

# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

**Thursday 10 September 2020**

**10:00am – Virtual Meeting**

**Contact Officer:** Alan Edwards

**Tel:** 07767444885

**Email:** Alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Part One: Agenda item	Pages
1 Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies	-
2 Declarations of Interests*	
3 Future Mobility Agenda: Update Report	
4 Transport & Mobility Performance Information	
5 Under 18 Travel Update	<i>To Follow</i>
6 Safe Speeds Review for London	
7 TEC Month 3 Revenue Forecast 2020/21	
8 Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee Meeting held on 16 July 2020 (for agreeing)	
<p><b>Part Two: Exclusion of the Press &amp; Public (Exempt)</b></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 3 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>	

<b>E1 Exempt Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 16 July 2020 (for agreeing)</b>	
---	--

### **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  
Tel: 07767444885  
Email: [alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

**Declarations of Interest – TEC Executive Sub Committee**  
**10 September 2020**

Freedom Pass & 60+ Oyster Card

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

South London Waste Partnership

Cllr Stuart King (LB Croydon), Cllr Hilary Gander (RB Kingston), and Cllr Manuel Abellan (LB Sutton)

Western Riverside Waste Authority

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

Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (RFCC)

Cllr Richard Livingstone (LB Southwark)

London Road Safety Council

Cllr Richard Livingstone (LB Southwark), and Cllr Tim Mitchell (City of Westminster)

Car Club

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing) and Cllr Tim Mitchell (City of Westminster)

London Cycling Campaign

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing) and Councillor Hilary Gander (RB Kingston)

Dockless Bike Scheme

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing)



# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

## Future Mobility Agenda: Update Report

Item No: 03

**Report by:** Paulius Mackela

**Job title:** Principal Policy & Project Officer

**Date:** 10 September 2020

**Contact Officer:** Paulius Mackela

**Telephone:** 020 7934 9829

**Email:** Paulius.Mackela@londoncouncils.gov.uk

---

**Summary:**

This report provides an update to TEC Executive on London Councils' work on future mobility and outlines information about three key workstreams: car clubs, mobility as a service platform and e-scooters.

**Recommendations:**

Members are asked to:

- Note and comment on the report.

## Overview

1. This report provides an update on three workstreams of the Future Mobility Agenda<sup>1</sup> – car clubs, mobility as a service platforms and dockless micromobility (e-scooters).

## Car clubs

2. The Task & Finish Group on Car Clubs was brought together by London Councils 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.
3. The group's proposed recommendations were approved by the TEC Executive in November 2019. Alongside other recommendations, the group suggested that there is a lack of data available to undertake an in-depth analysis of car sharing operations on both local and pan-London levels.
4. London Councils' officers have been working together with Imperial College London and the RAC Foundation to review existing car club data sharing schemes and propose a new standardised format of data sharing between car clubs and local authorities. Following an in-depth literature review, interviews with senior transport officers from other countries and several workshops with key stakeholders (London boroughs, TfL, DfT, car club operators, academia and other researchers), it is expected that the final report will be published in Autumn 2020. The final data sharing framework, which is to be known as CLADS (Car club – Local Authority Data Standard), will set out technical details for data sharing standards that are beneficial and acceptable to both car club operators and local authorities. We anticipate that this research project will lead to a closer partnership and better understanding between London local government and shared mobility operators.
5. The group also recommended to develop and support a new part-time officer role aiming to coordinate London's car sharing policy to ensure the continuation of the work started by the Task & Finish Group on Car Clubs. To better coordinate London's car clubs policies, London Councils and TfL agreed to co-fund a new Car Club Coordinator position to ensure we have the resources needed to support the car club sector going forward. We are now finalising the recruitment documents and aim to commence the recruitment process in Autumn 2020.

## MaaS platform

6. Smart Mobility & Mobility as a Service (MaaS) was the second focus area of the Future Mobility Agenda and a Task and Finish Group was set up in November 2019. The February TEC Executive meeting discussed and agreed the recommendations of this group<sup>2</sup>. The main recommendation was:

*“The group therefore recommends that TfL should be recognised as the lead organisation in developing and managing a pan-London MaaS solution which has public good at its heart, in collaboration with and support from London boroughs and London Councils”.*

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information about the Future Mobility Agenda see the full report here:

<https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/34772>

<sup>2</sup> Full report can be accessed here: <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/37357>

7. On 4 August 2020, TfL announced the launch of a new TfL Go app<sup>3</sup>, which makes it easier for customers to plan their journeys in London. The new app, which at the moment is only available on Apple Store, provides real-time train times and offers alternative routes, and walking and cycling options. TfL intends to release an Android version in Autumn 2020, with further updates later in the year. New features will include live bus information, lift status and the location of toilets.
8. London Councils' officers welcome the launch of the new app and are keen to encourage TfL to continue improving it by adding other transport modes and additional functionality.

## **E-scooters**

9. Many cities across the world have significant rental e-scooter markets. The Department for Transport (DfT) announced in early May 2020 its intention to bring forward trials of rental e-scooters (previously planned for 2021) and to roll the option out to any interested local area, as part of its coronavirus response. Following a consultation on allowing rental companies to make e-scooters available in year-long trials across the UK, relevant regulations have been made and came into force on 4 July 2020. The DfT have also published an accompanying guidance document<sup>4</sup>.
10. At TEC Executive meeting on 16 July 2020, members received a report<sup>5</sup>, which provided an update on a proposed multi-borough e-scooter trial in London. It was clear from that discussion that there was a great interest in these trials, as long as some concerns could be addressed, particularly around issues of safety and enforcement. It was also clear that not every borough would want to take part in a trial.
11. Since July 2020, London Councils and TfL have been hosting weekly borough officer working group meetings to consider the case for an e-scooter trial in the Capital and what London's boroughs would like to see in any trial that was proposed to the DfT for their approval. Officers from London boroughs, TfL and London Councils have now agreed the final version of the trial proposal document and are ready to continue developing other documents but are waiting for DfT to provide further clarity on some aspects of the trial.
12. London Councils' officers will continue to work closely with TfL to support London boroughs with the multi-borough rental e-scooter trial by hosting regular officer working group meetings, facilitating further developments of relevant documents, supporting TfL in selecting potential operators for the trial, and sharing relevant information from DfT and other stakeholders.

## **Recommendations:**

Members are asked to:

- Note and comment on the report.

## **Financial implications for London Councils**

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/media/press-releases/2020/august/new-tfl-app-to-help-londoners-plan-ahead-and-travel-safely>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/e-scooter-trials-guidance-for-local-areas-and-rental-operators/e-scooter-trials-guidance-for-local-areas-and-rental-operators>

<sup>5</sup> Full report can be accessed here: <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/37503>

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

**Legal implications for London Councils**

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

**Equalities implications for London Councils**

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

# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

## Transport & Mobility Services Performance Information

Item no: 04

**Report by:** Andy Rollock **Job title:** Mobility Services Manager  
**Date:** 10 September 2020  
**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 Q1 2020/21

**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 Q1 in 2020/21, figures for Q4(19/20) and full year 2019/20.

### Equalities Considerations

None.

### Financial Implications

None.

**APPENDIX 1: TRANSPORT & MOBILITY SERVICES: PERFORMANCE QUARTER 4  
LONDON TRIBUNALS**

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2019/20 Q4	2020/21 Q1	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q1
<b>Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA)</b>					
No. of appeals received	N/A	43,944	10,936	9,111	N/A
No. of appeals decided	N/A	35,391	9,166	4,438	N/A
% allowed	N/A	51%	51%	58%	N/A
% Did Not Contest	N/A	30%	29%	41%	N/A
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time	80%	90%	91%	91%	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	28 days	28 days	40 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	45 days	43 days	61 days	Red*
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	41 days	31 days	41 days	Green
<b>Road User Charging Adjudicators</b>					
No. of appeals received	N/A	17,734	4,393	2,763	N/A
No. of appeals decided	N/A	14,788	3,604	1,678	N/A
% allowed	N/A	37%	48%	51%	N/A
% Did Not Contest	N/A	31%	42%	45%	N/A
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time	80%	89%	92%	98%	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	41 days	49 days	55 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	43 days	40 days	114 days	Red*
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	41 days	48 days	54 days	Green
<b>Overall Service</b>					
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%*	100%	Green
Number of telephone calls to London Tribunals	N/A	35,201	7,705	5,439	N/A
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	99%	99%	99%	Green

## Comment

\*At the emergence of the Covid-19 pandemic in late February, risk assessments of all sites and a robust operational delivery plan was devised to mitigate the impact of a national 'lockdown' and significant operational disruption to normal service.

The most severely affected location was the hearing centre at Chancery Exchange where personal appeals take place on-site and adjudicators undertake postal appeals. The hearing centre closed to appellants on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2020.

Following physical changes to the hearing centre made in accordance with the recommendations from a COVID-19 specific risk assessment, the hearing centre reopened on 1<sup>st</sup> June to allow adjudicators to conduct telephone hearings. To date, approximately 70% of appellants due to have a personal hearing, have elected to have their hearing take place by telephone instead. The tribunals remain closed to appellants and support staff continue to work from home. This situation has had an effect on the average number of days taken to decide cases. This is likely to increase in the next quarter as adjudicators work their way through cases that were put on hold but will return within key performance targets by quarter three.

Adjudicators undertaking telephone hearings have felt reassured by the steps that have been taken to protect their health at Chancery Exchange and appellants have also responded positively to the changes to their hearings.

It is still unknown when the hearing centre will be able to fully reopen to appellants in person; however, government advice continues to be monitored to ensure that proper planning can take place to ensure a safe environment on the return to normal service.

### **Key Actions - Environment and Traffic Adjudicators:**

- Telephone hearings were introduced with 2500 affected appellants contacted and given the option to have their personal hearing by telephone.
- A small number of adjudicators remained on site to undertake telephone hearings until 2<sup>nd</sup> April.
- 600 ETA appeals with a personal hearing scheduled after 2<sup>nd</sup> April but prior to 1<sup>st</sup> June were suspended until further notice. These appeals are now being rescheduled.
- Postal appeals continued to be listed and heard remotely by adjudicators working from home.
- Local Authorities can participate in the telephone hearings by way of a conference call.

### **Key Actions – Road User Charging Adjudicators:**

- All RUCA appeals, including 500 personal appeals, scheduled between 19<sup>th</sup> March and 1<sup>st</sup> June were suspended. These appeals are now being rescheduled.
- Telephone hearings were introduced from 1<sup>st</sup> June 2020 with 500 affected appellants contacted and given the option to have their personal hearing by telephone.
- Transport for London can participate in the telephone hearings by way of a conference call.

## FREEDOM PASS

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2019/20 Q4	2020/21 Q1	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q1
Number of active passes at end of period	N/A	1,268,871	1,268,871	1,086,505	N/A
Number of new passes issued (BAU)	N/A	60,140	14,286	7,307	N/A
Number of passes issued (2020 Renewal)	N/A	571,580	568,267	11,908	N/A
Number of replacement passes issued	N/A	89,785	20,267	11,203	N/A
Number of phone calls answered (BAU)	N/A	200,309	52,095	18,832	N/A
% Answered within 45 seconds (BAU)	85%	80%	85%	81.7%	Red*
% of calls abandoned	<2%	3.2%	1.6%	2.4%	Red*
Customer Satisfaction Survey rating (scoring 7 or above)	75%	91%	91%	92.3%	Green
Number of phone calls answered (2020 Renewal)	N/A	34,243	28,978	9,773	N/A
% Answered within 45 (2020 Renewal)	85%	78%	85%	81.3%	Red
Number of letters and emails answered	N/A	62,049	26,176	15,450	N/A
Number of emails answered (2020 Renewal)	N/A	8,804	8,804	6,551	N/A

BAU = Business as Usual

### Comment

\*Call volumes in Q1 are below the usual trend due to the COVID-19 lockdown, which saw a reduction in customers using the transport network which impacted the call volumes to our contractor. However, the easing of some lockdown restrictions towards the end of Q1 has seen contact volumes begin to increase.

The contractor still has staff on furlough and with inconsistent call patterns forecasting has been difficult, which has had a negative impact on overall performance during this quarter. We are seeing an increase in call volumes, which the contractor has reacted to and they have returned staff back into the business from furlough to meet the demand.

London Councils are working with the contractor on their future forecasting to ensure enough resources are in place to meet the predicted call volumes and improve the overall performance.

Officers are meeting with the contractor on a bi-weekly basis to monitor performance and review their forecasting and performance.

Throughout the outbreak of COVID-19, customer satisfaction remains above the set target.

London Councils team are still working remotely, and continue to provide a seamless service to customers, boroughs.

## TAXICARD

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2019/20 Q4	2020/21 Q1	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q1
Number of active passes at end of period	N/A	60,191	60,191	60,373	N/A
Number of new passes issued	N/A	7,259	1,754	939	N/A
Number of replacement cards issued	N/A	2436	833	371	N/A
Number of phone calls answered at London Councils	N/A	15,345	2,917	*	N/A
% Answered within 30 seconds	85%	86%	87%	**	**
Number of journeys using Taxicard	N/A	703,250	154884	42,318	N/A
% in private hire vehicles	N/A	14%	16%	5%	N/A
% of vehicles arriving within 15 minutes (advance booking)	95%	87%	92%	95%	Green
% of vehicles arriving within 30 minutes (on demand)	95%	87%	92%	94%	Amber

### Comment

Trip volumes are below average in Q1 due to lockdown restrictions being in place and with a significant number of members being in the shielded group, this had an adverse effect on trip volumes.

However, at the beginning of lockdown in March and with the agreement of boroughs London Councils introduced a collection and delivery service whereby members can get a carer, family member, friend or driver to collect essential items on their behalf. Whilst there have not been large volumes of bookings for the collection and delivery service, it has proved beneficial to those members who have used it. London Councils is currently consulting with boroughs on extending this provision in the future.

The contractor is currently performing well and meeting the set targets around vehicle arrivals, albeit with reduced volumes of bookings.

\*Due to the London Councils team working remotely and not being able to access the telephone system they were using mobile phones to field calls during the early part of lockdown. Therefore, there is no data available on the volumes of calls taken during this quarter. However, the team are now using the new telephone system and data will be available for Q2.

\*\*As above this data is not available for Q1 but will be available for Q2.

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

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2019/20 Q4	2020/21 Q1	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q1
Number of vehicles notified to database	N/A	47,872	11,454	2,656	N/A
Number of phone calls answered	N/A	19,910	4,917	1,491	N/A
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	92%	91%	93%	Green

**Comment**

London Councils has been instrumental in co-ordinating national and London specific advice to authorities on traffic and parking management during the COVID-19 emergency and continue to do so.

Boroughs were initially advised in March that the removal of vehicles to a vehicle pound should be a last resort and if a vehicle did have to be removed then it should be relocated to a safe place on street. Whilst only having an impact for the final two weeks of the fourth quarter, there has been significant reductions in TRACE activity, which will continue for at least the first quarter of 2020-21.

**LONDON LORRY CONTROL SCHEME**

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2019/20 Q4	2020/21 Q1	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q1
Number of permits on issue at end of period	N/A	63,679	63,679	62,573	N/A
Number of permits issued in period	N/A	16,665	4,183	4,246	N/A
Number of vehicle observations made	10,800 per year 2,700 per quarter	10,143*	2,621*	1,447*	Red
Number of penalty charge notices issued	N/A	8,456	1,198	185 + 231 Warning Notices**	N/A
Number of appeals considered by ETA	N/A	99	12*	6***	N/A
% of appeals allowed	Less than 40%	59%	25%	66%	Red

**Comment**

\*London Councils was one of the first enforcement authorities in London to react to the COVID-19 emergency, suspending enforcement and a significant amount of notice processing on 17 March 2020.

The decision was taken to help the freight and logistics industry cope with increased pressures in keeping London's essential shops and services supplied at the time where there were food shortages and significant issues with deliveries. This was universally welcomed by the sector.

The suspension of the scheme remained in place until 1 June 2020, with full enforcement commencing again on 15 June 2020.

The impact of this for the 2019-20 financial year is not too significant as it was only for a two-week period, but the target for observations was not met by a total of 657.

The lack of any enforcement and therefore processing activity will be more noticeable in terms of indicators for the first quarter of 2020-21.

\*\* Warning Notices were issued for a period of two weeks when normal enforcement resumed.

\*\*\* Appeal hearings were postponed during April and May

\*\*\*\* The percentage of appeals allowed for the LLCS in part is due to the low number of cases taken to appeal (which was even less this quarter due to the suspension of the service). This means that any cases not contested due to the operator providing late proof that the route was necessary (which is common for the LLCS where contraventions are not always absolute) has more of an impact on the allowed figures.

#### TRANSACTIONAL SERVICES: DEBT REGISTRATIONS AND WARRANTS

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2019/20 Q4	2020/21 Q1	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q1
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of debt registrations	N/A	695,035	205,709	88,197	N/A
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of warrants	N/A	513,582	141,920	24,400	N/A
Traffic Enforcement Court: transactions to be processed accurately within 1 working day	100%	100%	100%	100%	Green

#### Comments

Activity remained strong during the fourth quarter. However, in March boroughs were advised not to register new debts and warrants in light of the COVID-19 emergency. The majority of debt collection and the service of debt notices was also largely suspended. Whilst having only a minor impact in this financial year, the impact will be more noticeable for at least the first quarter of 2020-21.

## HEALTH EMERGENCY BADGES

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2019/20 Q4	2020/21 Q1	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q1
Number of badges on issue at end of period	N/A	4,229	4,229	4,203	NA
Number of badges issued in period	N/A	1,755	313	289	NA

### Comment

Due to the COVID-19 emergency, the HEB team were not able to process any badge applications and issue new badges from the last two weeks of the fourth quarter 2019-20. Boroughs have been advised that the date of expiry has been extended during the emergency (to September 2020) which should ensure that health professionals on emergency calls should not receive unnecessary PCNs. Currently new badge applicants are able to utilise local permit and the national NHS pass schemes so there should not be any negative impact for health professionals. The effect on the number of applications processed will be more visible for the first quarter of 2020-21, but processing has now re-commenced.

## LONDON EUROPEAN PARTNERSHIP FOR TRANSPORT

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2019/20 Q4	20120/21 Q1	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q1
Number of Boroughs participating in EU transport funding projects	7	5*	5*	5*	Amber

### Comment

\*Although the borough participation target was not met, LEPT has continued to have a positive and increasing influence at the start of 2020/21. Borough engagement and communications output has increased substantially, and networks have developed in scope and activity. Horizon 2020 funding calls were not so relevant, as the programme was concluding but engagement with boroughs was good on other funding streams. The new Horizon call will have many items of significant interest for boroughs. We are continuing to monitor Brexit and the impact of this on funding and knowledge sharing opportunities.

# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

## Safe Speeds Review for London: Update

Item No:06

**Report by:** Andrew Luck      **Job title:** Transport Manager  
**Date:** 10 September 2020  
**Contact Officer:** Andrew Luck  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9646      **Email:** [Andrew.luck@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.luck@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

**Summary:** This report provides an update to members on activity and planned future actions following the oral update at the virtual Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) meeting on 11 June 2020. At this meeting it was agreed that London Councils would send a formal letter to Baroness Vere, the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Department for Transport, outlining our concerns on how speed is currently enforced and how this could be improved with greater borough powers. The report includes the response from DfT and the next steps.

### Recommendation:

The Committee is asked to note the contents of the report, including the progress to date and proposed future work.

### Background

1. At the Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) meeting in October 2019, members were presented with a set of recommendations on how London Councils should proceed with the Safe Speeds Review for London programme. This programme encompasses a variety of different interventions, but includes the investigation into enhanced borough enforcement powers, and closer working with TfL and MPS (Metropolitan Police Service) on improving the current

way that speed is enforced in London. This followed concerns that Members had raised regarding the adequacy of speed enforcement in London, and whether there was a better alternative to the current activities.

2. A full detailed update report was provided to TEC members for the meeting on 19 March 2020 which was subsequently postponed. This report outlined the actions that would need be taken to explore and lobby for a greater role for boroughs in delivering better speed management and ultimately improved compliance in London. Unfortunately, due to the Covid-19 emergency, delivery of the actions within the proposed timeline was not possible. Nevertheless, the commitment to fully explore and lobby Central Government for partial decriminalisation remains a primary goal for London Councils.
3. At the virtual TEC meeting held on 11 June 2020, members agreed that following a consultation with TEC vice chairs, a letter would be sent to the Department for Transport minister to lobby for boroughs to take over the enforcement of speeding on borough roads for certain offences.

### **Making the case for Legislative Change**

4. Following the TEC meeting, on 29 June 2020 a letter was drafted and sent to Baroness Vere, the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Department for Transport by the Chair of TEC Cllr Claire Holland. This letter can be seen in appendix 1.
5. The letter outlined the case for partial decriminalised speed enforcement in London and the concerns that TEC members have with respect to the inadequacy of the current regime and the safety risks posed for all road users. The letter set out benefits of enhanced borough powers and how this could be achieved without having a negative impact to the perceived seriousness of speeding. Closer working with the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and the sharing of systems and intelligence would be vital in delivering the best speed management regime possible.
6. The letter asked for an opportunity to meet with Baroness Vere to discuss the issues and our proposed solutions.

### **Government Response**

7. In an email sent on behalf of Baroness Vere, the DfT indicated that a meeting to discuss speed enforcement would not be possible at this time.
8. A response to Cllr Holland's letter from Charlotte Bradford at the Road User, Licencing, Insurance and Safety Division at DfT was received on 24 July 2020. This letter stated that Government has no plans to bring forward changes to legislation that it believes would be detrimental to speed enforcement. The letter added that no endorseable contraventions have been decriminalised, and they could not accept a situation where the Police would not have the power to enforce some speed limits. The letter indicated that they are concerned that the enforcement of civil penalties are not subject to the same rigorous scrutiny as criminal enforcement and this would affect public confidence and the level of support.

9. The letter did invite London Councils to respond to the Call for Evidence on the DfT's comprehensive review of roads policing that was launched in July and closes on 5 October. (see Appendix 2)

### **Next Steps**

10. London Councils will be responding to the Call for Evidence and will ensure that a draft is sent to the TEC Chair and Vice Chairs before submission.
11. London Councils has been in communication with all boroughs and has requested any evidence that would support our case for enhanced borough powers and a partial decriminalisation of speed enforcement in London. We have encouraged boroughs to also submit their own responses to this call.
12. It should be stated that whilst we will focus on speed enforcement, roads policing does also encompass several of other areas. Boroughs have already been in communication with respect to the need for greater power to deal with dangerous and obstructive parking, parking too close to junctions, illegal crossovers and driving on the footway, advanced stop line enforcement and vehicles driving in mandatory cycle lanes. By also highlighting the success and improved compliance of new schemes (such as the award winning Bank on safety road danger reduction scheme by the City of London) we can demonstrate that enhanced powers with respect to speed and moving traffic contraventions will have a similar positive impact on compliance.
13. In September, we will be meeting with Baroness Pinnock, a Liberal Democrat life Peer and Member of Kirklees Metropolitan Council, who is promoting a Private Members Bill on decriminalised speed enforcement. This meeting will allow us to find out more about her proposals and any evidence she has already gathered. Although there is no certainty at this stage as to whether the Bill will receive any further parliamentary time and make any progress, it may be something we can seek to support to deliver our aims.
14. London Councils will continue to seek support for our proposals and build an evidential case for partial decriminalisation of speed enforcement as set out in the March 2020 report.

### **Continuing work with TfL and MPS**

15. Whilst the report focuses on the activities looking at partial decriminalised speeding enforcement, we have continued to work with TfL and MPS on plans for enhanced enforcement and educational activity under the current regulations. We believe improved collaboration under the existing enforcement regime is having a positive impact and should continue to be supported.
16. We will be holding a further update meeting on speed with TfL and MPS on 15 September 2020 to discuss progress on Safety Camera Methodology and the Road Risk Tool. The meeting will also provide an opportunity to discuss the current situation and outline where improvements can be made.

### **Financial Implications**

17. There are no financial implications to this report.

### **Legal Implications**

18. There are no legal implications at this stage.

### **Equalities Implications**

19. There are no equalities implications to this report.

### **Recommendation**

The Committee is asked to note the contents of the report, including the progress to date and proposed future work.

### **Appendices**

Appendix 1: Letter from Cllr Holland to Baroness Vere

Appendix 2: Response from Charlotte Bradford at DfT

## APPENDIX 1



Baroness Vere  
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State  
Department for Transport

Contact: Andrew Luck  
Direct line: 020 7934 9646  
Email: [andrew.luck@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.luck@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

By email: [Baroness.Vere\\_PUSS@dft.gov.uk](mailto:Baroness.Vere_PUSS@dft.gov.uk)

Date: 29 June 2020

Dear Baroness Vere

### **Re: Partial decriminalisation of speed enforcement in London**

As Chair of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee (TEC), I write to seek your support in giving London's local authorities the powers they need to help keep the public safe on London's streets.

TEC Members strongly believe that urgent action is required to make changes to legislation to afford London authorities greater powers in managing speed enforcement on their roads. The current situation means that police enforcement is inadequately resourced and severely limits the ability of authorities to protect their residents from the negative safety impacts of poor speed compliance. Authorities set the speed limits on their highways but have very limited means to effectively manage and enforce these restrictions, which is a disconnect that must be addressed as soon as possible.

In view of this, I am seeking an urgent meeting with you to discuss the issues and our proposed solutions.

TEC Members are seeking a change of primary legislation to allow for the partial decriminalisation of speeding offences, that would enable local authorities to enforce some – but not all – incidents of speeding non-compliance. Authorities are also seeking the ability to offer diversionary or speed awareness courses where appropriate and manage and administer these courses if they so wish.

Our legal advice suggests that a change in legislation could allow the separation of criminal and civil regimes for speeding, with those offences over an agreed threshold defined as criminal and those under this threshold becoming a civil matter. The most obvious instrument to achieve this would be the existing Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004, where certain speeding offences could be added to the list of applicable contraventions. We note this option is already being explored in the Traffic Management (Amendment) Bill sponsored by Baroness Pinnock.

The contraventions that would become part of a civil enforcement regime would either be dealt with by way of a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) or using diversionary or speed awareness courses where appropriate. Intelligence, data and administrative systems

would be shared with the police to ensure the appropriate enforcement action is taken and to maximise efficiency. An agreed co-ordinated approach would be vital.

A key component of any decriminalised speed enforcement regime would be the ability to retain the endorsement of offences or points on a driving licence. Civil enforcement must not be perceived as reducing the severity of speeding offences so the impact and consequences of non-compliance must be maintained. Our legal advice indicates that this would be possible if authorities were permitted to inform the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) who, as agents for the Secretary of State, endorse the driving licence and implement the penalty points in cases of speeding. This would require a change in legislation.

A benefit of a partial decriminalised speed enforcement regime would mean that authorities would retain any revenue generated as a result of PCNs or speed awareness course costs. The ring-fencing of this revenue for traffic and safety management purposes would provide an income for enforcement equipment, safety educational campaigns and staff, which is currently lacking. It would provide the finances to deliver flexible speed enforcement where it is needed and the ability to react to change quickly. It would also assist the police in allowing them to concentrate on higher policing priorities at a time where the number of police traffic officers is declining, and resources are limited.

Traffic policing is often not aligned with other police command structures and a lack of collaboration means that Council highways team's knowledge of the road safety issues locally is not exploited when it comes to traffic enforcement. It often appears the Police enforce at high profile main road locations only and do not visit the local roads where risks and local concerns may be greater.

The issues that authorities have regarding the effectiveness of speed enforcement in London are not new. The inability of boroughs to manage speeds on their roads, the lack of resources to deploy speed enforcement equipment where it is needed and a current administrative system that only processes a handful of the offences captured have been a concern for a number of years. However, we are raising this with you now whilst Government is considering and implementing new powers and changes to existing legislation due to the current COVID-19 emergency. We believe that speed enforcement must form part of this consideration, as it is too important to ignore.

The current relaxation of traffic order regulations to allow for the easier re-purposing of our streets will encourage more walking and cycling. Authorities are actively assessing and implementing revised schemes, but the consequences of any temporary arrangements means that there will be an increase in shared space and potential road user conflict. The ability to manage speeds effectively in these safety critical areas is vital and must include borough roads where enforcement activity is usually deficient. It must also be said that increased incidents of excessive speed when the roads were quieter during lockdown cannot be allowed to continue as people social distance and return to their cars. The limited ability of the police to deal with such incidents suggests that the resources are not in place to react quickly enough.

With respect to resources, authorities have been supportive of the planned TfL and police improvements in both on-street enforcement and back-office processing. Despite concerns, that this will not go far enough and a strong feeling that residential roads in boroughs will still have limited enforcement as prioritisation remains on the main roads and the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), boroughs have been willing to support the proposals. What is a concern is whether such an investment programme costing millions of pounds will continue considering the financial situation at TfL and the current funding bail-out arrangement with Government.

It is clear to TEC members that the way speed is enforced in London must change to deliver a safe transport system and improve speed limit compliance. Authorities working in collaboration with the police are the most suitable bodies to deliver much of this efficiently and effectively. This letter highlights how we think this should be managed and it is vital now that we can discuss this with you as a matter of urgency. I would therefore be grateful if your office could contact Andrew Luck at London Councils using the details at the top of this letter to arrange a virtual meeting soon.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "C. Holland", written in a cursive style.

Cllr Claire Holland  
Chair, London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee



Department  
for Transport

Department for Transport  
Great Minster House  
33 Horseferry Road  
London  
SW1P 4DR  
Tel: 0300 330 3000

Web Site: [www.gov.uk/dft](http://www.gov.uk/dft)

Our Ref: 302607, 297519  
Your Ref:

24 July 2020

Cllr Claire Holland  
Chair, Transport and  
Environment Committee  
London Councils  
59½ Southwark Street  
London SE1 0AL

Dear Cllr Holland

## **The partial decriminalisation of speed enforcement in London**

Thank you for your letter of 29 June to Baroness Vere about a proposal that Government legislate to decriminalize some speed offences in London so authorities could enforce speed offences up to a threshold, and award speed awareness courses (currently offered by the police), collecting the proceeds. You will have received the email from her office regretting that she is unable to meet, and I have been asked to respond to you.

The Department has no plans to bring forward such legislation, which it believes to be detrimental to speed enforcement.

The most dangerous traffic offences are endorseable and no endorseable offences have been decriminalized. The purpose of endorsements is to disqualify people from driving who continue to show repeated dangerous behaviours, either by totting up (accumulation of points) or, as is the case for drink and drug driving, immediate disqualification. Speed is one of the offences referred to as the “Fatal 4” due to its prominence in the causation in serious and fatal collisions and we could not accept a situation where there were some speed limits that the police had no power to enforce.

We are concerned that enforcement of civil penalties is not subject to the same rigorous scrutiny as criminal enforcement and this would affect public confidence and the level of support. In particular, it would be likely to set back the growing public acceptance of speed cameras.

Turning to your proposals to be permitted to award speed awareness courses to offenders, the police can exercise their discretion to send some speeders on a training course instead of receiving a fine and points. Offenders can only attend a course once in 3 years and are then identified on a national data

base as not eligible to attend a second course as an alternative to prosecution: subsequent offending will lead to points which could lead to disqualification.

In the Refreshed Road Safety Statement in July 2019 we announced the most comprehensive review of roads policing, reflecting our commitment to continuing to reduce the numbers of people killed and seriously injured on our roads. We have recently launched a Call for Evidence to help us further investigate the link between enforcement, collisions, congestion and crime. Respondents will have the opportunity to outline their views on what could be done to better enable and equip those charged with enforcing traffic laws. We would welcome your input: the Call for Evidence closes on 5th October and may be found at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/roads-policing-review-future-methods-to-improve-safety-and-reduce-causalities>

Yours sincerely

CHARLOTTE BRADFORD

Road User Licensing, Insurance and Safety Division

# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

## Month 3 Revenue Forecast 2020/21      Item no: 07

**Report by:** Frank Smith      **Job title:** Director of Corporate Resources  
**Date:** 10 September 2020  
**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 June 2020 for TEC and provides a forecast of the outturn position for 2020/21. At this early stage, a surplus of £180,000 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 £3.327 million, due largely to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the scheme. The net borough proportion of this underspend is projected to be their full budget of £1.588 million, with £1.739 million accruing to TfL.

### Recommendations

The Executive Sub-Committee is asked to :

- note the projected surplus of £180,000 for the year, plus the forecast net underspend of £3.327 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.
-

## Report

1. This is the first budget monitoring report to be presented to the Committee during the current financial year. The next report will be the Month 6 figures (30 September 2020) for the year, which will be reported to the November 2020 meeting of this Committee.
2. The London Councils Transport and Environment Committee's income and expenditure revenue budget for 2020/21 as approved by the Full Committee in December 2019, is set out in Appendix A (Expenditure) and Appendix B (Income). The appendices show the actual income and expenditure at 30 June 2020 and an early 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 £1,029,000);
  - confirmation of payments made to the Rail Delivery Group (a reduction of £1,222,000); and
  - confirmation of the resources carried forward from 2019/20 (£91,000) approved by this Sub-Committee in July 2020.

## Variance from Budget

3. The current figures indicate that the Committee is projected to underspend gross expenditure budgets by £6.227 million and post a deficit of income of £6.047 million over the approved budget target for the year. However, these figures include offsetting amounts of £3.327 million relating to payments and income for taxicard trips, making an overall projected net surplus of £180,000.<sup>1</sup> 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 June 2020**

	<b>M3 Actual</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Forecast</b>	<b>Variance</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
Employee Costs	173	757	729	(28)
Running Costs	27	253	253	-
Central Recharges	122	486	486	-
<b>Total Operating Expenditure</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>1,496</b>	<b>1,468</b>	<b>(28)</b>
Direct Services	1,934	9,959	9,300	(659)
Research	0	40	37	(3)
Payments in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	86,405	353,780	349,743	(4,037)
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>88,661</b>	<b>365,275</b>	<b>360,548</b>	<b>(4,727)</b>
<b>Income</b>				
Contributions in respect of				

<sup>1</sup> While TfL has confirmed funding levels for Taxicard in a Section 159 agreement, TfL representatives have recently expressed some concern about whether they will be able to meet commitments to Taxicard in light of their on-going financial difficulties. London Councils officers are seeking commitment from TfL to honour the existing agreement.

Freedom Pass and Taxicard	(86,777)	(353,910)	(350,026)	3,884
Income for direct services	(1,993)	(10,525)	(9,881)	644
Core Member Subscriptions	(24)	(97)	(97)	-
Government Grants	-	-	-	-
Interest on Investments	(1)	-	(5)	(5)
Other Income	(3)	(73)	(49)	24
Transfer from Reserves	0	(670)	(670)	-
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>(88,798)</b>	<b>(365,275)</b>	<b>(360,728)</b>	<b>4,547</b>
<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>(137)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(180)</b>	<b>(180)</b>

4. The projected surplus of £180,000 is made up broadly of the following:

- A projected overall deficit of £44,000 in respect of TEC parking traded services, after considering an estimate of the level of borough/TfL/GLA usage volumes during the first quarter. The level of appeals heard has dramatically reduced in the first quarter due to the nationwide COVID-19 lockdown. This has had a significant impact on the level of income and expenditure within traded services. Some level of recovery has been built into the forecasted figures. The variance is attributable to several areas.
  - Firstly, there is a projected net surplus of £15,000 in respect of environmental and traffic appeals. This is made up of a reduction in appeals income of £309,000 less net reduction in costs against budget of £324,000 on Northgate unit charges and adjudicator fees. As stated above the estimated number of notice of appeals and statutory declarations received over the first three months was impacted upon by the lockdown. Further analysis of the full year forecasted appeals will be reported at the 6 monthly forecast report, when more accurate data is available.
  - Secondly, the transaction volumes for other parking systems used by boroughs and TfL over the first quarter are projected to result in a net deficit of £61,000;
  - Finally, the other Northgate fixed costs i.e. excluding the above, are forecasted to underspend by £2,000, which reflects a lower than anticipated inflation factor applied to the annual contract increase compared to when the budget was set.
- An underspend of £148,000 on the cost of administering the Hearing Centre at Chancery Exchange where the above appeals are heard. This is largely as a result of an additional £100,000 being included in the approved budget in anticipation of a rent increase in accordance with the lease. Following completion of a rent review a new lease was signed at no increase in cost;
- There is a forecasted £28,000 underspend on non-operational staffing costs inclusive of the maternity provision, which will continue to be monitored and reported on throughout the year;
- The level of trips made in the claims submitted by the independent bus operators has been severely impacted upon by the COVID-19 lockdown. A recovery scenario has been built into the forecast however, the anticipated annual expenditure is forecast to be £785,000 compared to an annual budget of £1.3 million, a projected reduction of £515,000. A detailed review of the claims received over the coming months will indicate more accurate levels and the true position of any increase of trips following lockdown which may impact this variance. This will be reported in the 6-monthly report in November;

- 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 as the year progresses. 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 have been severely impacted by the lockdown. Of the £750,000 annual budget, forecasted receipts are anticipated to be reduced by approximately £406,000 net of bank charges. Due to level of uncertainty in the current climate it is likely that this variance will fluctuate throughout the year;
- Charges are currently not being enforced for replacement Taxicards. This has resulted in reduction against the income budget of £18,000;
- Enforcement of the London Lorry Control Scheme ceased during the period from 17 March 2020 to 15 June 2020 in order to ease pressures during the lockdown. The number of PCNs issued have returned to normal levels since; however the impact of the first quarter has resulted in a projected reduction of income of approximately £250,000 against an annual budget of £1million;
- A forecasted amount of interest on investments of £5,000.

## Committee Reserves

5. Table 2 below updates the Committee on the projected level of reserves as at 31 March 2021, if all current known liabilities and commitments are considered:

**Table 2– Analysis of Projected Uncommitted Reserves as at 31 March 2021**

	<b>General Reserve</b>	<b>Specific Reserve</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
<b>Unaudited reserves at 1 April 2020</b>	<b>3,889</b>	<b>2,741</b>	<b>6,630</b>
Transfer between reserves	-	-	-
Approved in setting 2020/21 budget (December 2019)	(579)	-	(579)
Carried forward amounts from 2019/20	(91)	-	(91)
Indicative use of specific reserves including TEC special projects		(1,500)	(1,500)
Projected Budget Surplus/(Deficit) 2020/21	180	-	180
<b>Estimated Residual Balances at 31 March 2021</b>	<b>3,399</b>	<b>1,241</b>	<b>4,640</b>

## Conclusions

6. This report reflects the position at the first-quarter stage in the current financial year and forecasts a surplus position of £180,000 for the year. In addition taxicard trips are forecast to underspend by £3.327 million, with the borough proportion of this underspend projected to be £1.588 million, with £1.739 million accruing to TfL.
7. The majority of the projected surplus is a net effect of various factors such as a small deficit on trading operations, a reduction on projected income from replacement Freedom Passes

and Lorry Control scheme PCNs due and a significant decrease in expenditure to other bus operators largely to the impact of the COVID-19 lockdown.

8. After taking into account the forecast surplus and known commitments, general reserves are forecast to be £3.399 million at the year-end, which equates to 24% of budgeted operating and trading expenditure of £14.008 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. There is significant uncertainty surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic and the impact this may have on TEC budgets. Potentially unforeseen issues could impact later in the financial year and this will be reported on accordingly. Options for the treatment of general reserves in excess of the benchmark range will, therefore, be discussed at the November TEC Executive meeting, when the draft budget proposals for 2021/22 will be considered.

## **Recommendations**

9. Members are asked to :

- note the projected surplus of £180,000 for the year, plus the forecast underspend of £3.327 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 2020/21

London Councils Income and Expenditure Forecast File 2020/21

	Revised 2020/21 £000	Month 3 ATD £000	Month 3 Forecast £000	Month 3 Variance £000
<b>Payments in respect of Concessionary Fares</b>				
TfL	318,763	79,691	318,763	0
ATOC	20,665	5,166	20,665	0
Other Bus Operators	1,300	241	785	-515
Freedom Pass issue costs	1,518	209	1,346	-172
Freedom Pass Administration	505	128	500	-5
City Fleet Taxicard contract	10,447	829	7,120	-3,327
Taxicard Administration	581	142	565	-16
	353,779	86,406	349,744	-4,035
<b>TEC Trading Account Expenditure</b>				
Payments to Adjudicators- ETA	779	72	554	-225
Payments to Adjudicators - RUCA	519	54	400	-119
Northgate variable contract costs - ETA	305	24	260	-45
Northgate variable contract costs - RUCA	180	10	122	-58
Northgate variable contract costs - Other	205	18	175	-30
Payments to Northampton County Court	4,000	885	4,000	0
Lorry Control Administration	845	185	816	-29
ETA/RUCA Administration	3,084	676	2,936	-148
HEB Administration	42	10	38	-4
	9,959	1,934	9,300	-659
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>363,738</b>	<b>88,340</b>	<b>359,044</b>	<b>-4,694</b>
<b>Operating Expenditure</b>				
<b>Contractual Commitments</b>				
NG Fixed Costs	95	22	95	0
	95	22	95	0
<b>Salary Commitments</b>				
Non-operational staffing costs	708	168	690	-18
Members	19	5	19	0
Maternity Provision	30	0	20	-10
	757	173	729	-28
<b>Other Commitments</b>				
Supplies and service	159	4	157	-2
Research	40	0	37	-3
	199	4	194	-5
<b>Total Operating Expenditure</b>	<b>1,051</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>1,018</b>	<b>-33</b>
<b>Central Recharges</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>365,275</b>	<b>88,661</b>	<b>360,548</b>	<b>-4,727</b>

	Revised 2020/21 £000	Month 3 ATD £000	Month 3 Forecast £000	Month 3 Variance £000
Borough contributions to TfL	318,763	79,691	318,763	0
Borough contributions to ATOC	20,665	5,166	20,665	0
Borough contributions to other bus operators	1,300	325	1,300	0
Borough contributions to FP issue costs	1,518	352	1,518	0
Borough contributions to freedom pass administration	0	0	0	0
Income from replacing lost/faulty freedom passes	750	59	212	538
Income from replacing lost/faulty taxicards	18	0	0	18
Borough contributions to Comcab	1,588	0	0	1,588
TfL contribution to Taxicard scheme	8,859	829	7,120	1,739
Borough contributions to taxicard administration	324	324	324	0
TfL Contribution to taxicard administration	124	31	124	0
	353,909	86,777	350,026	3,883
<b>TEC trading account income</b>				
Borough contributions to Lorry Control administration	0	0	0	0
Lorry Control PCNs	1,000	0	750	250
Borough parking appeal charges	967	190	834	133
TfL parking appeal charges	118	28	125	-7
GLA Congestion charging appeal income	699	77	522	177
Borough fixed parking costs	2,069	517	2,069	0
TfL fixed parking costs	235	59	235	0
GLA fixed parking costs	875	219	875	0
Borough other parking services	562	18	471	91
Northampton County Court Recharges	4,000	885	4,000	0
	10,525	1,993	9,881	644
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>364,434</b>	<b>88,770</b>	<b>359,907</b>	<b>4,527</b>
<b>Core borough subscriptions</b>				
Joint Committee	46	13	46	0
TEC (inc TfL)	51	12	51	0
	97	25	97	0
<b>Other Income</b>				
TfL secretariat recharge	31	0	31	0
Investment income	1	0	5	-4
Other income	0	0	0	0
Sales of Health Emergency badges	42	3	18	24
	74	3	54	20
<b>Transfer from Reserves</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Central Recharges</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Income Base Budget</b>	<b>365,275</b>	<b>88,798</b>	<b>360,728</b>	<b>4,547</b>

## **LONDON COUNCILS' TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT EXECUTIVE SUB COMMITTEE (VIRTUAL)**

Minutes of a virtual meeting of the London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on **16 July 2020** at 10:00am.

### **Present:**

Councillor Claire Holland (Chair)	LB Lambeth
Councillor Krupa Sheth	LB Brent
Councillor William Huntington-Thresher	LB Bromley
Councillor Stuart King	LB Croydon
Councillor Julian Bell	LB Ealing
Councillor Wesley Harcourt	LB Hammersmith & Fulham
Councillor Hilary Gander	RB Kingston
Councillor Sophie McGeevor	LB Lewisham
Councillor Richard Livingstone	LB Southwark
Councillor Richard Field	LB Wandsworth
Councillor Tim Mitchell	City of Westminster

### **Others Present:**

Heidi Alexander	Deputy Mayor for Transport, GLA
Will Norman	Walking & Cycling Commissioner, GLA
Alex Williams	Director of City Planning, TfL
Sam Monck	Head of Projects & Programmes, TfL
Mike Beevor	Senior Policy Manager, TfL
Keith Townsend	Corporate Director of Environment &
Regeneration, LB Islington	
Ruth Knight	Green Infrastructure, GLA

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Manuel Abellan (LB Sutton) and Alastair Moss (City of London Corporation). Councillor Hilary Gander (RB Kingston) attended as a deputy.

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

Councillor Gander declared an interest in being a member of the South London Waste Authority (SWLA) and the London Cycling Campaign

### **3. Update on London Streetspace Programme and Future Funding, by Heidi Alexander, Deputy Mayor for Transport, GLA, Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner, GLA, and Alex Williams (TfL)**

Heidi Alexander, Deputy Mayor for Transport, introduced the item and made the following comments:

- Out of the £1.6 billion settlement to TfL, £55 million was allocated to the London Streetspace programme. £45 million had been allocated to borough roads. Also, £1.5 million had been set aside for the central London corridor, creating car free zones (A10 Bishopsgate).

- Boroughs had submitted bids. Social distancing schemes had been looked into. There were 850 schemes in London, including 450 school streets and 65 cycling routes so far.
- Three times more bids had been received than were expected, which meant that a number of projects could not be funded. However, schemes that were not funded in this existing round would be reviewed for any future rounds.
- People were being encouraged to make more journeys by bicycles and on foot. More journeys were also starting to be made on the public transport network.
- TfL would be administering the process for the tranche 2 funding of £20 million from DfT for Streetspace.
- For this funding, there was a need to make a London submission to DfT by 7 August 2020. This would be subject to ministerial approval.
- A “lessons learned” exercise was being carried out to ascertain where things went well/went wrong regarding the Streetspace programme.
- Thanks to Sam Monck and his team at TfL who had worked under extreme pressure throughout the pandemic.
- Funding from the Government would take TfL up to the 17 October 2020. There was no certainty with regards to funding beyond this date, and the financial outlook for TfL was still not good.
- Journeys on the Underground had risen by 20% and bus journeys by 40%, but this was still a fraction of the amount raised by fares prior to the pandemic. 80% of TfL revenue currently comes from fares.
- The Government had commissioned KPMG to review TfL’s finances. TfL had been told to reduce costs and maximise income, although this was not a sustainable answer to TfL’s financial problems.
- It was hoped that the Government would have come to help TfL sooner. It was not until TfL was going to raise a Section 114 that the Government came to help TfL. The situation was not going to improve quickly, so ongoing discussions needed to take place.

### Q and As

Councillor King voiced concern and dissatisfaction at the discrepancies in funding between the inner and outer London boroughs (three outer London boroughs had received 20% of all funding). Councillor McGeevor said that her borough of Lewisham had high ambitions, although there was very little funding available to achieve these ambitions. She queried what would happen to fares incomes should walking and cycling be increased by 80%. Councillor Livingstone felt that there were issues regarding transparency. He said that feedback was needed on the bids that had been submitted. Councillor Livingstone said that the borough of Southwark also felt the same about the inconsistencies regarding low traffic neighbourhoods. The Chair agreed and said that there were inconsistencies around funding and what the criteria for the bids were.

Heidi Alexander informed members that the Congestion Charge had been extended along with the expansion of the ULEZ. She said that more was being spent on sustainable schemes generally. TfL was continuing with the schemes that were “ready to go”. Heidi Alexander said that she recognised the issues around the funding going forward. She said that the lessons learned exercise would consider issues like whether a limit should have been put on the number of bids put forward, and a limit on the price of these bids. However, TfL was working under huge pressure during this time.

Sam Monck, Head of Projects and Programmes, TfL, said that there had been miscommunications on what was of value, and what was and was not funded. He said that a set of criteria would be written into the next tranche 2. Sam Monck said that he was happy to give boroughs more feedback on their bids. He informed members that the biggest constraint was the lack of funding. Sam Monck said that some very good projects had been submitted.

Will Norman, Walking and Cycling Commissioner, GLA, said the issue of the number of low traffic neighbourhoods had tried to be simplified, although there had been a problem with the forms to complete. He confirmed that this was now being mapped. Will Norman said that a second round of funding was now being negotiated with the DfT. He said that there would be a clear delivery of schemes that TfL had agreed to do. This would help build success.

Councillor Mitchell thanked everyone for assessing this number of schemes and said that he would like to see pedestrians recognised more, especially with regards to the safety aspect.

Councillor Gander thanked everyone and the officers in the boroughs for all their hard work. She said that the process would be more refined going forward. She said that her outer London borough of Kingston had benefitted from extra money, although this was still a great deal less than normally received, and compromises had had to be made. Councillor Gander also asked how the consultation was working. She asked whether TfL was considering having a branded sign for work that was going ahead.

Councillor Field thanked Heidi Alexander for the paper on funding. He said that a large number of letters were being received from residents regarding changes being made on roads. He said that these changes would also have an impact on traffic flows if they did not work. Councillor Field asked whether there would be funding for cycle training the next time around, and what proposals would be made for this training. He said that there was a major route going through the borough of Wandsworth that required funding.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that the red route scheme in the borough of Bromley was not going smoothly. He said that boroughs would soon be doing their 2021/22 budgets. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that the skills sets were different than those used to deliver walking and cycling. He said that he would like to see some of the LIP funding coming back into boroughs, as this also went towards paying some staff salaries.

Will Norman said that he had always been a strong advocate for walking and would continue to be, especially when it came to the safety of pedestrians. He said that, regarding Councillor Gander's funding concerns, that there was less money available at present, and a great deal of "unknowns". Will Norman confirmed that branding was available and officers should discuss this issue with TfL. He said that it was crucial to have long term engagement and an online map was being developed. There was a need to ensure that all the schemes were on this map. Will Norman asked members to pass any complaint letters received from their residents to TfL. He said that there was no money available to undertake cycle training, although there was some money for online training videos.

Heidi Alexander informed members that she did not have anything further to add on LIPs. She asked Councillor Huntington-Thresher to contact her separately if he had any further queries about LIP funding. Will Norman said that "sunk" costs helped

cover some staff costs. The Chair thanked Heidi, Sam and Will for answering all members' questions at TEC and for all their work during these difficult times. She said that bi-lateral and coordinated communication was key in going forward.

#### **4. Future Mobility Agenda: Multi-Borough e-Scooter Trial in London**

Members received a report that updated the TEC Executive on London Councils' work on future mobility, which had taken a focus on a multi-borough e-scooter trial in London, given the current policy environment.

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

- Eight e-scooter trial working group meetings had taken place so far, with up to thirty officers attending the meetings on average. Members had been sent a briefing about this work, and it was hoped that members had found this document useful. Final sign-off for the trial proposal document was 17 July 2020.
- The proposed documents offered boroughs a range of tools to manage the trial in their local areas. Each of the key zones could be tweaked during the trial. Boroughs could also leave the trial if they chose to.
- The results of the work on the trial proposal document so far were very pleasing and gave the boroughs a great deal of flexibility.
- It was hoped that TEC would agree for local authorities to support the recommendations and to continue with the trials.

Mike Beevor, Senior Policy Manager, TfL, said that the key issue in London in order to meet objectives was to get e-scooter trials hosted by boroughs that shared borders. He said that the take-up of e-scooters could provide an alternative option to public transport. Mike Beevor said that different experiences were being found in different boroughs, and this fragmentation needed to be joined-up. He said that there was a need to come up with operational proposals, like using the scooter rather than a car. Mike Beevor said that the timescale on e-scooters was very tight and had been set by the DfT. Trials would need to be finalised by the end of the summer and there was a need to know which boroughs wanted to start the trial.

Councillor Sheth asked about plans for boroughs to enforce speed safety. Councillor McGeever felt that there had been insufficient time to look at this. She said that she had safety concerns about the use of e-scooters (e.g. problems with road resurfacing). Councillor McGeever said that her borough of Lewisham would not be supporting the use of e-scooters for now. Councillor Gander asked whether boroughs could join the trials later in the year. Councillor Mitchell asked what legislative tools were in place to ensure that the e-scooter companies carried out what they said they were going to do. Councillor Field said that policies needed to comply with the law.

Paulius Mackela said that the trial proposal document had been drafted, edited and circulated for over six weeks now. He said that sub-regional discussions had been taking place, along with engagement with all boroughs at the weekly working group meetings. Paulius Mackela said that safety is the number one priority and confirmed that there was a whole section in the document on safety. He informed members that there were new safety features in the market and operators would be picked based on safety. The trial would last for a period of twelve months, which could be extended for a further six months if deemed appropriate and relevant permissions provided by

the DfT. Paulius Mackela said that, regarding enforcement, this would be made legal by the DfT and orders could be revoked if operators do not comply with the terms and conditions of the contract.

Mike Beevor informed members that a top speed would be set by the DfT (similar to e-bikes). He confirmed that it was possible for boroughs to join the trial later, although it would be useful to know who wanted to be involved right from the beginning. Further discussions would be taking place on highway maintenance.

The Chair asked about e-scooters breaking the law. Paulius Mackela said that local authorities and the police would be responsible for enforcement against users. However, problems arose when you could purchase an e-scooter online, which would make enforcement against the user difficult. Paulius Mackela said that there was a whole section on risk behaviour and night-time riding.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that the safety of cyclists could be put in danger as e-scooters were smaller and less visible. He said that training was needed on this. Paulius Mackela said that as part of the operator selection process operators would be asked to provide plans for any additional training. The Chair said that there was a high level of cautiousness regarding e-scooters, especially with regards to the safety aspects.

The Chair said that she had to leave the meeting early and Councillor Mitchell had kindly agreed to take over as Chair in her absence.

**Decision:** The Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed that Demand Responsive Transport becomes a focus area later in the year and instead continue working with TfL and the boroughs to facilitate a multi-borough e-scooter trial in London.

## **5. Transport and Mobility Services Performance Information**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the London Councils Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Q4 2019/20.

Spencer Palmer, Director of Transport and Mobility, London Councils, introduced the report, which was presented to the TEC Executive on a regular basis. He said that explanations for the “amber” ratings were given in the report. Spencer Palmer said that users’ needs had managed to be met during the Covid-19 outbreak. Councillor Mitchell thanked Spencer Palmer and all the officers that had been responsible for administering these schemes during the pandemic.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the performance information

## **6. TEC Pre-Audited Financial Results 2019/20**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that detailed the provisional pre-audited final accounts for the Transport and Environment Committee for 2019/20

Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Services, London Councils, introduced the report. He said that the financial results were reported to TEC throughout the year. Frank

Smith said that the time lag on enforcement actions had had a marginal effect on the year end, and there was an indicative surplus of £534,000 for the year.

Frank Smith said that some of TEC services had been suspended during the Covid-19 outbreak, but were now back on track. The adjudicators were now sitting again and the London Lorry Control Scheme (LLCS) was back up and running, with PCNs beginning to get issued.

Frank Smith informed members that TEC was still holding reserves that were above the level approved by the Committee. He said that he thought it would be prudent to keep money aside for the future. TEC had also recently recruited two additional policy officers (LEDNet and climate change), which had been fed into the accounts. Frank Smith said that the bulk Freedom Pass reissue had been carried out successfully.

Frank Smith said Table 7, paragraph 40, showed that TEC's finances were in a very healthy position. The first quarter financial results would be presented to the TEC Executive on 10 September 2020. The issue of the TEC reserves would be revisited in autumn 2020. Councillor Mitchell thanked Frank Smith and his team for putting together the accounts.

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

- Noted the provisional pre-audited financial results for 2019/20, which show an indicative surplus of £534,000 for the year;
- Agreed the transfer of £296,000 out of the provisional surplus to the specific reserve, in accordance with usual Committee practice;
- Agreed the carry forward of the underspend on the LLC Scheme review budget of £91,000 into 2020/21; and
- Noted the provisional level of reserves, as detailed in paragraph 40 and the financial outlook, as detailed in paragraphs 41-42 of this report

## **7. Freedom Pass Update**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that set out a proposed approach to gradually withdrawing the special payment arrangements to non-TfL bus operating companies in respect of the Freedom Pass scheme. It also sought member support for officers to begin consultation on the payment arrangements set out in this paper before returning to TEC in October 2020 with a final recommendation.

Stephen Boon, Chief Contracts Officer, London Councils, introduced the report, which proposed to phase-out the special payment arrangements to non-TfL bus companies.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher asked whether the level of support and expected passenger numbers implied that boroughs would be paying non-TfL buses 125% of the funding pre-Covid 19 levels (ie was the support in addition to the fares). Stephen Boon said payments would result in 60% of the normal amounts.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee approved that London Councils began consultation with non-TfL bus operators and the Department of Transport based on the proposals contained in this report.

## **8. Taxicard Update**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that provided members with an update on the Taxicard scheme during the COVID-19 pandemic and measures taken to support vulnerable and shielded members during the lockdown period.

Stephen Boon introduced the Taxicard report, which related to the proposal to continue the collection and delivery until 31 December 2020. He said that only 75 collection and delivery jobs had been carried out in the previous week, which was not a large number of jobs, but feedback from those that had used the service had been very positive. This was now going back to TEC Executive to seek member approval for the extension.

Councillor McGeevor asked if there was a breakdown of the boroughs where the 75 deliveries and collections came from. Stephen Boon said that there was a breakdown of overall use which could be found in Table 1 of the report. He said that some promotional work on this had been carried out and borough officers were encouraged to look at this.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee approved continuation of the collection and delivery service until 31 December 2020 and approved the proposal to consult with boroughs on making this a standard element of the scheme.

## **9. Minutes of the virtual TEC Main Meeting held on 11 June 2020 (for noting)**

The minutes of the virtual TEC Main meeting held on 11 June 2020 were noted.

## **10. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 6 February 2020 (for agreeing)**

The minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 6 February 2020 were agreed as an accurate record.

*Member of the press and public were asked to leave the virtual meeting while the exempt part of the agenda was discussed.*

**The meeting finished at 12:05pm**