on a limited, collaborative role in relation to electric vehicle charging infrastructure. The amendment wording sets out the types of actions that a function managed by LC TEC could undertake. The reason the amendment is worded in this way is to ensure that further amendments to allow some

development of the role would not be needed. Any decision making would still need to be agreed by TEC and every London local authority would need to agree to participate in any proposed activity.

The allocation of TEC reserve funding for the coordination function is subject to all London boroughs agreeing to the proposed TEC variation. TEC members are therefore asked to progress sign-off in the sixteen outstanding boroughs by the end of 2019. Without all 33, the electric vehicle coordination function will not be able to be undertaken.

Climate Change Policy Function:

As outlined in paragraph 3 above, climate change related activities are not within the functions delegated to TEC in the TEC Agreement and are therefore currently outside TEC's authority. However, the proposed activities are within the functions delegated to Leaders' Committee and these can be funded by a transfer of uncommitted funds from a TEC specific reserve to the Joint Committee.

Equalities Implications

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

Appendix 1: Car Clubs policy coordination function

Background information

The Task & Finish Group on Car Clubs was brought together by London Councils in order to provide an in-depth analysis of the current state of car clubs in London and to identify ways in which car sharing could contribute in responding to environmental, population growth and congestion challenges.

Recommendation no. 10

“Develop and support a new part-time officer role aiming to coordinate London’s car sharing policy to ensure the continuation and success of the work started by the Task & Finish Group on Car Clubs”

Summary

A. Category: Knowledge Sharing

1. Responsibility: Act as a first point of contact for London boroughs, the GLA and TfL officers, existing and new car clubs, and other relevant stakeholders seeking information about the capital’s policies on car clubs
 - I. Action: Respond to and, where relevant, signpost queries to relevant guidance documents or contacts within other organisations.
 - II. Action: Welcome new market entrants into the capital and provide relevant information on requirements for operation in London.

Key stakeholder(s): London boroughs, the GLA, TfL & the industry

2. Responsibility: Support the coordination and promotion of ULEZ and the opportunities it brings for the car sharing industry
 - I. Action: Encourage the collaboration between London’s local government and the car sharing industry on ULEZ expansion plans and relevant projects (i.e. scrappage schemes).
 - II. Action: Facilitate the sharing of relevant information between the GLA, TfL, London boroughs, car clubs and other relevant stakeholders.
 - III. Action: Promote the uptake of electric vehicles within the car clubs’ fleets.

Key stakeholder(s): London boroughs, the GLA, TfL & the industry

3. Responsibility: Facilitate sharing of best practice and other relevant information amongst London boroughs and other relevant stakeholders
 - I. Action: Maintain a centralised car clubs policy web page up to date.
 - II. Action: Facilitate sharing of best practice and latest developments in the car sharing industry through working groups and events.
 - III. Action: Coordinate, promote and attend relevant meetings and training events.

Key stakeholder(s): Primarily London boroughs but also all other stakeholders

B. Category: Operational arrangements

4. Responsibility: Provide advice and information on different operational arrangements
 - I. Action: Produce a guidance document alongside a set of different ways of having active car sharing operations in place to improve consistency across the capital whilst providing flexibility for boroughs.
 - II. Action: Help to promote the most appropriate and standardised routes to having car sharing operations in place.

Key stakeholder(s): London Boroughs

C. Category: Data & monitoring

5. Responsibility: Monitor and support data sharing between car clubs, London boroughs and TfL

- I. Action: Act as a first point of contact for boroughs and car clubs providing relevant information about data requirements and recommendations.
- II. Action: Monitor and support a successful flow of data from operators to London boroughs and TfL.

Key stakeholder(s): London boroughs, TfL & the industry

6. Responsibility: Share and promote TfL's analysis and key findings with relevant stakeholders

- I. Action: Assist TfL with disseminating key trends, patterns and other findings from data provided by car clubs to understand and promote most appropriate operational models across the capital.

Key stakeholder(s): TfL

Appendix 2: EV policy coordination function

A. Category: Knowledge Sharing

1. Responsibility: Act as a first point of contact for London boroughs, the GLA, TfL, existing and new charge point operators, and other relevant stakeholders seeking information about charge point installation in the capital
 - I. Action: Respond to and, where relevant, signpost queries to relevant guidance documents or contacts within other organisations.
 - II. Action: Welcome new market entrants to the capital and provide relevant information on requirements for operation in London.
 - III. Action: Promote the quickest and best routes to charge point installation.

Key stakeholder(s): London boroughs, the GLA, TfL & charge point operators

Lead: London Councils

2. Responsibility: Facilitate sharing of best practice and other relevant information amongst London boroughs and other relevant stakeholders
 - I. Action: Facilitate sharing of best practice, developments in charge point technology and technical requirements for delivery through working groups, events and guidance documents.
 - II. Action: Coordinate, promote and attend relevant meetings and training events.

Key stakeholder(s): London boroughs, TfL charge point operators

Lead: London Councils

3. Responsibility: Collate and share information to encourage Londoners to switch to Evs
 - I. Action: Share information on EV charging in London and direct Londoners to borough processes to request on-street charge points.
 - II. Action: Lead communications including myth busting and awareness raising of the benefits of EVs. Support marketing by Go Ultra Low campaign.

Key stakeholder(s): London boroughs, OLEV

Lead: London Councils

B. Category: Support borough delivery

4. Responsibility: Liaise with TfL to provide procurement and contract management support to London boroughs to support delivery of EV charge points
 - I. Action: Provide procurement advice and support to London boroughs.

Key stakeholder(s): TfL, London Boroughs

Lead: TfL

5. Responsibility: Oversee delivery of GULCS programme to the end of 2020.
 - I. Action: Oversee borough delivery of charge points through the GULCS programme ensuring funding is spent by the end of 2020 and lessons learnt are captured and shared.

Key stakeholder(s): TfL, GLA, OLEV, London boroughs

Lead: London Councils & TfL

6. Responsibility: Secure and distribute funding to London boroughs for the delivery of on-street charging points.

- I. Action: Identify and bid for funding to continue on-street charging point delivery through the London boroughs.

Key stakeholder(s): London boroughs

Lead: London Councils

C. Category: Data and Monitoring

7. Responsibility: Monitor and support data sharing between charge point operators, London boroughs, TfL and other relevant stakeholders

- I. Action: Act as a first point of contact for boroughs and charge point operators seeking information on charge point data requirements and recommendations.
- II. Action: Monitor and support a successful flow of data from operators to London boroughs and TfL.

Key stakeholder(s): London boroughs, GLA, TfL & charge point operators

Lead: London Councils

8. Responsibility: Analyse charge point usage data. Share and promote key findings with relevant stakeholders.

- I. Action: Analyse charge point usage data and share key trends, patterns and other findings to inform future planning and delivery across the capital.

Key stakeholder(s): TfL, GLA, OLEV, London boroughs

Lead: London Councils

9. Responsibility: Collate and share locations of charge points delivered

- I. Action: Assist with maximising the utilisation of existing infrastructure, by providing up to date and accurate information on charge point locations, where possible.

Key stakeholder(s): Charge point operators

Lead: London Councils & GLA

10. Responsibility: Monitor customer experience and charging behaviour

- I. Action: Lead on research to monitor customer experience and charging behaviour. Share findings to inform future delivery.

Key stakeholder(s): Charge point users, London boroughs

Lead: London Councils

D. Category: Other

11. Responsibility: Identify funding and partnership opportunities to continue the role of the coordination body from 2022

- I. Action: Engage with relevant partners to identify funding and partnership opportunities to continue the role of the coordination body from 2022.

Key stakeholder(s): London boroughs, charge point operators

Lead: London Councils

Appendix 3 – Climate Change policy coordination function

Boroughs	Sub-regional / London-wide	National advocacy
Assist with establishing a robust baseline of emissions across London boroughs – this would require consultancy support but should provide increased value for money and ensure consistency compared to boroughs doing this on their own	Assist with energy efficiency projects and programmes, particularly retrofitting. This will require working with several different stakeholders, including the London Housing directors, GLA and others	Lobby for improved fiscal measures to support retrofitting, the installation of renewable technology and EV infrastructure
Identify, support and share best practice around establishing a climate change action plan. This would include borough officer and member events	Energy generation including renewable projects and heat networks. Again, this will require working with several different stakeholders, including the GLA	Advocate for improved financing and possibly powers for climate change initiatives, e.g. a new 'green deal'
Signpost boroughs effectively to the current guidance documents produced by several organisations. This would entail the analysis of these guidance documents and recommendations on which ones are suitable to a London borough setting.	Sustainable procurement, including energy – working with the London Energy Project and the Mayors green procurement code team to develop guidance that boroughs can adopt to their local circumstances	Lobby for stronger planning policies to support carbon neutral development
Co-ordinate views and activities of the boroughs through assisting the borough officer network	Influencing and engaging with the planning sector, utilising our links with the planning officer society and other networks	Lobby for stronger, national decarbonisation of transport
Discuss and work jointly with other stakeholders as appropriate, such as TfL, GLA, Environment Agency, UK 100 , LWARB, LGA, ADEPT , LCCP , ALEO , LECF and others.	Continue to work on decarbonising travel in London through encouraging walking and cycling and move to electric vehicles for any necessary car journeys	Develop a collective voice with colleagues on climate asks in advance of COP26
Support training for members and officers on 'carbon literacy', either directly or through sign posting appropriate LGA events	Assess the cost vs impact of different actions that boroughs can undertake on their own or collectively, to identify climate actions that can deliver greatest value for money	Identify the collective gap in climate funding and lobby for this

Boroughs	Sub-regional / London-wide	National advocacy
Provide guidance on procurement, energy efficiency projects, divestment, using carbon offset funds and available funding opportunities	Undertake research to support boroughs to understand the views of different groups of Londoners on climate action, what action they would support and why	

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Future Mobility Agenda: Task & Finish Group on Smart Mobility & Mobility as a Service (MaaS) Update

Item no: 04

Report by: Paulius Mackela **Job Title:** Principal Policy & Project Officer
Date: 14 November 2019
Contact Officer: Paulius Mackela
Telephone: 020 7934 9829 **Email:** paulius.mackela@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: Smart technologies and the better use of data and Mobility as a Service platforms could make significant positive impacts on the efficiency, environmental performance and safety of London's transport networks. There are, however, many unanswered questions about the role of local government in the future of integrated multi-model journey planning and payment solutions in London. These questions are being discussed in an intensive, but time limited work by the Task & Finish Group on Smart Mobility & MaaS, with oversight from the London Councils' TEC Executive. This paper provides an update on the first two meetings of the Group and outlines next steps.

Recommendations: The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report

Future Mobility Agenda: Task & Finish Group on Car Clubs

Introduction / Overview

1. London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee (TEC Executive) received a 'Future Mobility: Recognising and seizing opportunities in London'¹ report on 15 November 2018, which suggested a more active role for London Councils TEC Executive Committee in contributing to policy development for autonomous transport, bicycle and car sharing schemes, demand-response services and developments in smart mobility platforms. Members agreed to the report's recommendation to set up temporary Task & Finish Groups with political oversight through London Councils TEC Executive Committee meetings.
2. At the TEC Executive meeting on 18 July 2019, members agreed for Smart Mobility & Mobility as a Service (MaaS) to be the second focus area of the Future Mobility Agenda. Following this, at TEC Executive meeting on 12 September 2019, members approved the proposed composition, purpose, scope, size and timeline for the work of the Group, and noted other relevant information about the Group.
3. TEC members also received a report² on smart mobility and MaaS on 7 December 2017, which suggested a more active role for London Councils TEC in contributing to policy development in this policy area to assist in tackling air pollution and congestion challenges in London.

Membership

4. Regular Members of the Group include officers from London Councils, London boroughs, the GLA and TfL. Out of a total number of 13 borough officers that volunteered to join the Group, the following seven boroughs were chosen based on inner and outer London groupings and political control:
 - Camden
 - Greenwich
 - Hillingdon
 - Islington
 - Kingston & Sutton
 - Redbridge
 - Westminster
5. Guest members invited to attend the meetings so far include the following stakeholders (the list includes MaaS platform providers, universities, consultancies, civil service and 3rd sector representatives actively working in this policy area): Bristol University, BVRLA, CityMapper, CoMoUK, Department for Transport, Mott MacDonald, Uber, University College London, University of Hertfordshire, Whim. These stakeholders were identified by doing further research on MaaS in London and utilising existing contacts with universities and the industry.

¹ Full report can be accessed here: <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/34772>

² <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/download/file/fid/21717>

First two meetings

6. The first meeting of the Group was held at London Councils on 3 October 2019. At the meeting London Councils' officers provided a project overview and together with all members agreed on the dates of the following meetings and approved a final version of the Terms of Reference document. The Group then discussed MaaS definitions and agreed on key themes that will be explored going forward.
7. It was agreed that MaaS will be defined as a platform (i.e. an app) where users can access, plan, book and pay for a range of mobility services through a single interface. This definition is closely aligned with the one used by TfL³. Berlin provides a good example of such platform as it has recently launched a new app, *Jelbi*, which offers multimodal transport solution by incorporating public transport, active travel, car sharing, and taxis into one app.
8. Members agreed that the following meetings will be split into the following themes:
 - Understanding the future of MaaS development on a national level (meeting no. 2)
 - Exploring MaaS platforms together with leading academics and researchers (meeting no.3)
 - Giving MaaS operators an opportunity to provide their vision of MaaS in the capital (meeting no.4)
 - Drawing conclusions and formulating a shared vision for MaaS development in London (meeting no.5)
9. The second meeting of the Group was held on 29 October 2019 and mainly focused on government's views on the future of MaaS in the UK. An officer from DfT's Centre for Connected and Autonomous Vehicles attended the discussion and outlined their upcoming work.

Next steps

10. The Group will hold the final three meetings on the dates provided below. The sessions will explore views of leading academics and researchers on MaaS development and give an opportunity for industry representatives to provide their own vision for MaaS in London going forward.
 - 15 November 2019
 - 5 December 2019
 - 9 January 2020
11. It is planned that the Task & Finish Group on Smart Mobility & MaaS concludes its work in early 2020 and produce a final report to TEC Executive in February 2020 for their comments and approval.

³ <http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/transport-committee/mobility-as-a-service/written/77598.pdf>

Recommendations

The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report

Financial Implications

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

Legal Implications

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

Equalities Implications

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

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Transport & Mobility Services Performance Information

Item no: 5

Report by: Andy Rollock **Job title:** Mobility Services Manager
Date: 28 October 2019
Contact Officer: Andy Rollock
Telephone: 020 7934 9544 **Email:** andy.rollock@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report details the London Councils Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Q2 2019/20

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 Q2 in 2019/20 and figures for Q1 (19/20) and full year 2018/19.

Equalities Considerations

None.

Financial Implications

None.

**APPENDIX 1: TRANSPORT & MOBILITY SERVICES: PERFORMANCE QUARTER 1
LONDON TRIBUNALS**

	Target (where appropriate)	2018/19 Full Year	2019/20 Q1	2019/20 Q2	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q2
Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA)					
No. of appeals received	N/A	42,835	10,804	11,546	N/A
No. of appeals decided	N/A	36,486	8,759	9,218	N/A
% allowed	N/A	49%	50%	53%	N/A
% Did Not Contest	N/A	27%	29%	29%	N/A
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time	80%	87%	89%	90%	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	29 days	29 days	29 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	47 days	48 days	44 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	34 days	32 days	22 days	Green
Road User Charging Adjudicators (RUCA)					
No. of appeals received	N/A	9,812	3,177	5,259	N/A
No. of appeals decided	N/A	9,366	2,310	4,599	N/A
% allowed	N/A	32%	28%	31%	N/A
% Did Not Contest	N/A	20%	28%	26%	N/A
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time	80%	85%	87%	84%	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	61 days	40 days	36 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	46 days	46 days	39 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	56 days	41 days	36 days	Green
Overall service					
Notice of Appeal acknowledgments issued within 2 days of receipt	97%	99%	99%	99%	Green
Hearing dates to be issued to appellants within 5 working days of receipt	100%	99%	99%	99%	Amber
Number of telephone calls to London Tribunals	N/A	34,496	8,154	9,899	N/A
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	99%	99%	99%	Green

Comment:

The % of hearing dates issued to appellants within 5 working days of receipt missed the target this period because of 9 cases that were received in August and processed late because of a user error. The cases were all processed within 10 days

FREEDOM PASS

	Target (where appropriate)	2018/19 Full Year	2019/20 Q1	2019/20 Q2	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q2
Number of active passes at end of period	N/A	1,170,848	1,186,022	1,183,188	
Number of new passes issued (BAU)	N/A	45,325	15,124	15,299	
Number of passes issued (2019 Renewal)	N/A	41,567	2,848	339	
Number of replacement passes issued	N/A	98,948	22,069	24,420	
Number of phone calls answered (BAU)	N/A	200,603	46,285	51,432	
% Answered within 45 seconds (BAU)	85%	79%	79%	71%	*Red
% of calls abandoned	<2%	2.99%	3.5%	5.4%	**Red
Customer Satisfaction Survey rating (scoring 7 or above)	75%	92%	94%	90%	Green
Number of phone calls answered (2019 Renewal)	N/A	7,852	3,674	1591	
% Answered within 45 (2019 Renewal)	85%	79.3%	78%	78%	Red
Number of letters and emails answered	N/A	72,692	20,916	20,576	
Number of emails answered (2019 Renewal)	N/A	0	0	0	

BAU = Business as Usual

Comment:

*The percentage of calls answered (BAU) has decreased this quarter to 71% against a target of 85%. Although London Councils' officers have been holding the contractor to account and continuing to closely monitor performance, we have continued to see a decline in performance.

The contractor will, therefore, be issued with a formal improvement notice, a marked improvement in performance by an agreed date before further formal action is taken.

TAXICARD

	Target (where appropriate)	2018/19 Full Year	2019/20 Q1	2019/20 Q2	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q2
Number of active passes at end of period	N/A	56,401	57,937	58,612	
Number of new passes issued	N/A	6,977	1,944	1,878	
Number of replacement cards issued	N/A	3,941	919	824	
Number of phone calls answered at London Councils	N/A	28,115	4,931	5,564	
% Answered within 30 seconds	85%	91.5%	86%	87%	Green
Number of journeys using Taxicard	N/A	1,122,279	199,766	239,235	
% in private hire vehicles	N/A	8%	15%	13%	
% of vehicles arriving within 15 minutes (advance booking)	95%	93.43%	86%	86%	Red
% of vehicles arriving within 30 minutes (on demand)	95%	94.51%	87%	86%	Red

Comment:

Since the change in the pricing structure in July, we have seen an improvement in overall performance. However, performance is still below target.

CityFleet is currently developing an app, which will allow non CityFleet drivers to do Taxicard work if they undertake the required training. The Android app is in development and due to be released shortly. The development and release of these apps will open the Taxicard scheme to significantly more drivers (approx. 19,000) and it is hoped that this will have a positive impact on improving performance.

London Councils' officers will continue to monitor performance against the improvement plan, which remains in place.

TRACE (TOWAWAY, RECOVERY AND CLAMPING ENQUIRY SERVICE)

	Target (where appropriate)	2018/19 Full Year	2019/20 Q1	2019/20 Q2	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q2
Number of vehicles notified to database	Number of vehicles notified to database	47,190	11,623	11,867	N/A
Number of phone calls answered	Number of phone calls answered	20,037	4,723	5,035	N/A
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	96%	95%	93%	Green

LONDON LORRY CONTROL SCHEME

	Target (where appropriate)	2018/19 Full Year	2019/20 Q1	2019/20 Q2	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q2
Number of permits on issue at end of period	N/A	66,199	65,932	66,548	
Number of permits issued in period	N/A	16,919	3,142	4,362	
Number of vehicle observations made	10,800 per year 2,700 per quarter	11,340	2,597	2,560	*Amber
Number of penalty charge notices issued	N/A	5,785	1,276	857	
Number of appeals considered by ETA	N/A	90	34	26	
% of appeals allowed	Less than 40%	62%	50%	69%	Red

Comment:

The target was not met by 140 observations due to staff resourcing issues and unexpected absences during the period, which are now being addressed.

**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)	2018/19 Full Year	2019/20 Q1	2018/19 Q2	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q2
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of debt registrations	N/A	656,658	147,456	156,409	N/A
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of warrants	N/A	526,272	146,078	124,102	N/A
Traffic Enforcement Court: transactions to be processed accurately within 1 working day	100%	99%	100%	100%	Green

HEALTH EMERGENCY BADGES

	Target (where appropriate)	2018/19 Full Year	2019/20 Q1	2019/20 Q2	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q2
Number of badges on issue at end of period	N/A	4,079	3,939	4,225	N/A
Number of badges issued in period	N/A	2,363	455	447	N/A

LONDON EUROPEAN PARTNERSHIP FOR TRANSPORT

	Target (where appropriate)	2018/19 Full Year	2019/20 Q1	2019/20 Q2	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q2
Number of Boroughs participating in EU transport funding projects	7	5	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' Transport and Environment Committee Executive Sub-Committee

Freedom Pass Eligibility Documentation and Processes Item 6

Report by: Stephen Boon **Job title:** Chief Contracts Officer
Date: 14 November 2019
Contact Officer: Stephen Boon
Telephone: 020 7934 9951 **Email:** Stephen.boon@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report sets out several changes designed to improve London Councils' assessment of Freedom Pass applicants' eligibility for the scheme. It also considers measures that can be taken to improve the prevention and detection of fraud.

Recommendations: Members are asked to:

- a. Approve the new list of proofs of identity and age, and residency listed in the table at paragraph 8.
- b. Provide a steer on whether their preference is to maintain the current position in terms of minimising data security risks and cost, or for officers to explore the additional costs of increased document retention for the purpose of retaining evidence to be used to prosecute fraud.
- c. Approve that for Freedom Pass applications not supported by photographic evidence of identity and age, the same criteria for photographic identification as used by the passport service is adopted.

Freedom Pass Eligibility Documentation and Processes

Background

1. Freedom Pass provides free travel for older and disabled London residents on all Transport for London (TfL) travel modes (bus, Tube, London Overground, TfL rail, DLR and Tram) 24 hours a day, and on most National Rail routes after 9.30am Monday to Friday and at any time on weekends and public holidays. It also allows travel on local buses anywhere in England.

Why Review Eligibility Documentation and Processes?

2. In September 2019, the London borough of Brent successfully prosecuted someone for making fraudulent Disabled Freedom Pass applications. The person in question was convicted of nine offences and received an 18-month suspended prison sentence. The prosecution followed over a year of cooperation between London Councils' officers and Brent fraud investigators.
3. Prompted by what the investigations revealed, London Councils commissioned an external organisation to review its current processes and procedures for checking eligibility across the Freedom Pass scheme. The review, which was finalised in October 2019, was intended to identify what more London Councils could do to prevent fraudulent applications.
4. London Councils is also currently in the process of designing new application portals for disabled and older persons Freedom Pass applications. Identity and verification processes will be built into these portals. It is, therefore, timely to make sure that new processes are included from inception.
5. London Councils intends to implement a number of the recommendations. However, these could potentially make it more onerous for some people to apply for the Freedom Pass scheme. Some could also increase the cost of managing the scheme. Conscious, that Members have supported London Councils' previous drive to develop clear and simple application processes, and to reduce costs, officers wish to gauge TEC Executive's appetite for making these changes.

What changes are proposed?

6. The first set of changes relate to documents accepted as proofs of identity and residency. Currently the following documents are accepted (NB – the proofs that the review recommended should be removed have been struck through in the table below):

Proof of Identity and Age	Proof of Residency
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Current passport• Medical card• Birth certificate (unless your name has changed)• Current driving licence• Letter of state pension entitlement• European ID card	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Current council tax bill/letter/payment book• Current council/housing association rent book/statement/letter/tenancy agreement• Current television licence• Residential utility bill/Letter (excluding mobile phone bills) dated in the last 3 months

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HM Revenue and Customs letter dated in the last 3 months • Department for Work and Pensions letter dated in the last 3 months • Occupational pension letter dated in the last 3 months
--	--

7. The reason for recommending to remove medical cards and television licences as acceptable proofs of identity and residence respectively is that both can be obtained without sufficient verification at the time of application and cannot be relied upon for the purposes currently used.
8. The review suggested that London Councils follow government guidelines on acceptable proofs of identity and proof of residency. Officers recommend that the following proofs be accepted:

Proof of Identity and Age	Proof of Residency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current passport • Birth certificate (unless your name has changed) • Current UK or EEA photocard driving licence • Letter of state pension entitlement • European Economic Area ID card • Resident permit issued by the Home Office to EEA nationals • National identity card bearing a photograph of the applicant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility bill (gas, electric, satellite television, landline phone bill) issued within the last three months • Local authority council tax bill for the current council tax year • Current UK driving licence (but not if used as proof of identity) • Bank, Building Society or Credit Union statement or passbook dated within the last three months • Original mortgage statement from a recognised lender issued for the last full year • Solicitor's letter within the last three months confirming recent house purchase or land registry confirmation of address • Council or housing association rent card or tenancy agreement for the current year • Original notification letter from DWP (but not if used as proof of identity) • HMRC self-assessment letters or tax demand dated within the current financial year

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHS Medical card or letter of confirmation from GP's practice of registration with the surgery
--	--

9. The second suggested change was for London Councils to update its document retention policy to ensure that documents used to prove eligibility are retained for as long as the Freedom Pass is valid, so that they can be used as evidence in case of later criminal prosecution. Currently, application documents are retained for three months, after which time they are securely destroyed.
10. There were two main reasons that London Councils set its current policy. The first was on data protection and security grounds i.e. it was a risk to keep copies of potentially sensitive personal information for long periods of time. The second was on cost grounds. It would cost significantly more money to store images of scanned documents.
11. Officers are conscious that there is a balance to be struck here and ask TEC Executive to provide a steer on whether its preference is to maintain the current position in terms of minimising data security risks and cost, or for officers to explore the additional costs of increased document retention for the purpose of retaining evidence to be used to prosecute fraud. Should TEC Executive's preference be the latter, officers will research indicative costs and make them available for consideration by members.
12. The third area officers would like TEC Executive to consider is processes for verifying photographic evidence. In cases where an applicant provides proof of identity and age that contains a photograph, this is fairly straightforward, as the likeness of the applicant contained in the photograph can be compared to the image on the proof.
13. However, where non-photographic proofs are provided, this cannot be done. Previously, when all applications were processed by the Post Office, this could be done at the point the application was provided to the Post Office. However, since 2015, the Post Office has not been involved in handling Freedom Pass applications and this gap has not been filled.
14. In order to close this gap for applications that are not supported by photographic evidence of identity and age, officers recommend that the same criteria for photographic identification as used by the passport service is adopted. This would require photographs to be countersigned by someone who has known the applicant for more than two years, can confirm that they are who they claim to be, and that as far as they know, the information provided to London Councils is true. As with the passport service, the countersignatory would need to be from one of the occupations listed at Appendix 1.
15. If accepted, this recommendation could slow-up the application process for people without photographic proof of identity and age. However, officers consider this inconvenience to be outweighed by the fraud prevention benefits. Should this recommendation be accepted, officers will explore with the current Freedom Pass contractor whether additional costs will arise from this process change.

Financial Implications for London Councils

The Director of Corporate Resources reports that the proposals have no immediate financial implications but notes that recommendations two and three could in the future. Therefore, any future developments in these areas that were above agreed annual budget levels (currently £1.518 million) would be brought to TEC for approval.

Legal Implications for London Councils

None

Equalities Implications for London Councils

None

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- a. Approve the new list of proofs of identity and age, and residency listed in the table at paragraph 8.
- b. Provide a steer on whether their preference is to maintain the current position in terms of minimising data security risks and cost, or for officers to explore the additional costs of increased document retention for the purpose of retaining evidence to be used to prosecute fraud.
- c. Approve that for Freedom Pass applications not supported by photographic evidence of identity and age, the same criteria for photographic identification as used by the passport service is adopted.

Background Papers

N/A

Appendix 1. Proposed List of Freedom Pass Photograph Countersignatories

The countersignatory must either:

- work in (or be retired from) a recognised profession
- be 'a person of good standing in their community'

Recognised professions

Examples of recognised professions include:

- accountant
- airline pilot
- articulated clerk of a limited company
- assurance agent of recognised company
- bank or building society official
- barrister
- chairman or director of a limited company
- chiropodist
- commissioner for oaths
- councillor, for example local or county
- civil servant (permanent)
- dentist
- director, manager or personnel officer of a VAT-registered company
- engineer with professional qualifications
- financial services intermediary, for example a stockbroker or insurance broker
- fire service official
- funeral director
- insurance agent (full time) of a recognised company
- journalist
- Justice of the Peace
- legal secretary (fellow or associate member of the Institute of Legal Secretaries and PAs)
- licensee of a public house
- local government officer
- manager or personnel officer of a limited company
- member, associate or fellow of a professional body
- Member of Parliament
- Merchant Navy officer
- minister of a recognised religion (including Christian Science)
- nurse (RGN or RMN)
- officer of the armed services
- optician
- paralegal (certified paralegal, qualified paralegal or associate member of the Institute of Paralegals)

- person with honours, for example an OBE or MBE
- pharmacist
- photographer (professional)
- police officer
- Post Office official
- president or secretary of a recognised organisation
- Salvation Army officer
- social worker
- solicitor
- surveyor
- teacher or lecturer
- trade union officer
- travel agent (qualified)
- valuer or auctioneer (fellow or associate members of the incorporated society)
- Warrant Officers and Chief Petty Officers

Professions that are not accepted

Your countersignatory cannot:

- work for London Councils, or the London borough in which you reside;
- be a doctor, unless they state that they know you well (for example they're a good friend) and that they recognise you easily from your photo

TEC Executive Committee

HGV Safety Permit Scheme: Update

Item 7

Report by: Spencer Palmer **Job title:** Director, Transport & Mobility
Date: 14 November 2019
Contact Officer: Spencer Palmer, Director, Transport & Mobility
Telephone: 020 7934 9908 **Email:** Spencer.palmer@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report provides an update on London HGV Safety Permit Scheme (Scheme) and seeks the Executive Sub-Committee's approval of the Policy Statement on the issuing of HGV Safety Permits (combined with permits to drive off the Excluded Route Network under the London Lorry Control Scheme) and the HGV Safety Permit and Conditions under the Committee's traffic regulation order powers.

Recommendations: Members are asked to:

1. **Note** the changes to the 1985 Order came into force on 24 August 2019 so that it now covers the London Lorry Control Scheme and London HGV Safety Permit Scheme;
2. **Note** that the legal challenge period to the making of the Amendment Order has expired without challenge;
3. **Approve** the following:
 - The Combined LLCS and HGV Safety Permit Scheme Policy Statement at **Appendix A**;
 - HGV Safety Permit and Conditions at **Appendix B**;

Note the position regarding Barnet LBC participating in the HGV Safety Permit Scheme and the LLCS.

HGV Safety Permit Scheme: Update

Overview

1. The Direct Vision Standard (DVS) has been developed by Transport for London (TfL) to address the high number of collisions involving HGVs and people walking and cycling in London. Using a star system, the DVS rates HGVs from zero (lowest) to five (highest) stars, based on how much a driver can see directly through their HGV cab windows. It was proposed to implement the Standard for HGVs over 12 tonnes (gvw) by the "HGV Safety Permit Scheme" ("Scheme") through changes to the Greater London (Restriction of Goods Vehicles) Traffic Order 1985 ("the 1985 Order") under which the London Lorry Control Scheme (LLCS) currently operates to accommodate the Scheme. Vehicles not meeting the minimum DVS threshold of one star (or which are un-rated under the Standard) would be required to fit up to seven additional safety features to the vehicle to improve its safety.

Background

2. As previously reported and authorised by the Transport & Environment Committee, London Councils has promoted the Greater London (Restriction of Goods Vehicles) Traffic Order 1985 (Amendment) Order 2019 ("Amendment Order") to make the necessary changes to the 1985 Order to implement the Scheme on a mandatory basis. Statutory notices of proposals/intent for the statutory consultation on the Amendment Order were published on 26 April 2019 and the necessary statutory documents placed on deposit and made available online. The statutory consultation closed on 23 May. On 13 June 2019 the Committee considered a report detailing responses to the statutory consultation and the position regarding potential objections and a potential public inquiry. In the event all potential objections were withdrawn and no public inquiry was held. The Committee delegated authority to the Director, Transport & Mobility in those circumstances to proceed to formally make the Amendment Order on the Committee's behalf. This was done by the Director on 23 August 2019 and the Amendment Order came into force next day. Statutory notices of making were published on 27 August 2019 and the six weeks period, within which a legal challenge to the order could be brought in the High Court, expired on 8 October without legal challenge.
3. The 1985 Order is now in effect with the necessary modifications to accommodate the HGV Safety Permit Scheme alongside the LLCS. From 26 October 2020, all HGVs of over 12 tonnes (gvw) will be required to obtain a permit (HGV Safety Permit) to operate on any borough or GLA road in Greater London. It will be a contravention of the 1985 Order to

operate without a permit or, where issued, in breach of its conditions. In the same way as the LLCS, enforcement is de-criminalised by the issue of Penalty Change Notices (PCN) at £500 for operators; recipients of PCNs have the right (subject to TEC approval) to appeal to the Environment and Traffic Adjudicators at London Tribunals.

4. As previously reported to the Committee the Scheme follows the same general arrangements that apply to the LLCS:
 - **Policy Statement:** this sets out the policy basis for issuing permits, including the new Safety Permit. A copy the “Combined Policy Statement” is at **Appendix A**. The policy considerations relating to the LLCS are unchanged. The policy considerations for the Scheme state that a minimum DVS rating is to be regarded as the appropriate level of direct vision necessary to operate an HGV safely in Greater London without requiring additional safety (Safe System) measures to be fitted to the vehicle. This is one star (or un-rated) until 26 October 2024 and three stars from that date. There are seven potential safety features¹ depending on the vehicle specification subject to various exemptions. (These are set out in the Schedule to the Safety Permit – see below).
 - **HGV Safety Permit and Conditions:** this document sets out the conditions subject to which a Safety Permit is to be issued. Here, the conditions for a HGV Safety Permit are sufficiently different to the LLCS to justify its own set of permit conditions, though modelled closely on the LLCS conditions. A copy of the proposed HGV Safety Permit and Conditions is at **Appendix B**.

(Both documents were part of the consultation materials available online and for public inspection during the statutory consultation on the Amendment Order between 26 April and 23 May. No objections or other representations were received regarding their content.)

5. HGV Safety Permits will be issued to operators by TfL free of charge. TfL launched a web portal to process voluntary applications for HGV Safety Permits on 28 October 2019. This is to allow operators a year to obtain a permit and fit any necessary safety equipment prior to the Scheme becoming mandatory and enforceable from 26 October 2020.
6. The London borough of Barnet left the LLCS in 1996 by passing its own traffic regulation order to take it out of the ambit of the 1985 Order. Barnet has agreed to be part of the HGV Safety Permit Scheme and to re-join the LLCS. TfL and London Councils recently met with officers at Barnet to discuss arrangements for the authority to re-join the ambit of the 1985

Order. It has been agreed that it will do this by promoting a traffic regulation order in Spring 2020 to repeal the 1996 Order. The Amendment Order was drafted so that it, and the 1985 Order that it amends, will come into operation in Barnet when that repeal takes effect. From that point Barnet will be part of the LLCS and HGV Safety Permit Scheme.

Approval of Policy Statement and HGV Safety Permit texts

7. The Executive Sub-Committee is asked to formally approve the final versions of the Combined Policy Statement and HGV Safety Permit Conditions, which will be used on the TfL application portal. Drafts of both documents were considered by the Committee at its 13 June meeting and the Executive is asked to approve them on the Committee's behalf.
 - **Combined Policy Statement:** the version appended to this report is unchanged from the earlier one considered by the Committee.
 - **Safety Permit Conditions:** the permit conditions now incorporate the Safe System' vehicle safety measures, which were previously set out in a separate Safe System measures Guidance document, which was considered by the Committee at that meeting.
 - The permit conditions appended to this report are substantially unchanged from that earlier version and now include clarifications to the text concerning notification of changes of vehicle ownership or control and expiry dates for the permit.
 - The text now merges the Safe System measures previously set out in the Guidance with the permit. The seven safety measures and relevant exemptions (Table 1) are repeated in the Schedule to the Permit. (A small change has been made to the Safe System Guidance concerning the fitting of a camera system to the vehicle's nearside following recommendations by operators, and this is also reflected in the Conditions.)
8. It is proposed that a report is considered by the Committee in due course to set out the arrangements to formalise TfL's role in administering the Scheme on its behalf.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

1. **Note** the changes to the 1985 Order came into force on 24 August 2019 so that it now covers the London Lorry Control Scheme and London HGV Safety Permit Scheme;
2. **Note** that the legal challenge period to the making of the Amendment Order has expired without challenge;
3. **Approve** the following:
 - The Combined LLCS and HGV Safety Permit Scheme Policy Statement at **Appendix A**;

- HGV Safety Permit and Conditions at **Appendix B**;
4. **Note** the position regarding Barnet LBC participating in the HGV Safety Permit Scheme and the LLCS.

Financial Implications

The HGV Safety Scheme would be developed with no implementation, operational or future costs to TEC or the London boroughs. TfL will bear all costs involved in the Scheme both now and in the future, including any legal or litigation costs, the holding of a public inquiry, and Barnet re-joining the LLCS, and any signage costs.

Equalities Implications

There are currently no equalities implications arising from the recommendations. A full Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA), including an equalities impact assessment, was published as part of the Phase 2a consultation and an updated IIA was included in the Phase 2c statutory consultation on the Amendment Order.

Background Information

- Information on the DVS and HSP Scheme proposal: www.tfl.gov.uk/direct-vision-standard
- Phase 1 consultation: <https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/direct-vision-standard-phase-1/>
- Phase 2a consultation: <https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/direct-vision-standards-phase-2/>
- Phase 2b consultation: <https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/direct-vision-standard-phase2b/>
- Phase 2c consultation: <https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/direct-vision-standard-phase2c/>

Appendices:

- **Appendix A: Combined LLCS and HGV Safety Permit Policy Statement**
- **Appendix B: HGV Safety Permit & Conditions**

LONDON COUNCILS TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

LONDON LORRY CONTROL SCHEME

LONDON HGV SAFETY STANDARD PERMIT SCHEME

POLICY STATEMENT ON THE ISSUE OF PERMITS

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The following explanatory statement of policy has been approved by London Councils Transport and Environment Committee to provide guidance for operators of vehicles affected by the Greater London (Restriction of Goods Vehicles) Traffic Order 1985 ("the Traffic Order"). The Traffic Order establishes the London Lorry Control Scheme ("LLCS") which has been in operation since 1985. It was amended on 23 August 2019¹ to introduce the requirements of the London HGV Safety Standard Permit Scheme. Both schemes are described below. This Policy Statement covers both Schemes.

London Lorry Control Scheme Permits

- 1.2 The intention of the London Lorry Control Scheme is to improve the environment for Londoners by reducing disturbance from heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) at night-time and weekends. This improvement will be achieved in two ways:
- by preventing lorries (HGVs) **over 18 tonnes** (gvw) from travelling on restricted roads during the controlled hours² unless they have a legitimate business which requires them to be there;
 - by ensuring that lorries which are on those roads cause as little disturbance as possible by requiring them to have a LLCS Permit with conditions ("LLCS Conditions") that require they are operated quietly and in an environmental way.
- 1.3 All roads in Greater London are now "restricted roads" for the purposes of the LLCS and an "excluded road" is a road to which the LLCS restrictions do not apply. The "Excluded Route Network" (ERN) is the network of excluded roads, as set out in the Schedule to the Traffic Order.
- 1.4 LLCS Permits are administered by the London Councils Lorry Control Administration Section.

London HGV Safety Permits

- 1.5 The intention of the HGV Safety Permit ("HSP") Scheme is to reduce the number of people killed and seriously injured on London's roads by improving the safety of HGVs of 12 tonnes (gvw) or over operating in Greater London. Using a star system, the Direct Vision Standard (DVS) rates HGVs from zero (lowest) to five (highest) stars, based on how much a driver can see directly through their HGV cab windows in relation to vulnerable road users, such as cyclists and pedestrians in the area of greatest collision risk around the vehicle.
- 1.6 This highway safety improvement will be achieved by:
- 1.7 requiring all HGVs 12 tonnes or over to obtain a permit ("HGV Safety Permit") to operate in Greater London from 28 October 2020;
- 1.8 granting HGV Safety Permits to all vehicles rated One Star or above under DVS; and
- 1.9 imposing Safe System Conditions on the HGV Safety Permits of those vehicles rated Zero Star (or those unrated) under DVS. These Safe System Conditions require the vehicle to be fitted with additional equipment to improve its safety for other road users.
- 1.10 All roads in Greater London are covered by the HSP Scheme as "restricted roads". No roads are excluded and so there is no ERN where this Scheme is concerned.
- 1.11 HGV Safety Permits are administered by Transport for London.

¹ By the Greater London (Restriction of Goods Vehicles) Traffic Order 1985 (Amendment) Order 2019 which was made by London Councils Transport and Environment Committee on 23 August 2019 and came into force the following day.

² The "Controlled Hours" for the LLCS Scheme are: (1) **Mondays to Fridays:** midnight and 7.00am and between 9.00pm and midnight (2) **Saturdays:** between midnight and 7.00am and between 1.00pm and midnight and (3) **Sundays:** all day.

Interaction between the two schemes

- 1.12 All 12 tonnes and over HGVs require a HGV Safety Permit to operate on any road in Greater London issued subject to "HGV Safety Permit Conditions", including the Safe System Conditions where applicable.
- 1.13 All such Zero Star (or un-rated) HGVs must operate in accordance with the Safe System Conditions and fit additional safety equipment; those rated One Star and above can be operated without such additional equipment.
- 1.14 All 18 tonnes and over HGVs intending to drive on roads off the ERN during controlled hours require a LLCS Permit, issued subject to LLCS Conditions.
- 1.15 In this document a "Permit" refers to a LLCS Permit or HGV Safety Permit, as appropriate, and "Conditions" to the LLCS Conditions or HGV Safety Permit Conditions.

2. PERMIT APPLICATIONS

- 2.1 An applicant may apply for a LLCS Permit and/or HGV Safety Permit for a vehicle which he or she proposes to use in circumstances affected by either Scheme and which is or will be under his or her control. If the applicant is not the owner of the vehicle, he or she must show that he or she is able to make the application and is able to ensure that Conditions attached to any permit that may be issued are complied with.

3. CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE ISSUE OF LLCS PERMITS AND HGV SAFETY PERMITS

- 3.1 The following matters will be taken into account in considering an application for a LLCS Permit or HGV Safety Permit (and the imposition of any Conditions attached thereto).
 - 3.1.1 The statutory duties on Transport for London and London Boroughs as traffic authorities under the **Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, Section 122 (1) and (2)** to secure the expeditious, safe and convenient movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, so far as is practicable, having regard to:
 - the need for securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;
 - the effect of the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles on the amenities of any locality concerned;
 - the national air quality strategy;
 - the need to assist public transport and its passengers;
 - 3.1.3 **Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, Section 6:** the purposes of controlling or regulating vehicular traffic as mentioned in section 6(1) of that Act, in particular those relating to highway safety and air quality mentioned in section 1 (1) (a), (c), (d) and (g):
 - avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising;
 - facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians);
 - preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property;
 - the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality); and
 - 3.1.5 **Road Traffic Act 1988, Section 39(3):** the duty, in the light of studies into accidents arising out of the use of vehicles, to take such measures, including those taken in the exercise of its powers for controlling, protecting or assisting the movement of traffic on roads, as appears to it to be appropriate to prevent accidents;
 - 3.1.6 Any other matters appearing relevant.

4. POLICIES ON GRANTING LLCS PERMITS

- 4.1 In particular (but without prejudice to above the generality of the above) the following considerations will be taken into account when deciding whether to grant an application for a LLCS Permit:
 - the circumstances of the applicant's needs for a LLCS Permit;
 - the environmental circumstances of the roads on which the vehicle is to be used and the extent to which the ERN, i.e. roads with no night-time and weekend controls, can satisfy the applicant's requirements;
 - the financial, commercial, professional, industrial, employment and other consequences likely to result from the issue or refusal of a Permit;

- the characteristics of the vehicles;
 - any special efforts made to reduce the environmental impact of the applicant's vehicle;
 - the practicability of and time required for adapting the applicant's operations;
 - the possibility of using other less environmentally damaging modes of transport
- 4.2 The following explanation (including some examples to illustrate some of the considerations) is intended to provide further guidance for operators of vehicles which are affected by the LLCS.
- 4.3 The most important criterion in deciding whether or not to grant a LLCS Permit is the applicant's need for it. First and foremost it is the Committee's policy to ensure that only vehicles undertaking necessary business in London should be permitted to use restricted roads.
- 4.4 The environmental circumstances of a road are relevant, for example where premises are linked to the ERN by a road which has no residential development, and which has not been identified by the Committee as an excluded road. Permits may be issued until the road concerned can conveniently be included in a supplementary order.
- 4.5 Another relevant consideration is when the continued viability of a firm may be affected by the LLCS. Permits may be granted while further consideration is given to finding an appropriate solution on a more permanent basis.
- 4.6 Certain companies already display a high degree of environmental awareness, involving such matters as driver training, or the use of vehicles which make less environmental impact. Matters such as these will be given due consideration. In other cases it would be reasonable to expect applicants to modify existing vehicles or choose more environmentally suitable vehicles when new purchases are made. Guidance will be available to applicants when they apply for exemption Permits.
- 4.7 It is the Committee's policy to seek the highest legally specifiable standards for vehicles in respect of which LLCS Permits are issued to ensure that they have the minimum adverse effect on the environment.
- 4.8 Where LLCS Condition 5 applies to an LLCS Permit, vehicles must minimise their use of roads away from the ERN unless a special routeing agreement is made with LLCS Administration Section. Such a routeing agreement will only be made if:
- the applicant, in proposing a route, can demonstrate that the alternative route results in reduced overall environmental impact, particularly in terms of noise effect on residential properties adjacent to the route; and
 - the holder is granted a LLCS Permit lasting at least three months.
- 4.9 Each case will be considered on its merits.
- 4.10 LLCS Permits will be specific to an applicant and a vehicle and will not be transferable to any other person or vehicle.

POLICIES ON GRANTING HGV SAFETY PERMITS

5. The primary purpose of the HGV Safety Permit Scheme is to increase the safety of vehicles and reduce the chances of collisions with vulnerable road users by encouraging the use of vehicles with increased driver direct vision. The Direct Vision Standard will identify those vehicles with unacceptably poor levels of direct vision to operate safely in Greater London and require those below a minimum acceptable rating to fit additional safety equipment to maximise safety as regards vulnerable road users.
- From 26 October 2020 it will be a requirement for all HGVs over 12 tonnes entering Greater London to have been granted a HGV Safety Permit.
 - Taking into account (amongst other matters) the current composition of the HGV 12 tonnes+ fleet in Greater London, the supply of "good" rated vehicles, the economic and operational impacts on HGV operators, the introduction by manufacturers of good rated HGVs into the supply chain, it is considered an initial minimum standard of One Star is appropriate for the first four years of the Scheme.
 - Those vehicles rated One Star DVS until 26 October 2024 are considered "good" in terms of their DVS rating.
 - Taking those matters into account the progressive minimum standard will increase to Three Stars from 26 October 2024.
 - Vehicles not meeting the above minimum DVS requirements must mitigate the potential harm they pose to vulnerable road users by fitting the additional safety equipment detailed in the Safe System Conditions. It is a legal requirement to comply with the Safe System Conditions.
 - The Safe System Conditions will be revised and consulted ahead of 2024 in order to consider any new appropriate technological developments

- Other conditions may be imposed on any HGV of irrespective the vehicle's DVS rating, as considered appropriate.
- 5.2 The Committee has determined that the appropriate minimum acceptable DVS threshold to operate a 12 tonnes or over HGV safely on roads in Greater London ("minimum DVS rating") having regard to the potential dangers posed to vulnerable road users is:
- One Star until 26 October 2024; and
 - Three Stars from 26 October 2024.
- 5.3 Where an application is made for a HGV Safety Permit, a permit will be granted to:
- an HGV meeting the minimum DVS star rating, without the Safe System Conditions being attached;
 - a vehicle not meeting the minimum DVS rating or which is un-rated will only be granted a HGV Safety Permit subject to the Safe System Conditions being attached.
- 5.4 HGV Safety Permits will be specific to an applicant and a vehicle and will not be transferable to any other person or vehicle.

6. DURATION OF PERMITS

- 6.1 The duration of LLCS Permits may be for such a period as seems reasonable in all the relevant circumstances. All LLCS Permits will automatically cease to be valid once the particular vehicle is no longer in the ownership of or under the control of the applicant and the applicant must inform the LLCS Administration Section of this immediately in writing.
- 6.2 The duration of a HGV Safety Permit will depend on whether the vehicle met the minimum DVS requirement or if it was granted subject to the Safe System Conditions:
- Vehicles rated Zero Star (or un-rated) and therefore subject to the Safe System Conditions will expire on 27 October 2024;
 - Vehicles rated One or Two Star will expire on 27 October 2024; and
 - Vehicles rated Three, Four or Five Star will expire on 25 October 2030 or ten years after the application date if later than 26 October 2020 (whichever the later).

7. APPEALS

- 7.1 If an applicant is refused a Permit or it is granted with Conditions unacceptable to the applicant, he or she is entitled to appeal. Similarly, users whose Permits are revoked or suspended may appeal.
- 7.2 Appeals regarding LLCS Permits must be made through the official London Councils complaints procedure. A temporary short-term exemption LLCS Permit may be issued, if considered appropriate, pending the outcome of an appeal against a refusal to issue or the revocation of the permit
- 7.3 Appeals regarding HGV Safety Permits must be made through the official Transport for London complaints procedure.

8. IMPLEMENTATION

- 8.1 It is expected that all applicants will use their best endeavours to implement not only the letter but also the spirit of the Traffic Order and the Conditions attached to Permits. To assist in ensuring that the Order and Conditions are implemented London Councils and TfL will employ officers whose duty it will be to advise, assist and check on the operation of vehicles. All applicants for Permits are expected to co-operate with these officers in the reasonable exercise of their duties and, if necessary, to comply with Conditions attached to the LLCS or HGV Safety Permit.
- 8.2 Failure to comply with Permit Conditions may result in the revocation or suspension of that Permit; suspension may be immediate where there is a danger to public safety. The applicant's past record of compliance generally will be a relevant consideration when future applications are considered.

GREATER LONDON (RESTRICTION OF GOODS VEHICLES) TRAFFIC ORDER 1985

LONDON HGV SAFETY PERMIT SCHEME

CONDITIONS ATTACHED A HGV SAFETY PERMIT

The following conditions were approved on 21 March 2019 by London Councils Transport & Environment Committee to apply to all HGV Safety Permits granted under the London HGV Safety Permit Scheme provisions of the Greater London (Restriction of Goods Vehicles) Traffic Order 1985 ("Traffic Order", as amended).

Notes:

- A. An HGV Safety Permit is required before an HGV in excess of 12 tonnes (gvw) ("the Vehicle") is operated¹ on any public road² in Greater London
- B. The HGV Safety Permit of any Vehicle not meeting the "minimum Direct Vision Standard (DVS) requirement" star rating (One Star or un-rated until 27 October 2024 and Three Stars after that date) will be granted subject to the Safe System Conditions set out in Condition 8 below. (The measures included in the Safe System will be reviewed in 2024; any new measures to be included in the System will be confirmed prior to 28 October 2024.)
- C. In these Conditions, unless stated otherwise, the word "applicant" shall be taken to mean both (1) the applicant for the HGV Safety Permit and, if different from the applicant, (2) the person to whom the HGV Safety Permit is granted or driver of the Vehicle in respect of which a HGV Safety Permit is granted.
- D. An HGV Safety Permit is valid under the Traffic Order³ for all public roads in Greater London for the duration of the Permit.
- E. Failure to comply with these Conditions may result in the revocation or suspension of the HGV Safety Permit. Suspension may be immediate if it is considered in the interests of public safety. It is a contravention of the Traffic Order to operate the Vehicle on any public road in Greater London while its HGV Safety Permit is suspended.
- F. It is a contravention of the Traffic Order to either (1) fail to obtain a HGV Safety Permit for a Vehicle prior to operating on any public road in Greater London, including when the Permit has been suspended or (2) operate the Vehicle in contravention of these Conditions (including the Safe System Conditions where they apply). A Penalty Charge Notice may be issued to operators/ hauliers for £550 and £130 for drivers (reduced by half if paid within 14 days).

General Conditions applying to all HGV Safety Permits

¹ Article 3(a) of the Traffic Order refers to the Vehicle being "used or driven (or caused or permitted to be driven".

² This is any highway or length of highway maintainable at public expense, in Greater London; referred to as the "restricted roads" in the Traffic Order

³ Articles 3(a)(i) and 4(1) of the Traffic Order.

1. The applicant shall operate the vehicle for which the HGV Safety Permit is issued in compliance with the requirements/ measures set out in these Conditions.
2. The applicant and the driver of the Vehicle shall co-operate in assisting any authorised officer of London Councils and/ or of Transport for London in the reasonable exercise of his/her duties in checking whether the vehicle has been modified and/or is being operated in accordance with the Conditions.
3. An applicant shall bring to the attention of the driver of the Vehicle all Conditions subject to which this HGV Safety Permit has been issued. However, this does not remove the applicant's responsibility for compliance with these Conditions.
4. The HGV Safety Permit is granted to the applicant for the specified vehicle and is not transferable to another vehicle or vehicle registration mark, and where granted to an individual or sole trader, may not be transferred to another Operator. The permit will automatically cease to be valid if the vehicle ceases to be under the ownership or control (as applicable) of the applicant and it shall then be the duty of the applicant to inform Transport for London of this immediately in writing via tfl.gov.uk/modes/driving/dvs-contact-us
5. The duration of a HGV Safety Permit will depend on whether the vehicle met the minimum DVS requirement or if it was granted subject to the Safe System Conditions:
 - The Permits of Vehicles rated Zero Star or un-rated (subject to the Safe System Conditions) will expire at the end of 25 October 2024;
 - The Permits of Vehicles rated One or Two Star will expire at the end of 25 October 2024; and
 - The Permits of Vehicles rated Three, Four or Five Star will expire at the end of 25 October 2030 or ten years after the application date if granted later than 26 October 2020 (whichever is the later).
6. No vehicle may be operated on any public road in Greater London during any time while its HGV Safety Permit is suspended.
7. The applicant shall ensure that all modifications, and any existing features fitted to the Vehicle to reduce its environmental impact and/ or increase its potential safety as regards other road users, including those required by Condition 8 below are:
 - maintained and kept in proper working order at all times; and
 - operated properly and appropriately in accordance with manufacturers' instructions.

Safe System Conditions where a vehicle does not meet the minimum DVS star rating

8. The applicant shall carry out and complete modifications to the Vehicle so as to comply with the measures set out in the Schedule (Safe System Measures) within the period specified subject to any further conditions, restrictions or limitations or exemptions indicated.

SCHEDULE

Safe System Measures

The following measures shall be fitted from 26 October 2020 unless an exemption is indicated in **Table 1** below:

1*	A Class V mirror shall be fitted to the nearside of the vehicle
2*	A Class VI mirror shall be fitted to the front of the vehicle
3*	Side under-run protection shall be fitted to both sides of the vehicle (except where this is impractical or proves to be impossible)
4*	External pictorial stickers and markings shall be displayed on vehicles to warn vulnerable road users of the hazards around the vehicle
5	A sensor system that alerts the driver to the presence of a vulnerable road user shall be fitted to the nearside of the vehicle
6	Audible vehicle manoeuvring warning shall be fitted to warn vulnerable road users when a vehicle is turning left
7	A fully operational camera monitoring system shall be fitted to the nearside of the vehicle

(* indicates certain vehicle types are exempt as indicated in Table 1)

Table 1: Exemptions from Safe System Measures No.s 1 to 4 above as indicated

Corresponding Safe System Measure that exemption applies to	Road sweepers	Gully emptier/ sucker	Breakdown organisations/ recovery vehicles (where not fully exempt)	Tractors for articulated vehicles	Vehicles mounted with cranes and/ or access working platforms	Vehicles fitted with items in the area where a sideguard would otherwise be fitted e.g. fuel tanks and equipment boxes	Tank-vehicles (see [A] below)	Vehicle transporters (see [B] below)	Vehicles equipped with anchorage points for roll-on/ roll-off transport	Bonneted vehicles. (Unimog only)	Vehicles fitted with any combination of direct view and/or indirect vision devices as an alternative to fitting a Class V or Class VI mirror	Tractors for articulated vehicles
1											X	
2										X	X	
3	X	X	X1 see below	X2 see below	X3 see below	X4 see below	X5 see below	X6 see below	X7 see below			
4												X8 see below

[A] **Tank Vehicle:** a vehicle designed solely for the carriage of fluid substances in a closed tank permanently fitted to the vehicle and provided with hose or pipe connections for loading or unloading.

[B] **Vehicle Transporter:** a vehicle specially designed and constructed, and not merely adapted, to carry other vehicles loaded on to it from the front or the rear.

- Only exempt where the sides of the vehicle are so designed and/or equipped that by their shape and characteristics their component parts together meet the requirements as to the fitting of sideguards or provision of lateral under-run protection.
- All trailers used with the exempt tractor unit will be required to fit sideguards (unless covered by an additional exemption).
- Exempt where applicable
 - From the forward point of the vehicle stabiliser legs
 - Otherwise where it is not fully practicable to comply with requirements as to the fitting of sideguards.
- Only where the shape and characteristics of such items or components would provide lateral under-run protection equal to that of a sideguard, provided that the spaces between component items providing lateral under-run protection shall not exceed 300mm.
- If it is not possible for practical reasons to comply with requirements as to the fitting of sideguards because to do so would prevent (not merely hinder) the operation of the vehicle's hose or pipe connections.

6. If the chassis rails are located on the extremities of the vehicle.
7. To the extent that there are gaps within the sideguard to accept the passage and tensioning of fixings or lashings.
8. All trailers used with the tractor unit will be required to fit warning signage.

London Councils TEC Executive Sub-Committee

Month 6 Revenue Forecast 2019/20 Item no: 8

Report by: Frank Smith **Job title:** Director of Corporate Resources
Date: 14 November 2019
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 September 2019 for TEC and provides a forecast of the outturn position for 2019/20. At this stage, a surplus of £595,000 is forecast over the budget figure. In addition, total expenditure in respect of Taxicard trips taken by scheme members is forecast to underspend by a net figure of £2.935 million, if trip volumes in the second quarter continue for the remainder of the year. The net borough proportion of this underspend is projected to be their full budget of £1.495 million, with £1.440 million accruing to TfL.

Recommendations The Executive Sub-Committee is asked to :

- note the projected surplus of £595,000 for the year, plus the forecast net underspend of £2.935 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in this report; and
- note the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraph 5 of this report and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee included in paragraphs 6-8.

Month 6 Revenue Forecast 2019/20

1. This is the second budget monitoring report to be presented to the Committee during the current financial year. The next report will be the Month 9 figures (31 December 2019) for the year, which will be reported to the February 2020 meeting of this Committee.
2. The London Councils Transport and Environment Committee's income and expenditure revenue budget for 2019/20 as approved by the Full Committee in December 2018, is set out in Appendix A (Expenditure) and Appendix B (Income). The appendices show the actual income and expenditure at 30 September 2019 and an estimate of the forecast outturn for the year, together with the projected variance from the approved budget. However, the budget is adjusted for:
 - the confirmation of borough and TfL funding for the Taxicard scheme for the year (a reduction of £620,000);
 - confirmation of payments made to the Rail Delivery Group (a reduction of £503,000); and
 - confirmation of the resources carried forward from 2018/19 (£133,000) approved by this Sub-Committee in July 2019.

Variance from Budget

3. The current figures indicate that the Committee is projected to underspend gross expenditure budgets by £2.597 million and post a deficit of income of £2.002 million over the approved budget target for the year. However, these figures include offsetting amounts of £2.935 million relating to payments and income for taxicard trips, making an overall projected net surplus of £595,000. Table 1 below summarises the forecast position, with commentary that details the trends that have begun to emerge during the first quarter and providing explanations for the variances that are projected.

Table 1 –Summary Forecast as at 30 September 2019

	M6 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
Expenditure	£000	£000	£000	£000
Employee Costs	361	716	732	16
Running Costs	23	271	157	(114)
Central Recharges	186	77	458	381
Total Operating Expenditure	570	1,064	1,347	283
Direct Services	4,888	9,221	9,584	363
Research	0	40	37	(3)
Payments in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	175,599	355,105	351,865	(3,240)
Total Expenditure	181,057	365,430	362,833	(2,597)
Income				
Contributions in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	(175,889)	(355,254)	(352,580)	2,674
Income for direct services	(4,946)	(9,689)	(10,312)	(624)
Core Member Subscriptions	(49)	(97)	(97)	-
Government Grants	-	-	-	-
Interest on Investments	(26)	-	(51)	(51)
Other Income	(19)	(71)	(69)	2
Transfer from Reserves	-	(320)	(320)	-
Total Income	(180,928)	(365,430)	(363,428)	2,002
Net Expenditure	129	-	(595)	(595)

4. The projected surplus of £595,000 is made up broadly of the following:

- A projected overall surplus of £106,000 in respect of TEC parking traded services, after considering an estimate of the level of borough/TfL/GLA usage volumes during the first half of the year. This is attributable to several areas:
 - Firstly, there is a projected net surplus of £73,000 in respect of environmental and traffic appeals. This is made up of a surplus in appeals income of £68,000 plus a net underspend against budget of £5,000 on adjudicator fees and Northgate unit charges. The estimated number of notice of appeals and statutory declarations received over the first five months amounts to 18,634, giving a projected number for the year of 44,722 which is 3,028 more than the budgeted figure of 41,694. The current indicative throughput of appeals is 3.78 appeals per hour, compared to a budget figure of 3.41.
 - Secondly, the transaction volumes for other parking systems used by boroughs and TfL over the second quarter are projected to result in a net deficit of £12,000;
 - In April 2019 the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) was introduced to London, the result of which is an increase in RUCA appeals being heard. Northgate fixed costs have been increased and are currently estimated to be £128,000 over budget as a result of this. Additional income of £173,000 is estimated at this stage of the year to cover the additional Northgate costs and associated increases to the proportion of the hearing centre premises costs which are now being attributed to RUCA based on appeal numbers.
- As discussed in the Quarter 1 report to a detailed review of how London Councils apports its central costs between the three committees has identified some overheads, which are attributed to members of staff working on TEC related activities, which were not being fully passed on to TEC. This has now been addressed and has resulted in additional costs of approximately £421,000 being included in the TEC forecast largely within central recharges but also within Direct Services and Freedom Pass & Taxicard, along with additional staffing costs of approximately £16,000.
- A projected underspend on running costs of £114,000 based on payment made to date.
- A projected underspend of £150,000 in respect of the £1.3 million budget for payments to independent bus operators, which reflects a lower take up of new bus operators compared to the contingent element of the budget.
- A projected underspend of £172,000 in respect of the £1.518 million budget for the issuing/reissuing costs of Freedom Passes. This however is based on invoices received in the early part of the year so may fluctuate during the period. This budget will therefore be monitored and managed throughout the financial year.
- Based on income collected during the first quarter, income receipts from replacement Freedom Passes are forecast to exceed the budget of £750,000 by £270,000, which, along with the above projected reissue budget underspend, will be applied to into the TEC committee Specific Reserve.
- Based on income collected during the first quarter, receipts from Lorry Control PCN income are forecast to exceed the budget of £900,00 by approximately £200,000.

- A marginal overspend of £24,000 on the administration costs associated with providing the concessionary fares service; and
- A forecasted amount of interest on investments of £51,000 not previously budgeted for.

Committee Reserves

- Table 2 below updates the Committee on the projected level of reserves as at 31 March 2020, if all current known liabilities and commitments are considered:

Table 2– Analysis of Projected Uncommitted Reserves as at 31 March 2020

	General Reserve	Specific Reserve	Total
	£000	£000	£000
Unaudited reserves at 1 April 2019	3,936	3,553	7,489
Transfer between reserves	-	-	-
Approved in setting 2019/20 budget (December 2018)	(187)	-	(187)
Carried forward amounts from 2018/19	(133)	-	(133)
2020 renewal spend	-	(1,176)	(1,176)
TEC Special projects	-	(750)	(750)
Projected Budget Surplus/(Deficit) 2019/20	153	442	595
Estimated Residual Balances at 31 March 2020	3,769	2,069	5,838

Conclusions

- This report reflects the position at the second-quarter stage in the current financial year and forecasts a surplus position of £595,000 for the year. In addition, taxicard trips are forecast to underspend by £2.935 million, with the borough proportion of this underspend projected to be £1.495 million, with £1.440 million accruing to TfL.
- Much of the projected surplus is attributable to a projected surplus on trading operations based on transaction volumes during the second quarter, plus additional projected income from replacement Freedom Passes and Lorry Control scheme PCNs. However, this is somewhat offset by additional central recharges charged to TEC.
- After considering the forecast surplus and known commitments, general reserves are forecast to be £3.769 million at the year-end, which equates to 29% of budgeted operating and trading expenditure of £12.911 million. This figure continues to exceed the Committee's formal policy on reserves, agreed in November 2015 that reserves should equate to between 10-15% of annual operating expenditure. This issue is explored in greater detail in the report of the draft revenue budget proposals in 2020/21, which is subject to a separate report on this agenda.

Recommendations

- Members are asked to :
 - note the projected surplus of £595,000 for the year, plus the forecast underspend of £2.935 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in this report; and

- note the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraph 5 of this report and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee included in paragraphs 6-8.

Financial Implications for London Councils

As detailed in report

Legal Implications for London Councils

None

Equalities Implications for London Councils

None

Appendices

Appendix A (Expenditure), Appendix B (Income)

Background Papers

London Councils-TEC Budget working papers 2019/20

London Councils Income and Expenditure Forecast File 2019/20

TEC M6 Expenditure Forecast 2019/20

Appendix A

	Revised 2019/20 £000	Month 6 ATD £000	Month 6 Forecast £000	Month 6 Variance £000
Payments in respect of Concessionary Fares				
TfL	320,913	160,457	320,913	0
RDG	19,450	9,726	19,450	0
Other Bus Operators	1,300	575	1,150	-150
Freedom Pass issue costs	1,518	592	1,346	-172
Freedom Pass Administration	498	261	522	24
City Fleet Taxicard contract	10,856	3,707	7,921	-2,935
Taxicard Administration	570	281	563	-7
	355,105	175,599	351,865	-3,240
TEC Trading Account Expenditure				
Payments to Adjudicators- ETA	790	325	779	-11
Payments to Adjudicators - RUCA	264	172	413	149
Northgate variable contract costs - ETA	293	125	299	6
Northgate variable contract costs - RUCA	80	48	129	49
Northgate variable contract costs - Other	209	101	205	-4
Payments to Northampton County Court	4,000	2,531	4,000	0
Lorry Control Administration	859	342	822	-37
ETA/RUCA Administration	2,687	1,224	2,895	208
HEB Administration	40	20	43	3
	9,221	4,888	9,585	364
Sub-Total	364,326	180,487	361,450	-2,876
Operating Expenditure				
Contractual Commitments				
NG Fixed Costs	94	15	94	0
	94	15	94	0
Salary Commitments				
Non-operational staffing costs	666	351	707	41
Members	19	10	19	0
Maternity Provision	30	0	5	-25
	715	361	731	16
Other Commitments				
Supplies and service	177	8	63	-114
Research	40	0	37	-3
	217	8	100	-117
Total Operating Expenditure	1,026	384	925	-101
Central Recharges	77	186	458	381
Total Expenditure	365,430	181,057	362,833	-2,597

	Revised 2019/20 £000	Month 6 ATD £000	Month 6 Forecast £000	Month 6 Variance £000
Borough contributions to TfL	320,913	160,457	320,913	0
Borough contributions to ATOC	19,450	9,726	19,450	0
Borough contributions to other bus operators	1,300	650	1,300	0
Borough contributions to FP issue costs	1,518	592	1,518	0
Borough contributions to freedom pass administration	0	0	0	0
Income from replacing lost/faulty freedom passes	750	427	1,020	-270
Income from replacing lost/faulty taxicards	18	4	9	9
Borough contributions to Comcab	1,495	0	0	1,495
TfL contribution to Taxicard scheme	9,360	3,707	7,920	1,440
Borough contributions to taxicard administration	326	326	326	0
TfL Contribution to taxicard administration	124	0	124	0
	355,254	175,889	352,580	2,674
TEC trading account income				
Borough contributions to Lorry ban administration	0	0	0	0
Lorry ban PCNs	900	660	1,100	-200
Borough parking appeal charges	901	430	1,033	-132
TfL parking appeal charges	182	49	118	64
GLA Congestion charging appeal income	343	230	542	-199
Borough fixed parking costs	1,990	995	1,990	0
TfL fixed parking costs	216	108	216	0
GLA fixed parking costs	575	288	748	-173
Borough other parking services	582	282	564	18
Northampton County Court Recharges	4,000	1,904	4,000	0
	9,689	4,946	10,311	-622
Sub-Total	364,943	180,835	362,891	2,052
Core borough subscriptions				
Joint Committee	46	23	46	0
TEC (inc TfL)	51	26	51	0
	97	49	97	0
Other Income				
TfL secretariat recharge	30	0	31	-1
Investment income	0	26	51	-51
Other income	0	0	0	0
Sales of Health Emergency badges	40	19	38	2
	70	45	120	-50
Transfer from Reserves	320	0	320	0
Central Recharges	0	0	0	0
Total Income Base Budget	365,430	180,929	363,428	2,002

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub-Committee

Draft Revenue Budget and Borough Charges 2020/21 Item no: 9

Report by: Frank Smith **Job title:** Director of Corporate Resources
Date: 14 November 2019
Contact Officer: Frank Smith
Telephone: 020 7934 9700 **Email:** frank.smith@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary

This report details the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2020/21.

The Executive Sub-Committee is asked to comment on these outline proposals, in order that any comments can be consolidated in the further report for the main TEC meeting in December, where the detailed budget proposals and levels of subscriptions and charges for 2020/21 will be presented for approval.

Recommendations

The Executive-Sub Committee is asked to recommend that the main Committee approve at their meeting on 5 December:

- The proposed individual levies and charges for 2020/21 as follows:
 - The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2019/20 - £1,500; paragraph 38);
 - The Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.3708 per PCN which will be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2018/19 (2019/20 - £0.3760 per PCN; paragraphs 36-37);
 - No charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass Administration Charge, which is covered by replacement Freedom Pass income (2019/20 – nil charge; paragraph 15);
 - The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,182 in total (2019/20 - £338,182; paragraphs 17-18).
 - No charge to boroughs in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which is fully covered by estimated PCN income (2020/21 – nil charge; paragraphs 19-20);

- Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) - charge of £27.35 per appeal or £23.63 per appeal where electronic evidence is provided by the enforcing authority (2019/20 - £28.75/£25.08 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £21.78 for hard copy submissions and £21.04 for electronic submissions (2019/20 - £23.23/£22.50 per SD) (paragraphs 26-27);
- Road User Charging Adjudicators (RUCA) – to be recovered on a full cost recovery basis under the contract arrangements with the GLA (paragraph 28);
- A unit charge of £12 for the replacement of a lost or damaged Freedom Pass (2019/20 - £12; paragraph 10);
- The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2019/20 - £7.53; paragraphs 29-35);
- The TRACE (Fax/Email) Charge of £7.70 per transaction, which is levied in addition to the electronic charge of £7.53 per transaction, making a total of £15.23 (2019/20 - £15.23; paragraphs 29-35);
- The TEC¹ Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2019/20 - £0.175; paragraphs 29-35).
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £367.434 million for 2020/21, 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 £366.855 million for 2020/21, with a recommended transfer of £579,000 from uncommitted Committee reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B; and
- To consider the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 52-56 and Table 8 of this report.

The Executive-Sub Committee is also asked to note:

- the indicative total charges to individual boroughs for 2020/21, dependent upon volumes generated through the various parking systems, as set out in Appendix C.1.

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

Introduction

1. This report details the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2020/21. The report seeks comments from the Executive Sub-Committee in order that recommendations can be made to the main Committee meeting in December, who will formally set the budget and the associated level of subscriptions and charges for 2020/21.
2. The report will, therefore, examine the key features of the proposed budget for 2020/21 and make proposals as to the level of charges for the Committee's consideration.

Budgetary pressures

3. There are several significant budgetary pressures that will impact on the revenue budget for 2020/21. These are:
 - An estimated 2% officer pay award has been built in to the budget from April 2020 which adds approximately £42,000 to the overall salaries bill for TEC;
 - Incremental drift relating to staff salary progression amounts to an additional £18,000 in 2020/21 for the Committee;
 - Additional central recharges of £429k arising from a review and correction of the recharge model and some increase relating to the depreciation of the capital costs of the refurbishment work at Southwark Street;
 - The Chancery Exchange offices, where the London Tribunals hearing centre is based, will be subject to a rent review in March 2020, which will result in additional costs within the TEC committee estimated to be in the region of £100,000; and
 - CPI in the year to August 2017 is now running at 1.7%, meaning that there will be increased pressure on overall contract prices.

Proposed Revenue Budget 2020/21 – Provisional Overview

4. As well as having to accommodate the effect of the budgetary pressures outlined in paragraph 3, the budget proposals in this report incorporate the following assumptions, leading to the following levels of subscriptions, charges and specific budget totals being recommended to the Executive Sub-Committee for consideration:
 - A provisional reduction in the TfL element of the Freedom Pass settlement for 2020/21 of £2.149 million, or 0.67%. (paragraph 6);
 - A provisional increase in the Rail Delivery Group element of the freedom pass settlement of £1.933 million, which equates to 9.7%. However, officers are still in negotiation with the RDG and will update TEC accordingly in December (paragraph 7);
 - Maintaining the budget for payments to other bus operators for local journeys originating in London at current year's level of £1.3 million, following projections for 2020/21, based on current claim trends being lodged by operators (paragraph 8).

- No change in the annual Freedom Pass survey and reissue costs budget to remain at the current year's level of £1.518 million, which will include the cost of the annual pass eligibility review that yields significant cost savings for boroughs (paragraph 9);
- No change in the unit cost of a replacement Freedom Pass of £12 or income budget of £750,000 (paragraph 10);
- A continued nil charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass administration fee, which remains fully funded by income receipts from replacing Freedom Passes that are lost or damaged (paragraph 15);
- No change in the TfL and borough contributions to the taxicard scheme budget of £9.360 million and £2.116 million respectively, which will be subject to confirmation by all parties in early 2020. The indicative budgetary provision for the taxicard trips contract with CityFleet Networks Limited, will, therefore, be an amalgam of the TFL and borough funding, currently equating to £11.476 million for 2020/21, which is no change on the revised budget for the current year (paragraph 16);
- The total Taxicard administration charge of £338,182 being held at the current year's level, requiring a subsidy from TEC reserves of £101,146, which will be apportioned to boroughs in accordance with the total active scheme membership as at 30 September 2019 and equates to a 6.7% increase per scheme member (paragraphs 17-18);
- A continued nil charge to boroughs in respect of the London Lorry Control scheme, which remains fully financed from PCN income receipts. The income budget for such receipts is proposed to increase by £100,000 to £1 million for 2020/21, based on actual and forecast outturn receipts over recent financial years. A sum of £50,000 will remain in the budget to fund further work on the development of the Lorry Control scheme during 2020/21, in order to continue to implement the outcome of the scheme review (paragraphs 19-20);
- The indicative hard copy unit ETA appeal cost for 2020/21 is £27.35, a reduction of £1.40 or 4.86% on the charge of £28.75 for 2019/20. For appeals where electronic evidence is provided by an enforcing authority, the unit cost will reduce by £1.45 to £23.63. Users will continue to pay a differential charge for the processing of ETA statutory declarations. For hard copy statutory declarations, the proposed unit charge will be £21.78 compared to the charge of £23.23 for the current year, which represents a reduction of £1.45, or 6.24%. For electronic statutory declarations, the proposed unit charge will be £21.04, a reduction of £1.46, or 6.50% on the electronic appeal unit charge for the current year of £22.50 (paragraphs 26-27);
- A continuation of the current agreement for TfL/GLA to reimburse London Councils on an actual cost-recovery basis for the variable cost of RUCA appeals, rather than on a unit cost basis. Continuation of this agreement will ensure that a breakeven position continues in respect of these transactions. This arrangement has been extended to cover the introduction of the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ), which came into effect on 8 April 2019. (paragraph 28);

- A nil increase in the charges to boroughs for TEC and TRACE electronic transactions and the continued phasing out of TRACE fax and email transactions for purposes other than disaster recovery². (paragraphs 29-35)
 - A reduction in the Parking Enforcement service charge of £0.0052 per PCN, or 1.4%, which will be apportioned to boroughs and TfL in accordance with the total number of PCNs issued by enforcing authorities in 2018/19 (paragraphs 36-37);
 - The Parking Core administration charge being held at the 2019/20 level of £1,500 (paragraph 38);
 - An increase of £392,000 from £187,000 to £579,000 in the recommended transfer from uncommitted reserves in order to deliver a balanced budget for 2020/21 (paragraph 50);
 - An estimated 2% cost of living increase on all officer salary costs to reflect the potential pay award, plus a 2% increase in respect of adjudicators' fees to reflect the potential outcome of a Ministry of Justice (MoJ) review. A provision of 3% (3% for 2019/20) is also required to cover the employers' pension contributions for adjudicators who have been automatically enrolled into a pension scheme and have elected to remain within the scheme. The overall staffing budget continues to include a £30,000 provision for maternity cover and the vacancy level remains at 2%; and
 - An estimated 1.7% inflationary increase on contracts, but all other running cost budgets for 2020/21 to be held at the 2019/20 level.
5. The following paragraphs detail the main proposed budget headings for 2020/21 and highlight any significant changes over 2019/20. The proposed level of expenditure for 2020/21 amounts to £367.434 million. A sum of £353.426 million relates to direct expenditure on the transport operators providing the Freedom Pass and the Taxicard schemes, leaving £14.008 million relating to expenditure on parking and traffic related traded service and other operating expenditure. This compares to a sum of £12.778 million for the current year, an increase of £1.23 million, or 9.6%, much of which is matched by additional income.

Freedom Pass

6. The provisional main settlement with TfL for concessionary travel on its service is estimated to be £318.764 million, which represents a provisional cash reduction of £2.149 million, or 0.67%, on the figure of £320.913 million for 2019/20. This reflects an overall fall of 2.2% in like-for-like journeys on TfL modes over the last year. However, these are offset by the real fares effect of the TfL price freeze i.e. the models assume that because TfL has frozen its prices, this would have generated additional journeys in the absence of the if the scheme.

² London Councils will continue to accept TRACE email and fax during the 2020/21 financial year, but notices sent in this way will continue to be charged the fax / email rate in addition to the electronic rate, as this method causes significant additional effort for London Councils and its contractor.

7. The Rail Delivery Group (RDG) settlement is still being negotiated. This year, the RDG has proposed moving to a model that uses Oyster card data (as opposed to the previous survey-based models). As reported to committee previously, this will increase the RDG element of the settlement. Early estimates are for additional costs of £1.933 Million, increasing this part to £21.886 million compared to the budget of £19.953 million for the current year. However, officers are continuing to negotiate regarding the price per journey to be paid and will update TEC accordingly in December.
8. The budget for payments to other bus operators for local journeys originating in London has been retained at the current year's level of £1.3 million, based on previous years' outturn.
9. The budget for pass issue and support services remains at £1.518 million, which will include the cost of an annual pass eligibility review that yields significant cost savings to boroughs and had previously been undertaken during the mid-term point of the five-year life of passes.
10. For income in respect of replacement Freedom Passes, current trends indicate that significant income continues to accrue, and in fact, increase. However due to the bulk renewal process, which is due to take place in 2020, it is anticipated that fewer replacement cards will be issued. The 2020/21 income budget is being held at £750,000 and there is no change to the unit cost of £12 for a replacement pass. As stated in paragraph 4 and detailed in paragraph 15 below, it is proposed that the in-house cost of administering the Freedom Pass scheme will be fully funded by this income stream in 2020/21.
11. As agreed by this Committee in December 2014, any annual surplus arising from both the freedom pass issuing costs budget of £1.518 million (paragraph 9 above) and replacement Freedom Passes income budget of £750,000 (paragraph 10 above) will be transferred to a specific reserves to accumulate funds to offset the cost of future major pass reissue exercises. The current projected balance on this element of the specific reserve is £3.995 million, as highlighted in paragraph 52.
12. Final negotiations on the actual amounts payable to transport operators will be completed in time for the meeting of the main Committee on 5 December and any late variations to these provisional figures will be tabled at this meeting.
13. A summary of the provisional freedom pass costs for 2020/21, compared to the actual costs for the current year, are summarised in Table 1 below:

Table 1 – Comparative cost of Freedom Pass 2020/21 and 2019/20

Estimated Cost of Freedom Pass	2020/21(£000)	2019/20(£000)
TfL Settlement	318,764	320,913
ATOC Settlement	21,886	19,953
Non TfL Bus Operators Settlement	1,300	1,300
Support services and issue costs	1,518	1,518
Total Cost	343,468	343,684

14. The total cost of the scheme is fully funded by boroughs and the estimated provisional cost payable by boroughs in 2020/21 is £343.468 million, compared to £343.684 million payable for 2019/20. This represents a reduction of £216,000 or 0.06%. The majority of costs payable by boroughs will be apportioned in line with

usage data, in accordance with the agreed recommendations of the arbitrator in 2008.

15. The administration of the freedom pass covers London Councils in-house costs in negotiating the annual settlements and managing the relationships with transport operators and contractors. For 2020/21, the total cost is estimated to be £505,006 compared to £497,916 in 2019/20. This equates to £15,303 per borough. However, it is proposed to continue to use income accruing from the replacement of lost and damaged Freedom Passes (refer paragraph 10) to continue to levy a nil charge in 2020/21, which members are asked to recommend to the main Committee. This position will be reviewed annually to ensure forecast income streams continue to cover the in-house costs of administering the scheme.

Taxicard Scheme

16. As stated in paragraph 4, it is assumed that TfL will provide an estimated fixed contribution of £9.360 million, no change in the figure for 2019/20. The total borough contribution towards the Taxicard scheme in 2020/21 is estimated to be £2.116 million, the same as for the current year, although the decision on boroughs' contributions is a matter for boroughs to take individually and will be confirmed in February 2020. The indicative budgetary provision for the taxicard trips contract with CityFleet Networks Limited, will, therefore, be an amalgam of the TfL and borough funding, currently equating to £11.476 million for 2020/21, the same figure as for the current year. However, several factors such as usage of the scheme could influence the final outturn position for 2020/21.
17. The gross cost of administration of the Taxicard Scheme is estimated to be £581,328 in 2020/21 compared to £569,893 in 2019/20. After excluding an estimated separate contribution from TfL towards these administrative costs of £124,000 and anticipated income of £18,000 from charging for replacement taxi cards, the net cost chargeable to boroughs in 2020/21 is £439,328. However, it is proposed to continue to use uncommitted general reserves held by the Committee of £101,146 to hold the total charge to boroughs at the 2020/21 level of £338,182.
18. The active Taxicard total membership as at 30 September 2019 is 64,552, compared to 68,860 as at 30 September 2018, a decrease of 4,308, or 6.2% this is a result of officers carrying out a review of members to establish if they are still active. The decrease in the spreading base and the recommended use of reserves of £101,146 has increased the underlying subsidised unit cost of a scheme member from £4.91 to £5.24 per member, a 6.7% increase.

London Lorry Control Scheme

19. The total charge is calculated in the same manner as the Freedom Pass and taxicard administration charge, although it is apportioned to boroughs in accordance with the ONS mid-year population figures for, in the case of 2020/21, June 2018. The total cost of administering the scheme is estimated to be £754,773 in 2020/21, compared to £742,951 in 2019/20. This figure includes a sum of £50,000 that has been retained in anticipation of further development of the scheme in 2020/21.
20. After analysing receipts from PCNs issued in relation to the scheme over the past three financial years, it is proposed to increase the income forecast to £1 million

for 2020/21, meaning that there will be a continuation of the nil charge to the 29 participating boroughs plus TfL towards the scheme in 2020/21. Again, this position will be reviewed annually to ensure forecast income streams continue to cover the costs of administering the scheme.

Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) Fees

21. The budget for adjudicators' fees and training will be increased for 2020/21, which is consistent with the estimated officers pay award. Any actual pay award will be dependent on a recommendation of the Senior Salaries Review Board, which is still to be agreed. This mechanism, which was agreed by TEC in November 2001, keeps the Adjudicators' pay at 80% of that for Group 7 full-time judicial appointments outside London. As discussed above a 2% pay award has been included, which increases the hourly rate by £1.26 from £63.06 to £64.32, inclusive of employers' National Insurance Contributions. In addition, all adjudicators have been entitled to be provided with a workplace pension scheme from August 2017. The employers' contribution to the scheme offered to the adjudicators will be 3% in 2020/21 which is no change to 2019/20. Current analysis indicates that 80% of ETA adjudicators are eligible to remain in the scheme under current earnings eligibility rules. This will add a further 2.4% onto the payroll cost in 2020/21, giving an average hourly rate of £65.86 (£64.57 2019/20 +£1.29 or 2.05%).
22. The estimated volume of ETA appeals and statutory declarations for 2020/21, based on volumes generated in the first half of 2019/20 is 44,722, an increase of 3,028 from the 41,694 budgeted level for the current year. The actual number of appeals represented by corresponding financial transactions posted in the accounts for 2018/19 was 42,721, including Statutory Declarations, Moving Traffic Contraventions and Lorry Control Appeals, indicating that the current number of ETA appeals has steadily increased.
23. The estimated average throughput of appeals for the first half of the current year is 3.78 appeals heard per hour (compared to 3.41 appeals per hour when the current year's budget was set in December 2018). This average figure takes account of all adjudicator time spent on postal and personal appeal hearing and non-appeal 'duty adjudicator' activities. The increase in throughput is attributable to continued system and service improvements that feed through into the processing figures. The ETA adjudicator fees base budget of £790,355 has, therefore, been reduced by £11,050 to £779,305 for 2020/21 to reflect the improved throughput rate.

Road User Charging Adjudicators (RUCA) Fees

24. The estimated volume of RUCA appeals for 2020/21, based on current volumes to August 2019 is 20,784, compared to 9,158 for the current year. The original estimate for 2019/20 did not consider the new Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) scheme which came in to force in April 2019 therefore is not comparable to the 2020/21 estimate. The actual number of RUCA Appeals represented by corresponding financial transactions posted in the accounts for 2018/19 was 9,644, including Statutory Declarations. Again, this excludes ULEZ appeals which hadn't come in to force at this stage.
25. As a result of this significant increase in caseload due to the introduction of the ULEZ scheme, the budget for RUCA adjudicators' fees has been increased by

£255,000 from £264,000 to £519,000 for 2020/21. The Committee will be fully reimbursed at cost by the GLA/TfL for the hearing of RUCA/ULEZ appeals under the current contract arrangements, which have been amended to include the ULEZ scheme.

Appeals Unit Charges 2020/21

26. The estimated overall cost for hearing appeals for 2020/21 is laid out in Table 2 below:

Table 2 – Proposed Unit Cost for Appeals 2020/21

	ETA	RUCA	Total
Estimated Appeal Nos.	44,722 (68%)	20,784 (32%)	65,506 (100%)
Average Case per hour	3.78	2.63	3.10
Adjudicator Hours	11,833	7,888	19,721
Expenditure			
Adjudicators Fees	779,305	519,497	1,298,802
Northgate Variable Cost	205,800	179,909	385,709
Total	1,085,106	699,406	1,684,511
Income			
Hearing Fees	1,085,106	699,406	1,684,511
Average Indicative Unit Cost of Appeal	24.26	33.65	25.72

27. For ETA appeals, based on an estimated 44,722 appeals and a projected throughput rate of 3.78 cases being heard per hour during 2020/21, it is proposed that the indicative hard copy unit ETA appeal cost for 2020/21 is £27.35, a reduction of £1.40 or 4.86% on the charge of £28.75 for 2019/20. For appeals where electronic evidence is provided by an enforcing authority, it is proposed that the unit cost will reduce by £1.45 to £23.63. The lower charge to boroughs recognises the reduced charge from London Councils contractor for processing electronic appeals, demonstrating that there remains a clear financial incentive for boroughs to move towards submitting electronic evidence under the current contract arrangements. Boroughs will pay a differential charge for the processing of ETA statutory declarations. For hard copy statutory declarations, the proposed unit charge will be £21.78 compared to the charge of £23.23 for the current year, which represents a reduction of £1.45, or 6.24%. For electronic statutory declarations, the proposed unit charge will be £21.04, a reduction of £1.46, or 6.5% on the electronic appeal unit charge for the current year. The Executive Sub-Committee is asked, therefore, to recommend that the main Committee approve these appeal charges to users for 2020/21.
28. London Councils is contracted to provide the RUCA appeals service up until January 2022 under the current contract arrangements effective from 1 January 2017. There is a continuation of the previous agreement for TfL/GLA to reimburse London Councils on an actual cost-recovery basis for the variable cost of these transactions, rather than on a unit cost basis. Continuation of this agreement will ensure that a breakeven position continues in respect of these transactions, so the estimated cost of £556,132 for hearing an estimated 20,784 RUCA/ULEZ appeals will be fully recovered. The fixed cost element of the contract is forecast to be £843,418 in 2020/21, an increase of £268,052 from 2019/20, due to a forecast increase from 18% to 32% in the proportion of RUCA appeals in relation

to the overall number of appeals and additional system costs of £133,000 both as a result of the ULEZ scheme.

Parking Managed Services – Other Variable Charges to Users

29. These variable charges form part of the parking managed service contract provided by Northgate, the volumes of which the Committee has no control. The individual boroughs are responsible for using such facilities and the volumes should not, therefore, be viewed as service growth. The volumes are based on those currently being processed by the contractor and are recharged to the boroughs and TfL as part of the unit cost charge. Current trends emerging during the first half of 2019/20 suggest that the TRACE electronic transactions are projected to marginally decrease by 3% and that TRACE Fax transactions will reduce by nearly 53% on the current year budget figures set in December 2018. Comparable figures indicate that use of the TEC system by boroughs will increase by over 6% compared to the current year budget figure. The estimated effect on expenditure trends are illustrated in Table 3 below:

Table 3 – Estimated expenditure on variable parking services 2020/21 and 2019/20

2020/21	Estimated Volumes (Nos)	Contractor Charge (£)	Expenditure Budget (£)
TRACE (Electronic)	45,452	1.811/1.842	83,335
TRACE (Fax Transaction)	2,389	3.987/4.055	9,653
TEC	1,149,655	0.096/0.0976	111,769
Total			204,757
2019/20	Estimated Volumes (Nos)	Contractor Charge (£)	Expenditure Budget (£)
TRACE (Electronic)	46,891	1.777/1.825	85,044
TRACE (Fax Transaction)	5,153	3.913/4.02	20,545
TEC	1,079,338	0.094/0.0965	103,458
Total			209,047

30. The estimated reduction in expenditure between 2019/20 and 2020/21 based on the current projected transaction volumes for 2019/20 and estimated movement in contract prices is £4,290
31. The corresponding estimated effect on income trends are illustrated in Table 4 below:

Table 4 – Estimated income accruing from variable parking services 2020/21 and 2019/20

2020/21	Estimated Volumes (Nos)	Proposed Unit Charge (£)	Income Budget (£)
TRACE (Electronic)	45,452	7.53	342,257

TRACE (Fax Transaction)	2,389	7.70	18,398
TEC	1,149,655	0.175	201,190
Total			561,842
2019/20	Estimated Volumes (Nos)	Actual Unit Charge (£)	Income Budget (£)
TRACE (Electronic)	46,891	7.53	353,085
TRACE (Fax Transaction)	5,153	7.70	39,678
TEC	1,079,338	0.175	188,884
Total			581,648

32. The estimated effect on income, between 2019/20 and 2020/21, based on the current projected transaction volumes for 2019/20 and a zero increase in charges to users, is a decrease of £19,806, leading to a net overall decrease in budgeted income of £15,516. The charging structure historically approved by TEC for the provision of the variable parking services (excluding appeals) includes a profit element in each of the charges made to boroughs and other users for these services. However, given the 3% increase in 2018/19 and the current volumes, it is proposed that there should be no increase in the three charges to boroughs for 2020/21.
33. Members will recall that the measures were approved by TEC from 2018/19 to begin the phasing out of TRACE fax and email service as a default means for enforcement authorities to notify the service of vehicles that have been moved.
34. In order to encourage enforcement authorities to use the electronic notification systems by default and thereby reduce processing time, all TRACE fax and email notifications were, therefore, charged at the electronic rate (£7.53) plus the fax/email rate (£7.70) making a total of £15.23 per transaction from 1 April 2018. The projected 53% reduction in the use of the TRACE fax and email service over the past 12 months indicates that this measure is proving successful and the dual charging mechanism is recommended for continuation for 2020/21.
35. The Executive Sub-Committee is asked, therefore, to recommend that the main Committee approve the following non-appeal charges to users for 2020/21:
- The TRACE (Electronic) charge of £7.53 per transaction, no change on the current year;
 - The TRACE (Fax/email) Charge of £7.70 per transaction, in addition to the electronic charge of £7.53 per transaction, making a total of £15.23, no change on the current year;
 - The TEC charge of £0.175 per transaction, no change on the current year.

Parking Enforcement Service Charge

36. The majority of this charge is made up of the fixed cost element of the parking managed service contract provided by Northgate and the provision of accommodation and administrative support to the appeals hearing centre. The total fixed cost is allocated to users in accordance with the number of PCNs

issued, which for 2019/20 will be the 5,958,048 PCNs issued by enforcing authorities during 2018/19, which is detailed in Appendix D. For 2020/21, expenditure of £3.084 million needs to be recouped, compared to £2.687 million for 2019/20, which is detailed in Table 5 below:

Table 5 – Breakdown of Parking Enforcement Charge 2020/21

	2020/21 (£000)	2019/20 (£000)
Fixed Contract Costs	1,285	1,135
Hearing Centre Premises Costs	728	620
Direct Staffing Costs	572	489
General Office Expenditure	46	46
Central Recharges	453	397
Total	3,084	2,687

37. After top-slicing this amount for the revised fixed contract sum of £875,418 attributable to congestion charging, ULEZ and LEZ contraventions rechargeable to the GLA - 32% of the estimated cost of the Tribunal (refer paragraph 28), a total of £2.209 million, compared to £2.111 million in 2019/20, remains to be apportioned through the 5.958 million PCNs issued by boroughs and TfL in 2018/19 in respect of parking, bus lane, moving traffic and London Lorry Control Scheme enforcement, compared to 5.616 million issued in 2017/18. The increase in the number of PCNs issued over the two comparative years increases the spreading base, which leads to a reduction in the proposed unit charge to boroughs and TfL of £0.0052, or 1.4%, from £0.3760 to £0.3708 per PCN for 2020/21, which members are asked to recommend to the main Committee. In addition, under the terms of the contract with Northgate, there is a separate fixed cost identified in respect of the use of the TRACE and TEC systems. For 2019/20, this sum was £94,000 and is estimated to increase to £95,000 in 2020/21. This sum will be apportioned to boroughs in accordance with volumes of transaction generated on each system.

Parking Core Administration Charge

38. The core subscription covers a proportion of the cost of the central management and policy work of the Committee and its related staff, accommodation, contract monitoring and other general expenses. It is charged to boroughs and TfL at a uniform rate, which for 2019/20 was £1,500 per borough. As there is limited scope for additional savings or efficiencies to be identified from within the £51,000 this levy raises for the Committee, it is recommended that this charge be held at the current level of £1,500 per borough and TfL for 2020/21.

Registration of Debt at the Traffic Enforcement Centre (TEC) - Northampton County Court

39. Expenditure in respect of the registration of debt related to parking penalties is directly recouped from the registering borough, so the transactions have a neutral effect on the financial position of the Committee. The Court Service last increased the £7 unit fee to £8 in July 2016, although no further increases are envisaged during 2020/21. Volumes generated by users registered parking debt is expected

to be maintained at £4 million for the current year, so it is, therefore, proposed keep both the income and expenditure budgets for 2020/21 at £4 million.

Estimated individual borough costs for 2020/21, covering the proposed charges highlighted in paragraphs 15-39 above, are detailed in Appendix C.1 and can be compared against the estimated charges for the current year at Appendix C.2, forecast at the budget setting stage for the current year 12 months ago.

Contractual Commitments

40. **Staffing Costs** -The proposed staffing budget for TEC for 2020/21 is illustrated in Table 6 below:

Table 6– TEC Indicative Staffing Budget 2020/21	£000
2019/20 Revised Budget	2,114
Addition officers in relation to the ULEZ scheme	64
2% pay award 2020/21	42
Incremental salary drift/other adjustments	41
2020/21 Base Budget	2,261
Split between:	
Services - Parking and Traffic	105
Services - ETA	357
Services - RUCA	215
Services - Transport and Mobility	795
PAPA - Policy	409
PAPA - Communications	247
Chief Executive - Committee Servicing	61
Chief Executive - DP/FOI work	72
2020/21 Base Budget	2,261

41. In line with other London Councils funding streams, the vacancy level for 2020/21 remains at 2%. The salary figures include an estimated 2% cost of living increase on all costs for 2020/21. In addition, there is an increase to cover incremental salary drift and other adjustment such as additional Communication and Policy staff time being charged to TEC following a detailed review by officers. In addition to the salaries figure of £2.271 million shown in Table 6, the £19,000 budgetary provision for member's allowances has been maintained at the 2019/20 level, as has the provision for maternity cover of £30,000.
42. **Accommodation Costs – Chancery Exchange** – The appeals hearing centre at Chancery Exchange, EC4 has been operational since July 2015. The budget for 2020/21 of £597,335 includes the full year cost of the leasehold agreement plus other premises running costs. The Committee is asked to note that a rent review is due at the five-year point of the lease on 30 March 2020 therefore an estimated increase of £100,000 has been included in the 2020/21 budget to account for movement in property rental rates over the past five years. In addition, a budget for depreciation in respect of the refurbishment costs of Chancery Exchange of £103,166 is required, along with the continuation of a provision for potential redecoration, dilapidation and reinstatement costs payable at the end of the Chancery Exchange lease of £27,400 per annum. These premises costs are fully recovered as part of the Parking Enforcement service charge (refer paragraphs 36-37).

43. **Accommodation Costs - Southwark Street** – These are included as part of central recharges cost. These costs are spread based on number of FTE's directly chargeable to the TEC funding stream. A detailed review of how London Councils apportions its central costs, which include accommodation costs, between the three committees has identified an anomaly within the model. Some overheads, which are attributed to members of staff working on TEC related activities, were not being fully passed on to TEC. As a result of this the Southwark Street premises cost recharge has increased by £195,215 to £451,518 for 2020/21 (2019/20: £256,303). The recharges in respect of the Southwark Street accommodation forms part of the administration charge for the direct services– for the freedom pass, taxicard, health emergency badge and the London lorry control scheme, as detailed in paragraphs 6-20 of this report.

Discretionary Expenditure

44. **Research Budget** – It is recommended that the budget for 2020/21 is maintained at the current year's level of £40,000.
45. **General/Office Costs** - The budgetary provision of £483,000 for 2020/21 is broken down in Table 7 below:

Table 7 – TEC General/Office costs budget 2020/21	£000
2019/20 Revised Budget	474
General/office costs inflation	11
2020/21 Base Budget	485
Split between:	
System Developments	100
General/Office costs – postage, telephones, copiers, etc.	167
Appeals related legal costs	26
External audit fees*	27
City of London finance, legal, HR and IT SLA*	165
2020/21 Base Budget	485

*forms part of central recharge costs

46. The increase primarily relates to a slight increase in general office running costs.
47. Inflation of 1.7% has been allowed for 2020/21 on general running costs, except where there are contractual commitments. This factor has been applied to all London Councils budgets.

Central Recharges

48. Southwark Street accommodation costs (paragraph 44), the Parking Enforcement Charge (paragraph 36) and general office costs (paragraph 46) all contain significant element of central recharge costs, which are apportioned to all London Councils functions in accordance with a financial model that is subject to annual review by London Councils external auditors. The premises costs of the hearing centre are split between the ETA and RUCA functions, as detailed in paragraphs 36-37. Of the total central costs apportioned to TEC in 2020/21 (excluding LEPT) of £1,434,402, a sum of £948,320 feeds into the recharges for the direct services administration charges based at Southwark Street and for the ETA and RUCA services at the appeals hearing centre. The residual £486,082 relates the TEC policy, communication and administrative functions based at Southwark Street. In

addition, as detailed in paragraph 36, a further sum of £728,000 relates the premises costs at Chancery Exchange.

Transfer from Reserves

49. As detailed in paragraph 52 below, it is proposed that this Committee recommend that the main Committee approve the transfer of a sum of £579,000 from uncommitted general reserves to smooth the effect of the underlying increase to direct service costs and to cover the additional central recharge costs. This is a increase of £392,000 on the £187,000 approved transfer for the current year. Specifically, the recommended use of a sum of £101,146 will increase the underlying subsidised unit cost of a Taxicard Scheme member from £4.91 to £5.24 per member. The boroughs will pay no more in 2020/21 than the £338,000 paid towards administering the Taxicard Scheme in the current year, as detailed in paragraphs 17-18 above.

Other Income

50. **Miscellaneous Income** – It is estimated that income of £73,000 will continue to accrue from two main sources in 2020/21. Firstly, £42,000 is expected to accrue for the administration of the Health Emergency badge (HEB) in the form of registration fees and charges for badges to medical professionals. This will enable this service to be provided at no cost to boroughs. Secondly, £31,000 is expected to accrue from TfL for secretarial services provided by the Committee during the Freedom Pass negotiations.

Committee Reserves

51. Table 8 below updates the Committee on the revised projected level of reserves as at 1 April 2020, if all current known liabilities and commitments are considered:

Table 8– Analysis of Estimated Uncommitted Reserves as at 1 April 2020

	General Reserve	Specific Reserve	Total
	£000	£000	£000
Audited reserves at 1 April 2019	3,936	3,553	7,489
Amount carried forward from 2018/19	(133)	-	(133)
Approved use in setting 2019/20 budget	(187)	-	(187)
Projected Budget Surplus 2019/20 @ M6	153	442	595
Projected uncommitted reserves as at 31 March 2020	3,769	3,995	7,764
Proposed use in setting 2020/21 budget	(579)	-	(579)
Estimated uncommitted reserves as at 1 April 2020	3,190	3,995	7,185
Freedom Pass 2020 Renewal	-	(1,176)	(1,176)
TEC priority projects	-	(750)	(750)
Estimated uncommitted reserves following potential 2020/21 commitments	3,190	2,069	5,259

52. The projected level of uncommitted general reserves as at 1 April 2020 assumes that the draft proposals as laid out in this report is agreed are by this Committee and approved by the main TEC meeting in December. It is proposed that a sum of £579,000 be transferred from general reserves to continue to smooth the effect

of the underlying increase in direct service charges, cover additional central recharges as a result of a correction to the recharges model.

53. In addition, the overall reserves position also reflects the projected amount expected to be held in the specific reserve as at 1 April 2020 of £3.995 million. The 2020 Freedom Pass bulk reissue exercise is about to commence and will consist of reviewing approximately 800,000 passes. The exercise will be funded from the specific reserve at an estimated cost of £1.176 million, a reduction from the £2.6 million spent on the 2015 reissue largely due to a new approach being taken. As there is no directly comparable data available to analyse baseline costs, the final cost of the exercise may vary from the current budget estimate.
54. After considering the forecast surplus of £595,000 for the current year, which is subject to a separate report on this agenda, uncommitted general reserves are forecast to be £3.190 million as at 1 April 2020. This equates to 22.7% of proposed operating and trading expenditure of £14.008 million for 2020/21. This figure, therefore, significantly exceeds the Committee's formal policy on reserves, agreed in December 2015 that reserves should equate to between 10-15% of annual operating and trading expenditure.
55. The holding of reserves of 7.7% above the 15% upper benchmark level equates to £1.089 million. In considering options for the use of this resource, the Executive Sub-Committee is asked to consider the following factors:
 - The likelihood of unforeseen events arising in the remainder of the current financial year, given that the projected surplus for the current year of £153,000 feeds directly into uncommitted general reserves;
 - Emerging additional ICT system development pressures across several service areas, which are yet to be fully quantified but include:
 - modernisation of the Health Emergency Badge service following the outcome of the current service review;
 - updates to the Freedom Pass records management system;
 - user-identified enhancements to the London Tribunals systems for the public, enforcement authorities and adjudicators; and
 - cross service website enhancements to meet new statutory accessibility requirements.
 - A rent review is due at Chancery Exchange, the London Tribunals hearing centre, with effect from March 2020; any increase above which has already been budgeted for will impact on the fixed costs of the contract with the GLA for RUCA and ULEZ as well as parking services provided to boroughs;
 - As detailed in paragraph 49 above, it is proposed a sum of £579,000 is transferred from uncommitted general reserves in order to present a balanced budget for 2020/21. Clearly this is not sustainable in the medium to long term so measures will need to be considered by members to bring total income and total expenditure more in to balance. In the short term the excess reserves could be used, as proposed, until a balanced budget is achieved; and

- Existing specific reserves will be called upon to provide policy support to deliver the proposed EV and car club coordination function, which is subject to a separate report on this agenda. It is likely that further research and policy work will be required in the future, for example to deliver the Committee's proposed actions on the Safer Speeds agenda. The Executive Sub-Committee may therefore consider that a transfer of further sums to the specific reserve, to fund bespoke future TEC projects, may be required to maintain the specific project reserve at £750K.
56. The Executive Sub-Committee is asked to consider a short-term strategy for the treatment of uncommitted reserves held in excess of the 15% upper benchmark, for recommendation to the main Committee meeting in December. Options, which are not mutually exclusive, include:
- No action recommended pending clarification of issues outlined in paragraph 55;
 - Further reduce charges to boroughs and TfL as part of the 2020/21 budget proposals; and
 - Return a one-off cash sum to all boroughs and TfL.

Summary

57. This report details the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2020/21. The Executive Sub-Committee is asked to comment on these outline proposals in order that any comments can be consolidated in the further report for the full TEC meeting in December, where the detailed budget proposals and levels of subscriptions and charges for 2020/21 will be presented for final approval. The proposed level of expenditure for 2020/21 amounts to £367.434 million. A sum of £353.43 million relates to direct expenditure on the transport operators providing the Freedom Pass and the Taxicard schemes, leaving £14.008 million relating to expenditure on parking and traffic related traded service and other operating expenditure. This compares to a comparable sum of £12.778 million for the current year, an increase of £1,230,000, or 9.6%, much of which relate to the introduction of the ULEZ scheme and an increase in central recharges.

Recommendations

58. The Executive-Sub Committee recommends that the main Committee approve at their meeting on 5 December:
- The proposed individual levies and charges for 2020/21 as follows:
 - The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2019/20 - £1,500; paragraph 38);
 - The Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.3708 per PCN which will be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2018/19 (2019/20 - £0.3760 per PCN; paragraphs 36-37);
 - No charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass Administration Charge, which is covered by replacement Freedom Pass income (2019/20 – nil charge; paragraph 15);

- The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,182 in total (2019/20 - £338,182; paragraphs 17-18).
 - No charge to boroughs in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which is fully covered by estimated PCN income (2019/20 – nil charge; paragraphs 19-20);
 - Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) - charge of £27.35 per appeal or £23.63 per appeal where electronic evidence is provided by the enforcing authority (2019/20 - £28.75/£25.08 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £21.78 for hard copy submissions and £21.04 for electronic submissions (2019/20 - £23.23/£22.50 per SD) (paragraphs 26-27);
 - Road User Charging Adjudicators (RUCA) including ULEZ – to be recovered on a full cost recovery basis under the current contract arrangements with the GLA (paragraph 28);
 - A unit charge of £12 for the replacement of a lost or damaged Freedom Pass (2019/20 - £12; paragraph 10);
 - The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2019/20 - £7.53; paragraphs 29-35);
 - The TRACE (Fax/Email) Charge of £7.70 per transaction, which is levied in addition to the electronic charge of £7.53 per transaction, making a total of £15.23 (2019/20 - £15.23; paragraphs 29-35);
 - The TEC³ Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2019/20 - £0.175; paragraphs 29-35).
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £367.434 million for 2020/21, as detailed in Appendix A;
 - On the basis of the agreement of the above proposed charges, the provisional gross revenue income budget of £366.855 million for 2020/21, with a recommended transfer of £579,000 from uncommitted Committee reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B; and
 - To consider the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 52-56 and Table 8 of this report.

59. The Executive-Sub Committee is also asked to note:

- the estimated total charges to individual boroughs for 2020/21, as set out in Appendix C.1.

Financial Implications for London Councils

None, other than those detailed in the report

³ The system that allows boroughs to register any unpaid parking tickets with the Traffic Enforcement Centre and apply for bailiff's warrants.

Legal Implications for London Councils

None

Equalities Implications for London Councils

None

Appendices

Appendix A – Proposed revenue expenditure budget 2020/21;

Appendix B – Proposed revenue income budget 2020/21;

Appendix C.1 – Indicative charges to boroughs 2020/21;

Appendix C.2 – Indicative charges to boroughs 2019/20; and

Appendix D – Parking Enforcement statistics 2018/19.

Background Papers

TEC Budget Working Papers 2019/20 and 2020/21;

TEC Final Accounts Working Papers 2018/19;

TEC Revenue Budget Forecast Working Papers 2019/20; and

London Councils Consolidated Budget Working Papers 2019/20 and 2020/21.

Item 9 - Appendix A - TEC Expenditure Base Budget 2020/21

	Revised 2019/20 £000	Develop- ments £000	Base 2020/21 £000	Inflation £000	Original 2020/21 £000
Payments in respect of Concessionary Fares					
TfL	320,913	-2,149	318,764	0	318,764
RDG	19,953	1,933	21,886	0	21,886
Other Bus Operators	1,300	0	1,300	0	1,300
Freedom Pass issue costs	1,518	0	1,518	0	1,518
Freedom Pass Administration	498	0	498	7	505
City Fleet Taxicard contract	11,476	0	11,476	0	11,476
Taxicard Administration	570	0	570	11	581
	356,228	-216	356,012	18	356,030
TEC Trading Account Expenditure					
Payments to Adjudicators- ETA	790	-11	779	0	779
Payments to Adjudicators - RUCA	264	255	519	0	519
Northgate variable contract costs - ETA	293	7	300	5	305
Northgate variable contract costs - RUCA	80	97	177	3	180
Northgate variable contract costs - Other	209	0	209	-4	205
Payments to Northampton County Court	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000
Lorry Control Administration	743	0	743	11	754
ETA/RUCA Administration	2,687	344	3,031	53	3,084
HEB Administration	40	0	40	1	41
	9,106	692	9,798	0	9,868
Sub-Total	365,334	476	365,810	18	365,898
Operating Expenditure					
Contractual Commitments					
Northgate Fixed Costs	94	0	94	1	95
	94	0	94	1	95
Salary Commitments					
Non-operational staffing costs	666	28	694	14	708
Members	19	0	19	0	19
Maternity/Paternity Provision	30	0	30	0	30
	715	28	743	14	757
Discretionary Expenditure					
Staff training/recruitment advertising	0	0	0	0	0
Staff travel	0	0	0	0	0
Other premises costs	0	0	0	0	0
SS ICT support	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies and services	160	-1	159	0	159
Research	40	0	40	0	40
Contribution to health related work	0	0	0	0	0
One off payment to boroughs	0	0	0	0	0
Other 3rd party payments	0	0	0	0	0
Premises recharge	0	0	0	0	0
	200	-1	199	0	199
Total Operating Expenditure	1,009	27	1,036	14	1,050
Central Recharges	77	409	486	0	486
Total Expenditure	366,420	912	367,332	32	367,434

Item 9 - Appendix B - TEC Income Base Budget 2020/21

	Revised 2019/20 £000	Develop- ments £000	Base 2020/21 £000	Inflation £000	Original 2020/21 £000
Borough contributions to TfL	320,913	-2,149	318,764	0	318,764
Borough contributions to RDG	19,953	1,933	21,886	0	21,886
Borough contributions to other bus operators	1,300	0	1,300	0	1,300
Borough contributions to surveys/reissue costs	1,518	0	1,518	0	1,518
Borough contributions to freedom pass administration	0	0	0	0	0
Income from replacing lost/faulty freedom passes	750	0	750	0	750
Income from replacing lost/faulty taxicards	18	0	18	0	18
Borough contributions to Taxicard scheme	2,116	0	2,116	0	2,116
TfL contribution to Taxicard scheme	9,360	0	9,360	0	9,360
Borough contributions to taxicard administration	324	0	324	0	324
TfL Contribution to taxicard administration	124	0	124	0	124
	356,376	-216	356,160	0	356,160
TEC trading account income					
Borough contributions to Lorry ban administration	0	0	0	0	0
Lorry control PCNs	900	0	900	100	1,000
Borough ETA appeal charges	901	0	901	66	967
TfL ETA appeal charges	182	0	182	-64	118
RUCA appeals income	343	356	699	0	699
Borough fixed parking costs	1,990	79	2,069	0	2,069
TfL fixed parking costs	216	19	235	0	235
RUCA fixed parking costs	575	300	875	0	875
Borough other parking services	582	0	582	-20	562
Northampton County Court Recharges	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000
	9,689	754	10,443	82	10,525
Sub-Total	366,065	538	366,603	82	366,685
Core borough subscriptions					
Joint Committee	46	0	46	0	46
TEC (inc TfL)	51	0	51	0	51
	97	0	97	0	97
TfL secretariat recharge	31	0	31	0	31
Sales of Health Emergency badges	42	0	42	0	42
Miscellaneous income	0	0	0	0	0
	73	0	73	0	73
Transfer from Reserves	187	0	187	392	579
Central Recharges	0	0	0	0	0
Total Income Base Budget	366,422	538	366,960	474	367,434

Indicative Charges to Boroughs 2020/2021

Appendix C.1

BOROUGH	Core Parking (£)	Fixed Parking (£)	Con.Fares Admin. (£)	Taxicard Admin. (£)	Lorry Ban Admin. (£)	Parking Appeals (£)	TRACE Electronic (£)	TRACE FAX (£)	TEC (£)	Total Estimate 2020/21 (£)	Total Estimate 2019/20 (£)	Estimated Movement (£)
Barking & Dagenham	1,500	41,600	0	6,241	0	30,761	54	53	0	80,208	84,703	-4,495
Barnet	1,500	90,727	0	11,077	0	31,510	0	0	13,152	147,967	189,740	-41,773
Bexley	1,500	21,321	0	5,444	0	6,143	0	0	0	34,409	36,218	-1,810
Brent	1,500	71,264	0	12,854	0	22,543	18,099	964	0	127,223	141,659	-14,437
Bromley	1,500	27,486	0	6,492	0	4,473	0	0	0	39,951	46,113	-6,162
Camden	1,500	87,871	0	15,788	0	43,460	21,603	806	10,050	181,079	179,604	1,475
Croydon	1,500	67,094	0	12,560	0	51,474	1,528	0	12,747	146,902	98,999	47,903
Ealing	1,500	81,109	0	13,021	0	23,646	629	210	10,519	130,635	123,303	7,332
Enfield	1,500	42,363	0	5,654	0	11,888	8,375	140	3,564	73,484	72,508	977
Greenwich	1,500	15,720	0	10,920	0	8,108	324	315	2,328	39,215	38,524	691
Hackney	1,500	60,478	0	15,170	0	26,576	7,782	1,279	14,533	127,318	127,348	-30
Hammersmith & Fulham	1,500	85,664	0	9,139	0	20,752	24,407	123	5,128	146,712	180,778	-34,067
Haringey	1,500	75,425	0	11,869	0	24,585	21,765	1,612	13,262	150,017	143,626	6,391
Harrow	1,500	68,457	0	12,896	0	36,743	0	0	8,710	128,306	115,264	13,042
Havering	1,500	45,150	0	12,744	0	30,933	0	0	0	90,327	87,454	2,873
Hillingdon	1,500	31,666	0	5,518	0	9,494	1,797	1,261	4,220	55,456	56,307	-851
Hounslow	1,500	53,892	0	9,914	0	24,087	6,902	123	3,583	100,000	90,358	9,642
Islington	1,500	96,524	0	15,049	0	41,050	25,809	245	9,387	189,564	179,976	9,588
Kensington & Chelsea	1,500	74,154	0	9,647	0	16,431	42,218	1,331	12,034	157,316	153,534	3,782
Kingston	1,500	49,325	0	8,913	0	10,089	18	18	0	69,863	76,334	-6,471
Lambeth	1,500	78,107	0	10,601	0	65,897	8,807	683	16,262	181,857	168,838	13,018
Lewisham	1,500	30,223	0	9,930	0	14,917	0	0	4,808	61,377	58,205	3,172
Merton	1,500	56,605	0	10,150	0	22,994	0	0	0	91,248	95,456	-4,208
Newham	1,500	86,774	0	11,926	0	46,128	62,042	4,958	13,422	226,750	244,416	-17,666
Redbridge	1,500	64,987	0	13,786	0	38,610	0	0	11,370	130,254	145,509	-15,255
Richmond	1,500	35,780	0	9,940	0	9,073	503	491	1,836	59,124	55,314	3,809
Southwark	1,500	44,037	0	14,929	0	15,861	13,228	543	6,005	96,102	99,338	-3,236
Sutton	1,500	13,727	0	7,498	0	5,042	0	0	1,690	29,457	25,173	4,285
Tower Hamlets	1,500	43,663	0	9,830	0	25,525	19,141	0	0	99,659	103,842	-4,183
Waltham Forest	1,500	75,499	0	8,201	0	31,727	29,799	1,367	0	148,092	130,101	17,992
Wandsworth	1,500	60,246	0	8,950	0	18,074	15,672	88	8,242	112,772	114,542	-1,770
City of Westminster	1,500	114,457	0	11,077	0	19,749	9,759	1,664	14,339	172,546	189,115	-16,568
City of London	1,500	75,395	0	524	0	17,285	126	123	0	94,953	108,621	-13,668
	49,500	1,966,789	0	338,252	0	805,630	340,387	18,395	201,190	3,720,144	3,760,821	-40,677
Transport for London - Street Management	1,500	240,078	0	0	0	276,737	0	0	0	518,315	399,631	118,684
Transport for London - Congestion Charging	0	875,418	0	0	0	699,406	0	0	0	1,574,824	918,861	655,963
Lorry Control	0	2,152	0	0	0	2,739	1,869	0	0	6,760	5,417	1,343
TEC/TRACE fixed costs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95,000	94,000	1,000
Registration of Debt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,000,000	4,000,000	0
Transfer from Reserves	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	51,000	3,084,437	0	338,252	0	1,784,511	342,257	18,395	201,190	9,915,043	9,178,730	736,312

Indicative Charges to Boroughs 2019/2020

Appendix C.2

BOROUGH	Core Parking (£)	Fixed Parking (£)	Con.Fares Admin. (£)	Taxicard Admin. (£)	Lorry Ban Admin. (£)	Parking Appeals (£)	TRACE Electronic (£)	TRACE FAX (£)	TEC (£)	Total Estimate 2019/20 (£)
Barking & Dagenham	1,500	39,630	0	6,417	0	37,122	15	19	0	84,703
Barnet	1,500	90,748	0	11,730	0	74,148	0	0	11,615	189,740
Bexley	1,500	21,193	0	5,126	0	8,400	0	0	0	36,218
Brent	1,500	71,717	0	13,070	0	27,062	24,255	4,056	0	141,659
Bromley	1,500	30,266	0	6,128	0	8,186	15	19	0	46,113
Camden	1,500	89,226	0	16,223	0	40,992	20,728	710	10,226	179,604
Croydon	1,500	44,838	0	12,039	0	30,544	1,868	37	8,173	98,999
Ealing	1,500	73,342	0	13,296	0	28,603	224	280	6,058	123,303
Enfield	1,500	41,414	0	5,470	0	11,822	8,040	93	4,168	72,508
Greenwich	1,500	14,417	0	11,249	0	8,271	120	150	2,819	38,524
Hackney	1,500	41,194	0	15,339	0	44,937	14,003	56	10,320	127,348
Hammersmith & Fulham	1,500	89,648	0	9,329	0	40,984	26,362	93	12,862	180,778
Haringey	1,500	76,245	0	11,632	0	19,572	17,530	1,626	15,521	143,626
Harrow	1,500	63,198	0	12,476	0	31,510	0	0	6,579	115,264
Havering	1,500	45,388	0	13,404	0	27,127	15	19	0	87,454
Hillingdon	1,500	29,453	0	5,484	0	15,351	15	2,243	2,261	56,307
Hounslow	1,500	44,253	0	9,943	0	18,138	8,115	3,794	4,615	90,358
Islington	1,500	94,767	0	14,337	0	29,501	20,817	1,103	17,950	179,976
Kensington & Chelsea	1,500	73,849	0	9,550	0	21,532	41,037	1,570	4,496	153,534
Kingston	1,500	57,290	0	8,902	0	8,441	90	112	0	76,334
Lambeth	1,500	70,788	0	10,463	0	57,493	8,787	7,252	12,555	168,838
Lewisham	1,500	28,377	0	8,838	0	15,995	15	19	3,461	58,205
Merton	1,500	59,557	0	10,183	0	23,610	269	336	0	95,456
Newham	1,500	83,219	0	12,457	0	59,751	61,406	12,858	13,224	244,416
Redbridge	1,500	61,711	0	14,175	0	54,155	15	19	13,934	145,509
Richmond	1,500	33,374	0	9,894	0	7,625	254	318	2,349	55,314
Southwark	1,500	44,672	0	15,363	0	17,635	13,031	168	6,968	99,338
Sutton	1,500	11,071	0	7,164	0	4,029	0	0	1,408	25,173
Tower Hamlets	1,500	44,786	0	9,363	0	27,793	20,399	0	0	103,842
Waltham Forest	1,500	61,432	0	8,666	0	32,529	25,600	374	0	130,101
Wandsworth	1,500	51,433	0	9,393	0	19,387	30,920	1,719	190	114,542
City of Westminster	1,500	121,706	0	10,448	0	29,119	8,892	318	17,131	189,115
City of London	1,500	89,935	0	550	0	16,097	239	299	0	108,621
	49,500	1,894,138	0	338,103	0	897,463	353,074	39,659	188,884	3,760,821
Transport for London - Street Management	1,500	215,735	0	0	0	182,396	0	0	0	399,631
Transport for London - Congestion Charging	0	575,366	0	0	0	343,495	0	0	0	918,861
Lorry Control	0	1,894	0	0	0	3,489	15	19	0	5,417
TEC/TRACE fixed costs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94,000
Registration of Debt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,000,000
Transfer from Reserves	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	51,000	2,687,133	0	338,103	0	1,426,843	353,089	39,678	188,884	9,178,730

Parking Enforcement Fixed Costs 2020/21
(based on PCNs issued for 2018/19)

Item 9 Appendix D

Enforcing Authority	Total PCNs	Parking Fixed Costs 0.3708
Barking & Dagenham	112,200	41,599.52
Barnet	244,704	90,727.00
Bexley	57,506	21,321.05
Brent	192,210	71,264.21
Bromley	74,133	27,485.72
Camden	237,000	87,870.65
City of London	203,351	75,394.87
Croydon	180,963	67,094.25
Ealing	218,764	81,109.43
Enfield	114,258	42,362.55
Greenwich	42,400	15,720.32
Hackney	163,118	60,477.99
Hammersmith & Fulham	231,048	85,663.87
Haringey	203,431	75,424.53
Harrow	184,639	68,457.17
Havering	121,777	45,150.31
Hillingdon	85,407	31,665.69
Hounslow	145,355	53,892.15
Islington	260,340	96,524.24
Kensington & Chelsea	200,004	74,153.93
Kingston	133,038	49,325.47
Lambeth	210,665	78,106.63
Lewisham	81,516	30,223.05
Merton	152,671	56,604.64
Newham	234,041	86,773.56
Redbridge	175,280	64,987.20
Richmond	96,505	35,780.41
Southwark	118,773	44,036.54
Sutton	37,023	13,726.73
Tower Hamlets	117,765	43,662.81
Waltham Forest	203,632	75,499.06
Wandsworth	162,493	60,246.27
Westminster	308,707	114,456.90
Transport for London Street Management	647,526	240,078.19
London Councils London Lorry Control Scheme	5,805	2,152.27
Total	5,958,048	2,209,019

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee – 10 October 2019

Minutes of a meeting of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee held on Thursday 10 October at 2:30pm in the Conference Suite, London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL

Present:

Council	Councillor
Barking and Dagenham	Cllr Syed Ghani
Barnet	Apologies
Bexley	Apologies
Brent	Cllr Krupa Sheth
Bromley	Cllr William Huntington-Thresher
Camden	
Croydon	Cllr Paul Scott (Deputy)
Ealing	Cllr Julian Bell (Chair)
Enfield	
Greenwich	Cllr Denise Scott-McDonald
Hackney	Cllr Jon Burke
Hammersmith and Fulham	
Haringey	Cllr Kirsten Hearn
Harrow	Cllr Chloe Smith (Deputy)
Havering	
Hillingdon	
Hounslow	
Islington	Cllr Claudia Webbe
Kensington and Chelsea	
Kingston Upon Thames	Cllr Hilary Gander
Lambeth	Cllr Jackie Meldrum (Deputy)
Lewisham	Apologies
Merton	Cllr Martin Whelton
Newham	Cllr James Asser
Redbridge	Apologies
Richmond Upon Thames	Cllr Martin Elengorn (Deputy)
Southwark	Cllr Richard Livingstone
Sutton	Cllr Manuel Abellan
Tower Hamlets	Cllr David Edgard
Waltham Forest	Cllr Clyde Loakes
Wandsworth	Cllr Richard Field
City of Westminster	Cllr Tim Mitchell
City of London	Apologies
Transport for London	Alex Williams

1. Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies

Apologies:

Cllr Dean Cohen (LB Barnet)
Cllr Peter Craske (LB Bexley)
Cllr Stuart King (LB Croydon)
Cllr Varsha Parmar (LB Harrow)
Cllr Claire Holland (LB Lambeth)
Cllr Brenda Dacres (LB Lewisham)
Cllr John Howard (LB Redbridge)
Cllr Alex Ehmann (LB Richmond)
Alastair Moss (City of London)

Deputies:

Cllr Paul Scott (LB Croydon)
Cllr Chloe Smith (LB Harrow)
Cllr Jackie Meldrum (LB Lambeth)
Cllr Martin Elengorn (LB Richmond)

2. Declaration of Interests (additional to those not on the supplied sheet)

60+ Oyster & Freedom Pass

It was noted that Councillor Gander was not a holder of a Freedom Pass.

Cllr Martin Elengorn (LB Richmond)
Cllr Jackie Meldrum (LB Lambeth)

West London Waste Authority

Cllr Jackie Meldrum (LB Lambeth)

East London Waste Authority

Cllr James Asser (LB Newham)

Car Club

Cllr Denise Scott-McDonald (RB Greenwich)

3. Environment & Traffic Adjudicators Annual Report

The Committee received the statutory joint Annual Report by the Environment and Traffic Adjudicators for the 2018/19 reporting year.

Caroline Hamilton, Chief Adjudicator, London Tribunals, introduced the report, and said that she was present to answer any questions that members might have. Councillor Field asked why a large number of bus lane appeals were allowed (page 9 of the report). Caroline Hamilton explained that often full evidence was not supplied by the appellants until the appeal progressed to the hearing stage. She said that the appellants were not quick at putting their full case forward at an earlier stage of the process. This was especially true if the motorist was no longer the legal owner of the vehicle in question. Caroline Hamilton said that, overall, the review process was working. The Chair thanked Caroline Hamilton for the work being carried out at London Tribunals.

Decision: The Committee received and noted the report.

4. Crossrail Update

This agenda item had been withdrawn. The Chair said that a Crossrail update would now be presented to TEC at the meeting on 5 December 2019.

5. London Waste & Recycling Board (LWARB) 2020 Strategy

The Committee received a report that provided members with a summary update on the London Waste and Recycling Board activities. It was suggested that London Councils' TEC would receive these updates on a six-monthly basis to improve visibility of LWARB's activities.

Liz Green, Chair of LWARB, introduced the presentation, stating that LWARB is seeking views on its next business plan and wanted to report back to members about the flats recycling work that LWARB was undertaking before handing over to Antony Buchan, Head of Programme, Resource London, who made the following comments:

New Business Plan

- LWARB was established in 2008 and had four local authority members on its Board, along with two independents, and Shirley Rodrigues, the Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy.
- Significant investment in waste infrastructure had taken place over the past 10 years. Significant support was also being provided to enable London's route to a more circular economy, with a greater focus on waste reduction.
- Part of the post 2020 focus would be to help support local authorities to tackle the climate emergency and help reduce consumption-based CO₂ emissions and restrict global warming to 1.5C.
- There is a £7.5 million budget to help achieve the aims of LWARB. The last funding received from Central Government was in 2015, and LWARB is now securing private sector funding.
- In order to plan for the next business planning round, key London Councils' stakeholders had been consulted, along with the Chief Executives' network and the Directors of Environment network. There was recognition of LWARB as a knowledge bank.
- LWARB was focusing on waste minimisation and delivering sustained behavioral change.
- Dialogue with London Councils' officers will continue and LWARB is considering setting up a new statutory committee to enable more borough officer input as well.
- LWARB is keen to support local authorities to reduce consumption-based emissions and to continue to work with the GLA and boroughs to minimise edible food waste and to help achieve recycling targets.
- LWARB will offer local authorities the opportunity to help residents embrace circular economy principles.
- The draft LWARB Business Plan would be presented to the Board on 31 October 2019.

Flats Recycling Programme

- A two-year project was taking place to look at how to improve recycling in flats.
- It was proving difficult to improve the recycling rates in flats, and a project was taking place in partnership between the Peabody Housing Association and six inner London boroughs. A great deal of analysis had been carried out, and a minimum flats waste standard had been tested, along with five resident focused interventions across ten estates.

- Interventions included a tenant recycling pack from the landlord, more and smaller bins and in-home storage solutions. This had all helped to increase recycling rates in flats by 22%, especially in glass and plastics.
- Key learnings for recycling in flats was that a minimum standard of service and consistency of service was needed within flats.
- The maximum dry recycling rate that could ever be achieved in flats is 32% and 60% with food, but only if 100% of everything was recycled without contamination, which was not achievable in flats.
- Another limiting factor to recycling rates in flats was the proportion of 15 to 34 year olds in flats. There was also still uncertainty over what items could and could not be recycled.
- A final report would be published at the end of November 2019, along with a toolkit.

Q and As

Councillor Mitchell asked whether any analysis had been carried out on old and new flats when it came to improving recycling rates. Councillor Webbe felt that there appeared to be a lack of coordination between different agencies when it came to recycling. She said that the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) was carrying out work that was not linked-up to what LWARB was doing.

Councillor Meldrum felt that there were too many different messages around when it came to recycling in flats, and it was not clear what people needed to do. She said that more consistent messages were needed throughout London. Councillor Meldrum said that social media needed to be engaged more in order to reach the 15 to 34-year old members of the public when it came to encouraging the take-up of recycling.

Councillor Edgar felt that there needed to be a shift in the measuring of targets when it came to reducing edible waste. Councillor Ghani said that recycling in flats was currently not working. He asked when the £7.5million in funding would be available to the boroughs. Councillor Scott-McDonald asked if any data was available with regards to recycling rates in old and new build flats (new build flats had a 60% higher recycling rate).

Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that the borough of Bromley was number one when it came to recycling rates in all the London boroughs. He felt that LWARB needed to include work that fed into building standards when it came to waste. Councillor Burke said that he would be happy to share the data and figures that the borough of Hackney had come up with in respect of recycling in flats. Councillor Abellan asked why 15 to 34-year olds recycled less than any other age group. He also asked what work the "hit squads" carried out.

Antony Buchan said that LWARB was working with the borough of Tower Hamlets to develop an SPG to encourage developers to think about what they could do in-house to encourage recycling. Talks around planning issues and recycling were also taking place with the borough of Hackney. Antony Buchan said that a template with regards to recycling in flats would be produced for all boroughs to use. He said that residents needed to be engaged in recycling inside their homes, or they would not bother to recycle outside their flats.

Antony Buchan said that how often the outside of flats were cleaned was an important factor when it came to recycling rates. He informed members that LWARB had a team that visited areas every two weeks, and had worked with local authorities to ensure that the bin storage area were kept clean and tidy. This can be a significant factor when it comes to an increase in recycling rates in flats. Antony Buchan said that data received from studying the 12 Peabody new build estates would be passed on to local authorities.

Antony Buchan said that coordination and consistency were both very important when it

came to increasing recycling rates. He confirmed that LWARB was using social media forums like Twitter and Snapchat to get through to the 15 to 34-year old age group to help increase recycling rates among this group. Antony Buchan said that LWARB was working closely with the North London Waste Authority with regards to waste and recycling. He confirmed that Councillor Clyde Loakes was the Chair of the Resource London Partnership Board, and resources were being made available to everyone. Antony Buchan said that it was hard to tackle consumption-based emissions. He said that pure tonnage targets were not helpful.

Antony Buchan said that LWARB had been asked by the Mayor to support local authorities to develop RRP. He said that the Mayor had requested to see every RRP before being signed-off (the GLA and the Mayor were responsible for taking the decision to sign-off). LWARB was also talking to all local authorities about making any changes to the toolkit. Antony Buchan said that “hit squads” were working with four local authorities to test the hypothesis to reduce contamination. LWARB was working in partnership with LEDNet, and results would be shared with TEC when completed.

Antony Buchan said that there were problems with recycling amongst 15 to 34-year olds, due to transiency, and more insight was needed into the behaviours of this group. He said that LWARB was trying to ascertain why the 15 to 34 age group was so difficult to reach when it came to recycling. Liz Goodwin said that the Business Plan would shape what LWARB would be focusing on, and feedback on this would be very helpful.

The Chair thanked Antony Buchan and Liz Goodwin for the comprehensive presentation.

Decision: The Committee:

- Noted that the draft LWARB Business Plan would be presented to the Board on 31 October 2019; and
- Noted that the next LWARB update would be presented to TEC on 26 March 2020.

6. Chair's Report

The Committee received a report that updated members on transport and environment activity since the last TEC meeting on 13 June 2019 and provided a forward look until the next TEC meeting on 5 December 2019.

The Chair introduced the report. He said that funding for two MRN schemes had been secured from the spending round. Assurances had also been received that the 2017/18 business plan figures for LIPs would not change in this business planning round. With regards to the proposal to change the LIPs funding formula, the Chair said that there was now agreement to delay the start date of any changes until the current 3-year LIP investment cycle ended in March 2022.

Alex Williams, Director of Borough Planning, Transport for London, confirmed that there were no changes to LIP funding at present. However, there could be some changes over the next few weeks with regards to Crossrail and a no deal Brexit.

Councillor Loakes said that he was disappointed that the World Car Free day was not mentioned in the Chair's Report, which had made a big difference to pollution levels. Councillor Field asked whether any money made from the ULEZ fines would be put back into improving air quality. He also asked what TfL was doing to educate residents and businesses with regards air quality. Alex Williams said that the ULEZ was about improving air quality and not making money. A report on the impact of the ULEZ over

the 6-month period would be presented to members in two weeks' time. Alex Williams said that there was a programme underway to clean-up London's buses and make 140 of them all electric.

Councillor Scott-McDonald felt that the public should be informed on what the money raised from the ULEZ was being spent on. Alex Williams said that this would be reflected in the TfL Business Plan when published in December 2019.

Decision: The Committee:

- Noted that any changes to the corridor formula for borough LIP funding had been deferred until 2022. There would be no changes to LIP funding until then (subject to any external funding influences like Crossrail or a no-deal Brexit); and
- Noted the Chair's Report.

7. Electric Vehicle Coordination Function

The Committee considered a report that provided members with an overview of the proposed electric vehicle (EV) coordination function activities for review and feedback.

Katharina Winbeck, Strategic Lead, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure, London Councils, introduced the report and informed members that there had been a great deal of activity in the roll out of EV infrastructure this year and in order for this to continue, a form of co-ordination function was required. She said that the role of GULCS Senior Lead was paid for up to March 2020, and it would be very beneficial for this to continue beyond this date.

Katharina Winbeck said that a report would be taken to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 14 November 2019, to get support for part funding the coordination of EV activity from TEC reserve funding. A report would then be presented to the TEC Main meeting on 5 December 2019.

Katharina Winbeck said that in order for London Councils to host the coordination function, boroughs needed to sign the and send in their amendment to the LCTEC Agreement as soon as possible. The following boroughs had still not sent in their amendment: Bexley, Brent, Bromley, Greenwich, Hammersmith & Fulham, Haringey, Havering, Hillingdon, Kensington & Chelsea, Lambeth, Newham, Southwark, Sutton, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest and the City of London. The Chair said that he would be happy to send the outstanding boroughs a reminder letter.

Councillor Field said that it was important to not let the programme slip. Katharina Winbeck acknowledged that and stated that as soon as all applications for funding had been received by the deadline of 31 October 2019, officers will look at ways of speeding up the decision process to give boroughs certainty of funding more quickly.

Councillor Webbe said that the borough of Islington had signed the amendment to the TEC Agreement back in September 2018. She said that the outstanding boroughs now needed to send in their signed amendments in order for the GULCS programme to be extended beyond 2020. Councillor Webbe said that 400 charge points were needed by 2020, with lamp post charges being the most effective. She said that the GULCS Senior Lead role had been very helpful. Consistency across boroughs was required to help deliver the programme. Councillor Webbe felt that legislation needed to be introduced to ensure that residents were not at a disadvantage by moving towards EVs. Councillor Burke said that a rapid roll-out of EV charge points was needed. Katharina Winbeck said that the process now needed to be sped-up. She said that there were uncertainties

regarding future funding of EV infrastructure (beyond the current GULCS programme).

Decision: The Committee:

- Agreed that relevant TEC members would progress sign-off and return the proposed amendment to the LCTEC agreement for their borough by the end of 2019. This would give London Councils permission to actively participate in the delivery of the EV coordination function. (The following boroughs had not yet signed the variation to the TEC Agreement: Bexley, Brent, Bromley, Greenwich, Hammersmith & Fulham, Haringey, Havering, Hillingdon, Kensington & Chelsea, Lambeth, Newham, Southwark, Sutton, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest and the City of London).
- Agreed to bring a report to look at resourcing the EV coordination function to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 14 November 2019; and
- Reviewed and provided feedback on the proposed activities of the electric vehicle coordination function provided in Appendix B.

8. Climate Change Update

The Committee received a report that outlined a programme of activities where London Councils could usefully support boroughs' individual and collective actions on climate change in the interest of value for money and efficiencies. This work area was within the functions delegated to Leaders' Committee.

Katharina Winbeck said that 25 boroughs, had now declared a climate emergency. She said that London Councils would be coordinating some work on climate change policy on behalf of the boroughs, initially focusing on getting an accurate and robust baseline. The table in paragraph 14 of the report outlines some ways in which London Councils could help support local authorities. Katharina Winbeck said that this table would need to be signed off by Leaders' Committee before the work was taken forward. Additional resources would need to be provided in order to proceed with this work, and a business case would need to be made for this.

Councillor Loakes said that the wording for climate "change" should be replaced with climate "emergency". He said that work on this needed to be progressed quickly. The Chair said that he would prefer to use the term "climate change emergency".

Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that the borough of Bromley had not declared a climate emergency, as it had not needed to. He informed members that Bromley had an action plan in place to help reduce emissions over the past 10 years and had been successfully delivering on this. Councillor Livingstone voiced concern over the carbon emissions being given off from buildings, which could be worse than emissions from vehicles. He felt that there should be a role for London Councils in this and to find some underspend to take this forward.

Councillor Burke said that the term "climate change" had been coined in the late 1980s. He felt that the term "global warming" should now be used. Councillor Burke said that a construction company in Norwich had recently won an award for producing zero emissions homes. Councillor Gander said that she welcomed the support on the climate change emergency. She said that it would be beneficial to feedback what officers were saying regarding this. Councillor Gander felt that there was very little in

the report with regards to lobbying for more funding. She said that this was important as boroughs did not have a budget for this work. Councillor Gander said that she also welcomed the change of wording to “climate change emergency”.

Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, informed members that there would be a need to look at how TEC would fund the climate change proposals, should Leaders’ Committee agree to the proposals. This could be addressed by having a recharge to TEC, from the Joint (Leaders) Committee, or by a transfer from TEC Uncommitted Reserves to the Joint Committee. Frank Smith said that discussions with legal colleagues had commenced to clarify what was permissible under the current TEC Agreement.

Katharina Winbeck said that a great deal of engagement on the climate change emergency was taking place with several officer groupings, such as Chief Executives, LEDNet, as well as Finance and Housing and London Councils was working with all these different networks. Katharina Winbeck said that she will note the Committees views on the issue of carbon emissions in construction and discuss this further with officers from each local authority.

The Chair said that it was important to include the word “emergency” when discussing climate change (because it was an emergency). He said that the pace on this also needed to be picked-up.

Decision: The Committee:

- Noted that the climate change proposals would have to be signed off by Leaders’ Committee, prior to going back to TEC;
- Noted that if Leaders’ Committee agree to the climate change proposals, the issue of how to resource these proposals will need to be addressed, potentially either by a recharge to TEC from the Joint (Leaders) Committee, or by a transfer from TEC Uncommitted Reserves to the Joint Committee; and
- Agreed to refer to climate change as a climate change “emergency” in future wording.

9. Traffic Signals Budget 2020/21

The Committee considered a report that set out the cost to boroughs of maintaining traffic signals in London in 2020/21 based on the “actual cost” model agreed in December 2018, and recommended a new four-year transitioned approach for the apportionment of the costs to each authority based on the average of controller site locations and mid-2018 Office of National Statistics population statistics.

Spencer Palmer, Director of Transport and Mobility, London Councils, introduced the report. He said that the traffic signals model now better reflected the actual cost of maintaining traffic signals. There would also be savings for boroughs in 2020 due to lower energy cost forecasts. Spencer Palmer confirmed that there would be some “winners” and some “losers” with the proposed apportionment model, but these costs would be smoothed over the next 4-years. Spencer Palmer mentioned that one authority had recently pointed out a small error in the TfL calculations and confirmed that a retrospective adjustment would be made next year to compensate for this and any other errors that were found in the meantime.

Decision: The Committee:

- Agreed the total cost to boroughs for maintaining traffic signals in London for 2020/21, which was £11,019,852.37 as shown in Appendix 1;

- Agreed that this cost was apportioned between boroughs based on controller site locations and mid-2018 Office of National Statistics population calculations, as shown in Appendix 2;
- Agreed to a four-year transition period to help smooth the impact of resulting significant cost changes for many boroughs, as outlined in Appendix 3; and
- Noted that any borough queries about potential errors found with the TfL data and calculations would be investigated and where necessary, retrospective adjustments would be made to the following year's apportionment calculations.

10. Safe Speeds in London Review

The Committee received a report that provided members with an update on the legal advice received from Counsel regarding the constraints on the ability of local authorities to enforce speeding limits in London.

Spencer Palmer introduced the report, which listed a number of options for Committee to consider. He informed members that further legal advice on what could or could not be carried out had been sought.

Spencer Palmer gave an overview of the options described in the report and explained that a steer on the options to take forward was now needed from members.

The Chair said that the steer from the Labour Group was for partial discrimination of speed enforcement (option 16b, page 4 of the report). He said that most boroughs were implementing 20mph zones but were unable to enforce them. Councillor Mitchell said that the Conservative Group had not come to a collective decision yet owing to concerns around decriminalisation. He said that the City of Westminster was also in favour of partial decriminalisation (option 16b).

Councillor Mitchell said that it was important to give the public the confidence that 20mph roads were being enforced. Councillor Webbe informed Committee that Islington was the first borough to roll-out 20mph speed limits boroughwide. She said that the 20mph limit was not being effectively enforced, and boroughs needed greater control over this. Councillor Webbe said that she also supported the partial decriminalisation of speed enforcement (option 16b). Councillor Burke said that he was also in support of option 16b, but felt that more clarity was needed when it came to who was responsible for prosecuting what offences.

Councillor Abellan said that he supported partial decriminalisation. He felt that more clarity was needed in the report on what options were mutually exclusive. Councillor Abellan said that he was concerned in the short-term and said that a parallel approach needed to be taken. He said that he also supported all of the options listed in paragraph 35 of the report regarding "supporting TfL and the MPS speed enforcement action plan." Councillor Abellan said that he was also in support of paragraph 21d – "London Councils to lobby Central Government for the new primary legislation to allow boroughs to prosecute speed offences under s.222 of the LGA Act 1972". He said that the main objective was to reduce speeding and save lives. He said that he also supported the need to the steering group to carry on its work.

The Chair said that he was in favour of all the options in paragraph 35 of the report. Spencer Palmer confirmed that he had noted the comments with regards to paragraph 35. Councillor Field emphasised the need to keep the momentum up on this in order to save lives. He said that he supported partial decriminalisation and said that the enforcement of 20mph speed limits now needed to be taken forward quickly. Councillor Field said that residents wanted to see action with regards to the enforcement of 20mph speed limits.

Councillor Whelton said that he also supported option 16b but asked whether the LGA had any views regarding wider legislation across England. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that 20mph zones in the borough of Bromley were mainly around schools. The Chair said that more work was needed on the definition of partial decriminalisation of speed enforcement. Spencer Palmer said that he was unaware of any support from the LGA or authorities for decriminalisation outside of London. He said the steering group would look into the definition of partial decriminalisation before lobbying for legislative change.

Spencer Palmer thanked the Committee for their comments and steer and confirmed the options to be progressed, as noted below.

Decision: The Committee:

- Agreed to lobby Central Government for the new primary legislation required for partial decriminalisation to allow local authorities to enforce some (but not all) speeding offences. The steering group to look into the definition of what partial decriminalisation should include;
- Agreed to support TfL and the MPS plans for boroughs to play a more active role in where speed enforcement took place and where cameras were located;
- Agreed to explore the development of borough-led pilots of increased speed data and intelligence gathering for sharing with the police to pursue prosecutions or to inform subsequent police deployments;
- Agreed to pursue the borough provision of speed awareness courses in conjunction with the lobbying for partial decriminalisation;
- Agreed to support TfL and the MPS with regards to their speed awareness publicity campaigns;
- Agreed to continue to support TfL with the implementation of their speed enforcement action plan;
- Agreed to support TfL in delegating speed enforcement powers to Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) and for the TEC Chair to send a letter of support to the Mayor and the Met Police Commissioner outlining this support;
- Agreed to continue to support TfL in developing the revised methodology for safety cameras with boroughs on London roads;
- Agreed to support the development of TfL proposals for borough funded cameras, at locations chosen by boroughs, to help implement trials in a small number of boroughs before further roll-out is considered; and
- Agreed to support the trialling of 'moveable' camera technologies to enhance enforcement opportunities and build flexibility into the network.

11. Freedom Pass Progress Report

The Committee received a report that provided members with an update on the 2019 mid-term review of the eligibility and the 2020 renewal of Freedom passes.

Stephen Boon, Chief Contracts Officer, London Councils, introduced the report. He said that members were being asked to decide on whether or not to automatically send new passes to people that had not used their passes in the last year. Councillor Huntington-Thresher felt that a one-year period of inactivity to not automatically renew a pass was too short, especially if a passholder had been in hospital for a long period of time. He said that where renewal letters were sent to those that appear to have changed address, the letter should also state that if the person no longer used their pass, then they need not reapply.

Stephen Boon informed members that between 80 to 85% of passholders did renew their passes in previous renewal exercises. He said that the automatic renewal could be

extended to everyone who had used their pass in the last two-year period, instead of a year. Spencer Palmer confirmed that for inactive pass holders, the plan would not mean a person's Freedom pass would be permanently cancelled, it would just not be renewed automatically. They would be able to reapply at any time and Stephen Boon confirmed that it normally took between 3 to 5 days to send out a new pass.

Decision: The Committee:

- Noted the information and advice for their authorities within the report;
- Agreed not to automatically renew passes for pass holders that had not used their Freedom pass for **two** years, and in instances where it was necessary to write to pass holders to verify that they were still eligible, to state in this letter that the pass holder need not reapply if they no longer used their pass; and
- Agreed to support their borough concessionary travel teams in respect of Disabled Persons' Freedom Pass renewals and agreed that London Councils would ask each individual authority to ensure borough resources were in place to undertake the 2020 review of disabled pass holders.

12. Taxicard Update

The Committee considered a report that provided members with a progress update on the implementation of the new Taxicard contract. It highlighted savings made to date, some issues with performance and analysed the reasons, setting out the mitigating steps that were being taken to improve the situation.

Stephen Boon introduced the report. He informed members that there had been a number of positive improvements to the Taxicard service as a result of the new contract. The Chair said that City Fleet was currently developing a new app that would allow non CityFleet drivers to do Taxicard work if they undertook the required training. As a result of this, the number of drivers available for Taxicard jobs would increase. Stephen Boon said that this app might take longer than the scheduled release date of October 2019. The Chair said that improvements should continue to be made to ensure that Taxicard holders received a better service.

Decision: The Committee noted the Taxicard update report.

13. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 13 June 2019 (for agreeing)

The minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 13 June 2019 were agreed as an accurate record.

14. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting held on 12 September 2019 (for noting)

The minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting held on 12 September 2019 were noted.

The press and public were asked to leave the room while the exempt part of the agenda was discussed.

The meeting finished at 16:53pm

LONDON COUNCILS' TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT EXECUTIVE SUB COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on **12 September 2019** at 10:00am, at London Councils, Meeting Room 1, 1st Floor, 59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL.

Present:

Councillor Julian Bell (Chair)	LB Ealing
Councillor William Huntington-Thresher	LB Bromley
Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald	RB Greenwich
Councillor Wesley Harcourt	LB Hammersmith & Fulham
Councillor Claire Holland	LB Lambeth
Councillor Zulfiqar Ali	LB Newham
Councillor Richard Livingstone	LB Southwark
Councillor Manuel Abellan	LB Sutton
Councillor Guy Humphries (Deputy)	LB Wandsworth
Councillor Tim Mitchell	City of Westminster

1. Apologies for Absence & Announcement & Deputies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Claudia Webbe (LB Islington), Councillor Richard Field (LB Wandsworth), and Alastair Moss (City of London). Councillor Guy Humphries attended as a deputy (LB Wandsworth).

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Livingstone declared an interest in being on the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee.

3. LEDNet & ADPH London Air Quality Position

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that provided members with the combined views of the London Environment Directors' Network (LEDNet) and the Association of Directors of Public Health – London (ADPH) on how tackling air quality could most effectively be achieved.

Dagmar Zeuner, Director of Public Health, London Borough of Merton, introduced the report and made the following comments:

- The purpose of the position statement was to have a shared narrative when it came to tackling air pollution, to lobby, and to bring together professionals in order to reach more people
- Air pollution affected the health of children, and impaired cognitive behaviour and caused problems with regards to sedentary behaviour, like obesity and mental health
- There were a number of untapped resources and supply chains that could help with tackling air pollution – the NHS has a long-term plan and was now committed to dealing with air pollution. LEDNet and ADPH were working at a London level

Dipti Patel, Vice Chair of LEDNet, made the following comments:

- Air quality was getting worse and one of the recommendations was advocating for at least 2.5% of UK annual GDP to be spent on tackling air quality and climate change in the UK
- Children needed to be protected from air pollution
- A “Healthy Streets” approach was being implemented to help deal with air pollution
- Tackling pollution “hot spots” was being looked into to help to protect vulnerable communities
- Health bodies and providers would alert people on the impacts of air pollution
- ULEZ and scrappage schemes were being supported, and the impact of air pollution in outer London boroughs was being looked at.

Q and As

Councillor Mitchell welcomed the report and said that air pollution was a key issue in Central London and was a major concern. He said that it was important to ensure that funding was made available to implement the list of “asks”. Councillor Mitchell emphasised that this was a partnership across all levels, and not just through government. He said that the position statement was a good initial framework.

Councillor Ali said that there was a need to look at restructuring existing funding. He felt that there was a lot more that could be done with regards to air quality, and a serious financial commitment to this was needed.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that there were problems with some of the details in the position statement, especially with regards to the funding. He also felt that the 2.5% of UK annual GDP that was advocated to be spent was unrealistic. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that the issue of air quality was everyone’s responsibility. He felt that there should be a move away from domestic gas and a move towards low emission forms of heating like heat pumps for households.

Councillor Livingstone welcomed the report but said that there were areas that could be improved on. He said that infrastructure needed to be included in the position statement, along with need to see how local authorities were playing their role to improve air quality, and the GLA and TfL etc. Councillor Livingstone said that his borough of Southwark was lobbied a great deal on the issue of air quality. He said that there was a big issue around inequality, as well as issues about raising awareness.

Councillor Abellan also welcomed the report but asked for more details regarding the 2.5% of GDP to be spent on air pollution. He asked whether this was specific to the UK. Councillor Abellan said that the position statement did not include many details around car idling. He asked whether London Councils could put together some key messages for borough residents, in order to raise awareness of the problems and causes of air pollution.

Councillor Scott-McDonald said that the position statement was a good way forward. She said that a cross departmental approach to tackling air pollution was needed. Councillor Scott-McDonald felt that there was a need to find ways to accelerate the funding to prevent air pollution. She said that the Royal Borough of Greenwich

received a large number of complaints about wood burning stoves, and these types of issues needed to be emphasised.

Councillor Holland said that it was right to have a joint approach, and she felt that the issue of air quality and inequality needed to be made stronger in general. Councillor Holland said that more funding was needed, as borough officer capacity was already stretched on all fronts. She said that more information on air quality needed to be provided to the public, like notifying them when there were days of particularly high pollution.

Councillor Humphries said that the issue of funding was key when it came to tackling air pollution. He felt that other stakeholders needed to be encouraged to play their part in this as well. Councillor Harcourt said that more work was needed on dealing with tail pipe emissions, tyres and break pipes. He said that residential wood burners, along with burning items in back gardens also needed to be concentrated on. Councillor Harcourt said that a number of new developments/buildings did not achieve the required carbon targets that were set.

Councillor Livingstone said that it would be a good opportunity now to lobby the political parties to make air pollution a priority in their manifestos. Councillor Ali said that there was no mention of aviation pollution in the report, or what TfL or the Mayor were doing specifically to tackle air pollution. Councillor Huntington-Thresher felt that walking needed to be promoted more vigorously, as a means to help reduce air pollution. The Chair said that break dust and tyres were also adding to PM10 emissions.

Dagmar Zeuner said that this was the first position statement, which was ongoing and would be refined and improved. She said that aviation, and also boats on the Thames also contributed to pollution in the London boroughs. Dagmar Zeuner said that there were certain “trade offs” that boroughs could learn through joint working. She said that it was important to bring officers together, monitor and to share ideas. There was also a need to look at obtaining funding from other stakeholders and organisations, like the NHS.

Dipti Patel said that funding, and how best to utilise all the different bodies was challenging. She said that examples of what had already been carried out before (eg case studies) needed to be looked at. A consistent message from the boroughs, London Councils and the Mayor was also required. Dipti Patel said that issues regarding inequalities would be taken on board, and there was a need to speak out for the people from these communities. She said that the position statement was a “collective voice”.

The Chair said that the 2.5% of GDP proposed to be spent on tackling air pollution was an international response. He said that more work was needed to provide a link with air quality and the climate emergency. Jim Odling-Smee, Director of Communications, London Councils, said that the lobbying of Government was being led by John O’Brien, Chief Executive of London Councils, through the political groups and around London Councils’ pledges. He said that the issue of air pollution had been raised with the Secretary of State as a priority. Dagmar Zeuner said that air pollution went beyond party politics, and everybody needed to be involved in this.

The Chair asked what the plan was to take these issues on board. Kate Hand, LEDNet Programme Manager, confirmed that adjustments would be made to the joint position statement on air quality, which would then be shared with the Chair and vice

chairs of TEC. Dagmar Zeuner said that the position statement would be used as a basis for initial dialogue with Londoners.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed that adjustments would be made to the LEDNet and ADPH joint position on air quality and this would then be shared with the Chair and vice chairs of TEC; and
- Noted and commented on the report.

4. Climate Change – Borough Actions So Far & Future Activity

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that provided members with an update on the work that London Councils had carried out to support local authorities to develop their climate change programmes, including an overview of and outcomes from the recent workshop for lead climate change officers.

Owain Mortimer, Principal Policy Officer, London Councils, introduced the report and made the following comments:

- The report provided a brief update since the discussions that took place on the climate emergency at the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 18 July 2019
- Engagement between London Councils and UK:100 had continued to take place.
- A workshop had taken place with borough officers to identify joint issues and solutions, and how best London Councils could provide support.
- This was the first step at bringing officers and other parties together.
- At the last TEC meeting, 16 boroughs had declared a climate emergency. Now 24 boroughs had declared a climate emergency.
- A further update on climate change would be presented to the full TEC meeting on 10 October 2019.
- A TEC/LEDNet Conference was taking place on 13 November 2019, and members were encouraged to attend.
- A “climate strike” in London was planned for 20 September 2019.

Councillor Abellan asked whether a table could be produced that outlined each boroughs’ current position climate change. Owain Mortimer confirmed that it could. Councillor Abellan felt that there was not much detail in the report, or where London Councils was going with regards to climate change. Councillor Abellan also asked if councillors would be getting more information than this at the next TEC meeting. Owain Mortimer said that a more detailed paper would be presented to TEC in October. Councillor Ali said that more information sharing needed to take place between boroughs. He said that key issues needed be addressed, and an “action plan” compiled.

Councillor Mitchell said that officers in the City of Westminster had discussed the lack of resources at a borough level. He said that there were actions that emerged when boroughs signed up for a climate emergency, and this needed to proceed in a focussed and practical manner. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that he fully supported what had come up from the boroughs with regards to climate. He felt, however, that TEC/London Councils did not need to lead on these issues as the boroughs would set out their own agendas (e.g. on emissions etc), with regards to

climate change. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that best practice needed to be facilitated between the boroughs.

Councillor Scott-McDonald asked for more details about the “climate strike”. Owain Mortimer said that this was a global strike being and was a joint response by a broad coalition of Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), including Greenpeace, national unions and social movements. Councillor Holland said that TEC should be focussing and providing leadership on the climate emergency. She said the boroughs were in a major need of a toolkit to help with this. Councillor Holland said that climate change affected everybody, and boroughs needed to come up with a way forward together. Councillor Livingstone said that London Councils had a role in cross borough working on climate change, and TEC had a real role in this. Owain Mortimer said that he noted the points raised by members on climate change and would cover these in a more detail report to TEC in October.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed to provide members with details relating to borough positions on the climate emergency; and
- Agreed that a more detailed report on climate change would be presented to members at the full TEC meeting on 10 October 2019

5. The Final Report of the Task & Finish Group on Car Clubs

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that informed members of the Task and Finish Group that was brought together by London Councils’ officers to provide an in-depth analysis of the current state of Car Clubs in London, and to identify ways in which car sharing could contribute in responding to environmental, population growth and congestion challenges.

Paulius Mackela, Principal Policy and Projects Officer, London Councils, introduced the report, and made the following comments:

- This was the first milestone for the future mobility agenda
- A previous update on the Task and Finish Group on Car Clubs was presented to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 18 July 2019
- The recommendations came from the Task and Finish Group, and not London Councils
- There were 6 categories on each recommendation. They were as follows:

Understanding Car Sharing

Not all officers understood what the principal of car sharing was, and London Councils proposed a briefing on this. There was a proposal for a separate page on car sharing on the London Councils’ website (over the past 10 years). Promote code of conduct and accreditation.

Data & Evidence Base

Looking at where car sharing works best. Come up with a list of data/matrix table. Not enough evidence to have a clear policy line.

Operational Arrangements

Some boroughs had need for a guidance document. Include BVRLA and CoMoUKs accreditation schemes with operators.

Low Emission Zones, EVs & Car Sharing

Have discussions with the GLA with regards to ULEZ

Coordinating London's Car Sharing Policy

A new part-time policy officer role to produce a guidance document for boroughs, and to ensure the work started by the Task and Finish Group continues.

On-going Engagement between Car Clubs and Government

Part-time officer to support on-going engagement, and to coordinate meetings and training events.

Paulius Mackela said that members were being asked to support, in principle, having a part-time officer role to take forward the recommendations outlined by the Task and Finish Group on car clubs. He said that a decision on this could be made at the Main TEC meeting on 10 October 2019. Potential funding proposals for this officer role could then be presented to TEC on 5 December 2019. Other organisations were also being asked to assist with the funding of this officer role.

Councillor Mitchell said that there was a need to see some justification for having a part-time officer role to take car clubs forward. He said that electric vehicles were becoming far more sophisticated, like the launch of the new Mini, and would hopefully ween families off from having multiple cars in their households.

Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, apologised to the Committee as he was unaware of the request for resources for the new part-time officer role to take car sharing forward. He said that the current proposed timescale for funding the new officer was at odds with the TEC budgetary timeline, and a decision on this funding would need to be made at the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 14 November 2019. Councillor Ali said that external sources of funding should be looked into to pay for the part-time officer, along with looking at the role that IT could play to make things more efficient.

The Chair said that the main comments had been noted, along with making a funding decision with regards to the part-time officer role at the TEC Executive meeting on 14 November 2019. Frank Smith informed members that TEC did have a "special projects" budget that could go towards funding this role. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that clarity was needed as to whether the new officer role was a "one off", or whether the role would be "ongoing", and this needed to be clear as part of the budget negotiations. Paulius Mackela said that the role would be funded by the public sector for two years, after which the role would be self-sustained from industry. The Chair said that the car clubs needed to be made aware of this "ask" of them. Paulius Mackela said that he would report back to TEC on this.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed that any decisions made regarding the funding of a part-time officer be taken to the TEC Executive on 14 November 2019;
- Agreed that the car club companies be made aware of any "asks" made of them, with regards to the future funding of a part-time officer role;
- Noted that external sources of funding should be looked into, as well as the role of IT in order to make things more efficient; and

- Agreed the final recommendations put forward by the Task and Finish Group on Car Clubs.

6. Future Mobility Agenda: Task & Finish Group on Smart Mobility & MaaS

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a paper that informed members of the significant positive impacts on the efficiency, environmental performance and safety of the transport network. TEC was well placed to play a stronger role in understanding the potential of Smart Mobility and Mobility as a Service (MaaS) platforms in the capital and it was proposed that a Task and Finish Group be set-up to look to help shape this policy agenda going forward.

Paulius Mackela introduced the “Future Mobility Agenda” report, which was the next focus of the Task and Finish Group. He said that the structure of the report would be the same as the car clubs and would comprise of up to 15 members and identify the role of the London boroughs and local government going forward. Paulius Mackela said that the GLA and TfL would also be attending the Group as regular members, and the DfT would join one of the meetings. Paulius Mackela said that the Group was only expected to come up with a few recommendations. The final report from this Task and Finish Group would be presented to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 6 February 2010.

Councillor Mitchell said that he welcomed this report and said that a lot of work would need to be carried out on this. He said that it would be useful for boroughs to analyse the data on this. Councillor Mitchell said that he would also like to see Google Maps promoting healthy walking options. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that it would be beneficial if the TEC Executive could receive further guidance with regards to MaaS, before receiving the final report. Spencer Palmer said that a more detailed programme would be presented to the TEC Executive at the meeting on 14 November 2019.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed to bring a more detailed programme on the Task and Finish Group on Smart Mobility and MaaS to the TEC Executive on 14 November 2019; and
- Agreed the purpose, topics, size, composition and timescales of the proposed Task and Finish Group on Smart Mobility and MaaS.

7. Transport and Mobility Services Performance Information

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that detailed the London Councils’ Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Quarter 1 in 2019/20.

Spencer Palmer, Director of Transport and Mobility, London Councils, introduced the report which provided the performance information for Quarter 1 for 2019/20.

Spencer Palmer said that although customer satisfaction remained very high, targets were still struggling to be met in Freedom Pass section of the report, resulting in the three “red” ratings. He said that measures had been put in place to rectify this but pointed out that customer service standards were set quite high compared to other local authority services. He said that he would be reviewing these standards in the future. The two “red” ratings for the Taxicard section of the report were still mainly the

result of the new contract changes, especially the move to a fixed price structure as requested by customers. Spencer Palmer explained that the agreed Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) had remained in place and progress was being made. to help improve these targets. Spencer Palmer said that a new pricing structure had now been implemented that ensured customers still enjoyed the price guarantee, but drivers would get paid based on the metered fare. This was proving more popular with the contractor taxi drivers. Improvements were continuing to be monitored with the contractor.

Spencer Palmer said that the “red” rating for the London Lorry Control Scheme was due to the relatively low number of appeals received, which caused the performance against these targets to fluctuate. Councillor Livingstone asked whether the Taxicard targets were expected to improve in Quarter 2. Spencer Palmer said that a sustained improvement to the targets was currently taking place.

Councillor Livingstone asked what the change to drivers’ pricing structure meant. Spencer Palmer explained that, before the retendering exercise took place, Taxicard members had been consulted and had said that they wanted a degree of cost certainty when it came to pricing. The successful tenderer rolled out a fixed price module, however, this was affecting performance and Taxicard drivers were not happy about the new fixed pricing. Spencer Palmer said that, since then, it had been agreed that drivers would now get a percentage of the meter price. Spencer Palmer informed members that there were also issues around more taxi drivers leaving the industry. He said that CityFleet was introducing an app that would open the circuit to a bigger pool of drivers.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the report.

8. Month 3 Revenue Forecast 2019/20

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that outlined actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of June 2019 for TEC and provided a forecast of the outturn position for 2019/20.

Frank Smith introduced the report and informed members that, at this early stage, there was currently a budget surplus forecast of £299,000. He said that there were projected surpluses from the Committee’s trading activities, as well as from the London Lorry Control Scheme PCN income and income from replacement Freedom passes. Frank Smith said that £96,000 in revenue had been collected in respect of members losing their Freedom passes for August alone, and the income levels showed no sign of reducing.

Frank Smith informed Committee that London Councils was currently moving towards agile working and a pilot had taken place on the third floor of the building. This would cut down on overall desk space and potentially allow London Councils to generate greater rental income.

Frank Smith said that the TEC budget was in a healthy position. The TEC reserves continued to breach the agreed 15% upper benchmark, and the decrease in costs for the 2020 Freedom Pass re-issue exercise (£3 million down to £1 million) had contributed further to this position.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher asked whether the £3.125 million “overspend” referred to in paragraph 3 (page 2) of the report was meant to be referred to as an

“underspend”. Frank Smith confirmed that this was the case and apologised for this typographical error.

Decision: The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that the gross expenditure budgets by £3.125 million was an underspend, and not an overspend (paragraph 3, page 2 – Variance from Budget);
- Noted the projected surplus of £299,000 for the year, and the forecast net underspend of £3.505 million 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 to 8.

9. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 18 July 2019 (for agreeing)

It was noted that the TEC Executive meeting on 18 July 2019 finished at 12.07 pm and not 16.50pm, and this should be amended.

Subject to the above minor amendment, the minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting held on 18 July 2019 were agreed as an accurate record.

The meeting finished at 11:35am