

# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

**Thursday 18 February 2021**

**10:00am – Virtual Meeting**

**Contact Officer:** Alan Edwards

**Tel:** 020 7934 9911

**Email:** [Alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:Alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

Part One: Agenda item	Pages
1 Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies	-
2 Declarations of Interests*	
3 Update from the London Deputy Mayor for Transport and the Walking and Cycling Commissioner – Presentation from Heidi Alexander and Will Norman followed by Members' Questions and Discussion	-
4 TfL Board Update (Oral update by Councillor Julian Bell)	-
5 Transport & Mobility Performance Information	
6 TEC Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2020/21	
7 Go Ultra Low City Scheme (GULCS) Surplus Funding Allocation	
8 Taxicard Funding and Governance, Transport for London	
9 Proposed Dates for TEC & TEC Executive Sub Committee for 2021/22	
10 Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee Meeting held on 19 November 2020 (for agreeing)	
11 Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 10 December 2020 (for noting)	

<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>	
<p><b>E1 Freedom Pass Payments to Non-TfL Bus Operators Update</b></p>	
<p><b>E2 Exempt Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 10 December 2020 (for noting)</b></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  
Tel: 07767444885  
Email: alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

**Declarations of Interest – TEC Executive Sub Committee**  
**18 February 2021**

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 Manuel Abellan (LB Sutton)

Western Riverside Waste Authority

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

London Road Safety Council

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)

Dockless Bike Scheme

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing)

TfL Board Member

Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing)

London Waste & Recycling Board (LWARB)

Cllr Claire Holland (LB Lambeth)  
Cllr Krupa Sheth (LB Brent)

LGA Member of Environment, Economy, Housing and Transport Board  
Mayor Phil Glanville (LB Hackney)

Member of SERA

Mayor Phil Glanville (LB Hackney)

Labour Cycles

Mayor Phil Glanville (LB Hackney)

# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

## Transport & Mobility Services Performance Information

Item  
no:05

**Report by:** Andy Rollock **Job title:** Mobility Services Manager  
**Date:** 18 February 2021  
**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 Q3 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 Q3 in 20/21, figures for Q2(20/21) and full year 2019/20.

### Equalities Considerations

None.

### Financial Implications

None.

**APPENDIX 1: TRANSPORT & MOBILITY SERVICES: PERFORMANCE QUARTER 3**  
**LONDON TRIBUNALS**

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2020/21 Q2	2020/21 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
<b>Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA)</b>					
No. of appeals received	N/A	43,944	8,111	10,399	N/A
No. of appeals decided	N/A	35,391	9,678	8,501	N/A
% allowed	N/A	51%	41%	45%	N/A
% Did Not Contest	N/A	30%	18%	25%	N/A
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time	80%	90%	N/A	N/A	*N/A
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	28 days	56 days	35 days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	45 days	78 days	58 days	**Amber
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	41 days	62 days	38 days	Green
<b>Road User Charging Adjudicators</b>					
No. of appeals received	N/A	17,734	2,990	4,149	N/A
No. of appeals decided	N/A	14,788	3,339	3,627	N/A
% allowed	N/A	37%	28%	42%	N/A
% Did Not Contest	N/A	31%	20%	36%	N/A
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time	80%	89%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	41 days	83 days	89 days	Red
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	43 days	100 days	112 days	Red
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	41 days	85 days	90 days	***Red
<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%	99%	****Amber
Number of telephone calls to London Tribunals	N/A	35,201	9,098	8,571	N/A
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	99%	99%	98%	Green

## Comment

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.

Appellants requesting a personal hearing are now given a telephone hearing rather than a face-to-face personal hearing as standard, but Enforcement Authorities are able to participate in the telephone hearings by way of a conference call.

\*The percentage of personal hearings started within 15 minutes of the scheduled SLA time for Q2 and Q3 is not available as "personal" hearings have been conducted by telephone during the COVID-9 pandemic and it has not been possible to accurately record the start time of hearings.

\*\* The average number of days (from receipt) to decide personal appeals SLA has improved for ETA in Q3 but the target was still missed slightly. This was due to a large group of linked cases that have taken some time to co-ordinate and then decide.

\*\*\* The average number of days (from receipt) to decide personal RUCA appeals SLA was missed considerably. This has been due to the adjudicators working through the backlog of appeals built up whilst the tribunal was closed and the decision by the RUCA Chief Adjudicator to reduce the number of RUCA personal hearing slots offered this quarter as government advice has evolved. Figures for Q4 will also likely be high as adjudication at the hearing centre (both personal and postal appeals) has been suspended again for the months of February and March, with postal hearings only being conducted by adjudicators who are able to work at home.

\*\*\*\* The target to issue hearing dates to appellants within 5 working days of receipt was marginally missed because 25 RUCA cases were delayed in scheduling because the preferred hearing days of the appellant were not being offered by adjudicators at that time, and staff needed to agree revised hearing dates with the adjudicators.

## FREEDOM PASS

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2020/21 Q2	2020/21 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of active passes at end of period	N/A	1,268,871	1,088,469	1,094,247	N/A
Number of new passes issued (BAU)	N/A	60,140	17,648	15,809	N/A
Number of passes issued (2020 Renewal)	N/A	571,580	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of replacement passes issued	N/A	89,785	16,759	13,029	N/A
Number of phone calls answered (BAU)	N/A	200,309	31,323	31,694	N/A
% Answered within 45 seconds (BAU)	85%	80%	72.3%	83%	Amber*
% of calls abandoned	<2%	3.2%	3.4%	2%	Green
Customer Satisfaction Survey rating (scoring 7 or above)	75%	91%	88%	93%	Green
Number of phone calls answered (2020 Renewal)	N/A	34,243	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Answered within 45 (2020 Renewal)	85%	78%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of letters and emails answered	N/A	62,049	18,871	19,844	N/A
Number of emails answered (2020 Renewal)	N/A	8,804	N/A	N/A	N/A

BAU = Business as Usual

### Comment

Call volumes in this period are comparable to those in Q2 which show signs of volumes recovering to the usual trend. However, we have seen call volumes reduce towards the end of the period due to the introduction of tougher COVID-19 restrictions, which are likely to continue during Q4.

\*Although the target for percentage of calls answered has not been met during this quarter, we have seen an improvement from Q2. The contractor continues to see inconsistent call volumes but has been able to react to this by bringing staff back into the business from furlough.

Members should note that London Councils recognises the difficulty for the provider in anticipating the number of calls that will be received from week to week. It recognises also that with reduced volumes of calls, percentage-based targets are more challenging to meet, as small individual numbers have a larger impact on performance in percentage terms. Therefore, London Councils has agreed to temporarily suspend service performance credits until the end of March (to be kept under review).

London Councils are continuing to work 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. This work will continue despite the suspension of service credits and London Councils and the contractor remain focussed on providing high levels of customer service. This is supported by customer satisfaction scores which remain high, and we have seen this increase during this period.

## TAXICARD

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2020/21 Q2	2020/21 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of active passes at end of period	N/A	60,191	58,393	57,984	N/A
Number of new passes issued	N/A	7,259	733	879	N/A
Number of replacement cards issued	N/A	2436	609	460	N/A
Number of phone calls answered at London Councils	N/A	15,345	4008	3854	N/A
% Answered within 30 seconds	85%	86%	92%	95%	Green
Number of journeys using Taxicard	N/A	703,250	127,455	124,458	N/A
% in private hire vehicles	N/A	14%	4%	2.5%	N/A
% of vehicles arriving within 15 minutes (advance booking)	95%	87%	95%	96%	Green
% of vehicles arriving within 30 minutes (on demand)	95%	87%	95%	95%	Green

### Comment

Taxicard journeys have reduced during this period, which can be attributed to stricter COVID-19 restrictions being introduced in December. We are beginning to see journey volumes fall due to even tighter lockdown restrictions being imposed nationally.

As agreed by the Transport and Environment Committee in December all boroughs were written to in order to extend the collection and delivery service until the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021. With the introduction of the national lockdown towards the end of December 2020, this variation to the scheme continues to provide support to vulnerable Taxicard members in having access to essential items being collected and delivered on their behalf.

The contractor is currently performing well and meeting the set targets around vehicle arrivals, albeit with reduced volumes of bookings. As we want to ensure the current level of performance is maintained moving forward, London Councils are working with the contractor to start planning for when lockdown measures are eased and competing areas of the taxi industry begin to pick up, providing increased competition to the scheme.

The Taxicard scheme is providing support to some drivers, with a source of income during a period which is very difficult for the wider taxi industry.



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

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2020/21 Q2	2020/21 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of vehicles notified to database	N/A	47,872	9,068	8,927	N/A
Number of phone calls answered	N/A	19,910	3,056	3,672	N/A
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	92%	89%	85%	Green

**LONDON LORRY CONTROL SCHEME**

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2020/21 Q2	2020/21 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of permits on issue at end of period	N/A	63,679	63,235	63,673	N/A
Number of permits issued in period	N/A	16,665	4,273	4,305	N/A
Number of vehicle observations made	10,800 per year 2,700 per quarter	10,143*	3,116	2,548**	Red
Number of penalty charge notices issued	N/A	8,456	1,507	1,275	N/A
Number of appeals considered by ETA	N/A	99	13	28	N/A
% of appeals allowed	Less than 40%	59%	38%	53%***	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 enforcement contractor (NSL) experienced staffing issues during this quarter which have now been resolved.

\*\*\* The percentage of appeals allowed for the LLCS in part is due to the low number of cases taken to appeal. 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	2020/21 Q2	2020/21 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of debt registrations	N/A	695,035	145,160	114,629	N/A
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of warrants	N/A	513,582	128,856	115,273	N/A
Traffic Enforcement Court: transactions to be processed accurately within 1 working day	100%	100%	100%	100%	Green

**HEALTH EMERGENCY BADGES**

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2020/21 Q2	2020/21 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of badges on issue at end of period	N/A	4,229	4,529	4,206	NA
Number of badges issued in period	N/A	1,755	813*	835	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 were advised that the date of expiry had been extended during the emergency (to September 2020) which ensured that health professionals on emergency calls did not receive unnecessary PCNs. We have again suspended the scheme for a period of time to facilitate a likely increase in emergency home visits. Once again, new badge applicants can 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 lower for the full 2020-21 financial year in light of this.

**LONDON EUROPEAN PARTNERSHIP FOR TRANSPORT**

	Target (where appropriate)	2019/20 Full Year	2020/21 Q2	20120/21 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of Boroughs participating in EU transport funding projects	7	5*	5*	6*	Amber

**Comment**

\*Although the borough participation target was not met, LEPT has continued to have a positive and increasing influence during 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. The news from the EU UK contacts regarding Brexit is positive and full participation on funding streams will be available for UK authorities.

# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub-Committee

## Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2020/21      Item no: 06

**Report by:** Frank Smith      **Job title:** Director of Corporate Resources  
**Date:** 18 February 2021  
**Contact Officer:** Frank Smith  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9700      **Email:** Frank.smith@londoncouncils.gov.uk

---

### Summary

This report outlines actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of December 2020 for TEC and provides a forecast of the outturn position for 2020/21. At this stage, a surplus of £287,000 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 £5.025 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 £3.437 million accruing to TfL.

### Recommendations

The Executive Sub-Committee is asked to :

- note the projected surplus of £287,000 for the year, plus the forecast net underspend of £5.025 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 final budget monitoring report to be presented to the Committee during the current financial year. The next report will be the provisional outturn figures for the year, which will be reported to the July 2021 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 31 December 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 million);
  - confirmation of payments made to the Rail Delivery Group (a reduction of £1.222 million); 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 £6.201 million and post a deficit of income of £5.914 million against the approved budget target for the year. However, these figures include offsetting amounts of £5.025 million relating to payments and income for taxicard trips, making an overall projected net surplus of £287,000.<sup>1</sup> Table 1 below summarises the forecast position, with commentary that details the trends that have emerged during the first 9 months of the year and provides explanations for the variances that are projected.

**Table 1 –Summary Forecast as at 31 December 2020**

	<b>M9 Actual</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Forecast</b>	<b>Variance</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
Employee Costs	547	757	943	186
Running Costs	76	253	137	(116)
Central Recharges	365	486	528	42
<b>Total Operating Expenditure</b>	<b>987</b>	<b>1,496</b>	<b>1,608</b>	<b>112</b>
Direct Services	6,279	9,959	9,112	(847)
Research	18	40	24	(16)
Payments in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	260,726	353,780	348,330	(5,450)
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>268,009</b>	<b>365,275</b>	<b>359,074</b>	<b>(6,201)</b>
<b>Income</b>				

<sup>1</sup> While TfL has confirmed funding levels for Taxicard in a Section 159 agreement, TfL representatives have recently confirmed their continued commitment to Taxicard, but note that this is subject to agreement of funding with government.

Contributions in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	(260,521)	(353,910)	(348,557)	5,353
Income for direct services	(6,559)	(10,525)	(9,710)	815
Core Member Subscriptions	(73)	(97)	(97)	-
Government Grants	-	-	-	-
Interest on Investments	(26)	-	(34)	(34)
Other Income	(63)	(73)	(84)	(11)
TfL Environmental initiatives	(43)	-	(57)	(57)
Transfer from Reserves	0	(670)	(822)	(152)
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>(267,285)</b>	<b>(365,275)</b>	<b>(359,361)</b>	<b>5,914</b>
<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>724</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(287)</b>	<b>(287)</b>

4. The projected surplus of £287,000 is made up broadly of the following:

- A projected overall deficit of £66,000 in respect of TEC parking traded services, after considering an estimate of the level of borough/TfL/GLA usage volumes during the first three quarters of the year. The initial level of appeals heard has dramatically reduced compared to prior years due to the nationwide COVID-19 lockdown. This has had an impact on the level of income and expenditure within traded services. Some level of recovery has occurred, which informs the forecasted figures. The variance is attributable to several areas.
  - Firstly, there is a projected net surplus of £26,000 in respect of environmental and traffic appeals. This is made up of a reduction in appeals income of £221,000 less net reduction in costs against budget of £246,000 on Northgate unit charges and adjudicator fees. As stated above the estimated number of notice of appeals and statutory declarations received during the early part of the year was impacted upon by the lockdown. Further analysis of the full year actual appeals included in the provisional outturn figures will be reported to this Committee in July 2021, prior to the external audit.
  - Secondly, the transaction volumes for other parking systems used by boroughs and TfL over the first 9 months of the year are projected to result in a net deficit of £114,000;
  - Finally, the other Northgate fixed costs i.e. excluding the above, are forecasted to underspend by £23,000, which reflects a lower than anticipated inflation factor applied to the annual contract increase compared to when the budget was set along with a reduction on RUCA.
- An underspend of £149,000 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 negotiated at no increase in cost;
- There is a forecasted overspend on non-operational staffing costs and central recharges of approximately £186,000 and £42,000 respectively, which is largely due to the impact of additional Environmental Policy officers. These are funded by TfL and a previously agreed transfer from TEC reserves, therefore they have no impact on the revenue budget;
- An underspend of £116,000 on general running costs as a result of several small variances across many budgets largely due to the impact of remote working arrangements.

- 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 £915,000 compared to an annual budget of £1.3 million, a projected reduction of £385,000. Details of the full year claims will be reported to this Committee as part of the pre audit outturn figures in July 2021.
- A projected underspend of £50,000 in respect of the £1.518 million budget for the issuing/reissuing costs of Freedom Passes. Costs associated with this budget can fluctuate throughout the year based on activity levels. Officers will therefore continue to monitor and manage this budget during the final part of the year;
- Based on income collected up to and including quarter 3, 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 £309,000 net of bank charges. Due to level of uncertainty in the current climate it is likely that this variance will continue to fluctuate throughout the remainder of the year. The actual net deficit position on this income and the above Freedom Pass reissue costs, currently projected to be £259,000, will be charged against the Freedom Pass Specific Reserve by way of a transfer to revenue at the year end in line with normal TEC practice;
- 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 £200,000 against an annual budget of £1 million;
- However, an underspend of £164,000 on Lorry Control administration, largely due to delays in developing the scheme, is being projected. This includes the rolled forward budget of £91,000 from 2019/20, and members are likely to be requested to approve the carry forward of this underspend into 2021/22 as part of the July 2021 outturn report.
- Additional income from TfL of £57,000 and the transfer from the special projects specific reserve of £152,000 to fund the additional Environment Policy officers as previously agreed by members; and
- A forecasted amount of interest on investments of £34,000.

## 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>Audited reserves at 1 April 2020</b>	<b>3,946</b>	<b>2,741</b>	<b>6,687</b>
Transfer between reserves	-	-	-
Approved in setting 2020/21 budget (December 2019)	(579)	-	(579)
Carried forward amounts from 2019/20	(91)	-	(91)
Use of specific reserves including TEC special projects in 2020/21		(152)	(152)
Indicative use of specific reserves including TEC special projects		(1,348)	(1,348)
Projected Budget Surplus/(Deficit) 2020/21	546	(259)	287
<b>Estimated Residual Balances at 31 March 2021</b>	<b>3,822</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>4,804</b>

## Conclusions

6. This report reflects the position at the third-quarter stage in the current financial year and forecasts a surplus position of £287,000 for the year. In addition, taxicard trips are forecast to underspend by £5.025 million, with the borough proportion of this underspend projected to be £1.588 million, with £3.437 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, all due largely to the impact of the COVID-19 lockdown.
8. After considering the forecast surplus and known commitments, general reserves are forecast to be £3.822 million at the year-end, which equates to 27% 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, as noted at the main TEC meeting in December 2020 when considering the future budget proposals. There remains significant uncertainty surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic and the impact this may have on TEC budgets, particularly traded services. Potential unforeseen issues could still impact in the final part of the financial year and this will be detailed in the pre audit outturn figures which will be reported to this Committee in July 2021.

## Recommendations

9. Members are asked to :
- note the projected surplus of £287,000 for the year, plus the forecast underspend of £5.025 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 9 ATD £000	Month 9 Forecast £000	Month 9 Variance £000
<b>Payments in respect of Concessionary Fares</b>				
TfL	318,763	239,072	318,763	0
ATOC	20,665	15,498	20,665	0
Other Bus Operators	1,300	567	915	-385
Freedom Pass issue costs	1,518	887	1,468	-50
Freedom Pass Administration	505	396	528	23
City Fleet Taxicard contract	10,447	3,879	5,422	-5,025
Taxicard Administration	581	426	569	-12
	353,779	260,725	348,330	-5,449
<b>TEC Trading Account Expenditure</b>				
Payments to Adjudicators- ETA	779	397	595	-184
Payments to Adjudicators - RUCA	519	250	376	-143
Northgate variable contract costs - ETA	305	175	236	-69
Northgate variable contract costs - RUCA	180	71	99	-81
Northgate variable contract costs - Other	205	106	149	-56
Payments to Northampton County Court	4,000	2,885	4,000	0
Lorry Control Administration	845	487	681	-164
ETA/RUCA Administration	3,084	1,877	2,935	-149
HEB Administration	42	31	41	-1
	9,959	6,279	9,112	-847
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>363,738</b>	<b>267,004</b>	<b>357,442</b>	<b>-6,296</b>
<b>Operating Expenditure</b>				
<b>Contractual Commitments</b>				
NG Fixed Costs	95	71	95	0
	95	71	95	0
<b>Salary Commitments</b>				
Non-operational staffing costs	708	533	914	206
Members	19	14	19	0
Maternity Provision	30	0	10	-20
	757	547	943	186
<b>Other Commitments</b>				
Supplies and service	159	5	42	-117
Research	40	18	24	-16
	199	23	66	-133
<b>Total Operating Expenditure</b>	<b>1,051</b>	<b>641</b>	<b>1,104</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Central Recharges</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>528</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>365,275</b>	<b>268,010</b>	<b>359,074</b>	<b>-6,201</b>

	Revised 2020/21 £000	Month 9 ATD £000	Month 9 Forecast £000	Month 9 Variance £000
Borough contributions to TfL	318,763	239,072	318,763	0
Borough contributions to ATOC	20,665	15,498	20,665	0
Borough contributions to other bus operators	1,300	975	1,300	0
Borough contributions to FP issue costs	1,518	330	1,518	0
Borough contributions to freedom pass administration	0	0	0	0
Income from replacing lost/faulty freedom passes	750	350	441	309
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	3,879	5,422	3,437
Borough contributions to taxicard administration	324	324	324	0
TfL Contribution to taxicard administration	124	93	124	0
	353,909	260,521	348,557	5,352
<b>TEC trading account income</b>				
Borough contributions to Lorry Control administration	0	0	0	0
Lorry Control PCNs	1,000	0	800	200
Borough parking appeal charges	967	577	752	215
TfL parking appeal charges	118	86	112	6
GLA Congestion charging appeal income	699	333	475	224
Borough fixed parking costs	2,069	1,552	2,069	0
TfL fixed parking costs	235	176	235	0
GLA fixed parking costs	875	656	875	0
Borough other parking services	562	294	392	170
Northampton County Court Recharges	4,000	2,885	4,000	0
	10,525	6,559	9,710	815
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>364,434</b>	<b>267,080</b>	<b>358,267</b>	<b>6,167</b>
<b>Core borough subscriptions</b>				
Joint Committee	46	35	46	0
TEC (inc TfL)	51	38	51	0
	97	73	97	0
<b>Other Income</b>				
TfL secretariat recharge	31	23	31	0
Investment income	0	26	34	-34
TfL Environmental Initiatives	0	43	57	-57
Other income	0	0	12	-12
Sales of Health Emergency badges	42	40	40	2
	73	132	174	-101
<b>Transfer from Reserves</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>822</b>	<b>-152</b>
<b>Central Recharges</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Income Base Budget</b>	<b>365,274</b>	<b>267,285</b>	<b>359,360</b>	<b>5,914</b>

# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

## Go Ultra Low City Scheme, Surplus Funding Allocation

Item No: 07

**Report by:** Claudia Corrigan

**Job title:** Senior Lead – EV Infrastructure Coordination

**Date:** 18 February 2021

**Contact Officer:** Claudia Corrigan

**Telephone:** **Email:** [claudia.corrigan@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:claudia.corrigan@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

**Summary:** This report sets out a recommendation for the allocation of c. £400,000 Go Ultra Low Cities Scheme surplus funding.

**Recommendations:** The Committee is asked to:

- review and agree recommendation to allocate surplus GULCS funding,
- review and agree recommendation to reallocate any future GULCS surplus funding to top-up borough funding allocations recommended for dedicated parking bays and signage in Appendix C.

## Background

1. In 2016, London's Go Ultra Low Cities Scheme (GULCS) was awarded £13m in capital funding from the Office for Zero Emissions Vehicles (OZEV). The funding was awarded to drive the uptake of low emissions vehicles through a programme managed in partnership between London Councils, Transport for London (TfL) and the GLA. The majority of funding was allocated to 28 London boroughs and TfL to deliver on-street residential charge points, car club charge points, rapid charge points, community charging hubs and Neighbourhoods of the Future programmes. The programme had a target to deliver a total of 2,150 on-street charge points and has delivered nearly 2,500 points to date, with more than 3,000 planned for delivery by spring 2021.
2. c. £400,000 capital funding remains unallocated in the programme budget. Following feedback from borough and TfL officers, in December 2020 it was agreed by the GULCS Project Board, and OZEV, that surplus funding would be allocated to boroughs and TfL to deliver the following two workstreams:
  - TfL rapid charge point programme – delivery of additional rapid charge points at sites originally progressed as part of the TfL programme. The programme has delivered more than 300 rapid charge points to date and has capacity to deliver additional points on borough and TfL highway in early 2021.
  - Borough delivery of signage and dedicated parking bays to improve visibility of, and access to, existing on-street charge points. Boroughs requested funding for this purpose to respond to complaints received re: access to existing charge points, and to increase visibility and awareness of lamp post column charge points to increase utilisation. Current utilisation of slow, on-street residential charge points remains low at an average of <5% across London.
3. In January 2021 TfL confirmed that 14 rapid charge points could be progressed with available surplus funding, and 13 boroughs submitted bids to deliver dedicated bays and signage at existing charge points. A total of £1.16m funding was requested across both workstreams, as per the summary table below. As a result, a review and prioritisation process was completed by London Councils to inform the allocation recommendation included in this paper. This recommendation was approved by the GULCS Project Board on 27 January 2021.

<b>Workstream</b>	<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>
Rapid charge points	TfL	£0.4m
Dedicated parking bays	Boroughs	£0.7m
Signage	Boroughs	£0.06m
Total:		£1.16m

4. Following a review of the 14 sites initially identified, TfL prioritised five sites for funding, requiring a total of £145,000 to progress to delivery. The sites, with associated costs, are listed in Appendix A. Four of the five sites are on borough highway and so the payment of an annual site fee and income share for the rapid charge points delivered will be paid directly to the borough. One site is proposed on TfL land. All sites have been approved by the relevant highway authority.
5. A summary of the funding requested by the boroughs to deliver dedicated bays and signage is provided in Appendix B. Total funding requested would deliver 1,402 signs and 871 dedicated bays. All signage is forecast for delivery by June 2021 and dedicated bays by December 2021.
6. Given the requirement to match allocations to just over half of bids, it is recommended that £145,000, less than a third of the total funding available, is allocated to TfL to deliver the five priority sites identified. The remaining funding (£250,000) can then be allocated to the 13 boroughs who submitted bids to deliver dedicated parking bays and signage.
7. It is recommended that the remaining funding is, at first, split equally between each of the 13 boroughs that submitted a bid for funding. This provides each borough with a maximum of £19,200 as an initial funding allocation. Using this approach, all 7 bids for signage would be fully funded, leaving remaining funding of £194,500 to allocate for delivery of dedicated parking bays across six boroughs, providing each with £32,500. A summary of proposed allocations per borough is provided in Appendix C.
8. It is estimated that the funding allocations proposed will deliver c.1,402 signs and c.250 dedicated bays. The final number of dedicated bays and signage to be delivered will be confirmed with the recipient boroughs as part of the allocation process.
9. If approved, funding will be confirmed with each of the boroughs and made immediately available through the TfL funding portal.

10. It is likely that a small amount of additional funding may be returned to the GULCS programme budget for reallocation. It is recommended that any additional funding is allocated to top-up the borough allocations recommended in Appendix C as and when it becomes available. Future funding allocations will be approved by the GULCS Project Board.

### **Recommendation**

11. The Committee is asked to:

- review and agree recommendation to allocate existing surplus GULCS funding,
- review and agree recommendation to reallocate any future GULCS surplus funding to top-up borough funding allocations recommended for dedicated parking bays and signage in Appendix C.

### **Financial Implications**

12. The Director of Corporate Resources comments that as this report proposes the allocation of existing approved residual GULCS capital funding, there are no additional financial implications arising from the recommendations.

### **Legal Implications**

13. There are no specific legal implications arising from this report.

### **Equalities Implications**

14. There are no specific implications for equalities arising from this report.

## Appendix A: TfL rapid charge point priority sites

ID	Site name	Land Ownership	Status	Cost	Borough	Access
1110	357-361 Upper Richmond Road, Richmond/Wandsworth – A205	Borough Highway	Progressing	£28,600	Wandsworth	Public
1233	Edgware Rd junction with Harrow Road	TfL Highway	Progressing	£28,600	Westminster	Public
1319	Rose Lane (Marks Gate Shopping Parade)	Borough Highway	Progressing	£28,600	Barking & Dagenham	Public
1397	74 Warren St, London W1T 5PF	Borough Highway	Progressing	£30,600	Camden	Taxi
1360	Wimbledon, 162-166 The Broadway, SW19 1RX	Borough Highway	Progressing	£28,600	Merton	Public



**Appendix B: Summary of borough funding requests for dedicated parking and signage**

	Dedicated Parking Bays		Signage	
Borough	Funding requested	Number of dedicated parking bays to be delivered	Funding requested	Number of signs to be delivered
Camden	£ 43,678	30	£ -	
Ealing	£ 32,000	64	£ -	
Hackney	£ 250,000	193	£ -	
Hammersmith & Fulham	£ 54,470	230	£ -	
Islington	£ -		£ 3,600	90
Kingston	£ -		£ 8,000	100
Lambeth	£ 121,080	300	£ -	
RBKC	£ -		£ 7,600	190
Richmond	£ -		£ 6,156	342
Sutton	£ -		£ 10,240	80
Tower Hamlets	£ -		£ 12,400	200
Wandsworth	£ -		£ 7,200	400
Westminster	£ 175,000	54	£ -	
	<b>£ 676,228</b>	<b>871</b>	<b>£ 55,196</b>	<b>1,402</b>

## Appendix C: Summary of proposed allocations

Funding Recipient	Workstream	Funding requested	Proposed Allocation
TfL	Rapid charge points	£ 398,200	£ 145,000
Camden	Dedicated parking bays	£ 43,678	£ 32,500
Ealing	Dedicated parking bays	£ 32,000	£ 32,000
Hackney	Dedicated parking bays	£ 250,000	£ 32,500
Hammersmith & Fulham	Dedicated parking bays	£ 54,470	£ 32,500
Islington	Signage	£ 3,600	£ 3,600
Kingston	Signage	£ 8,000	£ 8,000
Lambeth	Dedicated parking bays	£ 121,080	£ 32,500
RBKC	Signage	£ 7,600	£ 7,600
Richmond	Signage	£ 6,156	£ 6,156
Sutton	Signage	£ 10,240	£ 10,240
Tower Hamlets	Signage	£ 12,400	£ 12,400
Wandsworth	Signage	£ 7,200	£ 7,200
Westminster	Dedicated parking bays	£ 175,000	£ 32,500
		<b>£ 1,129,624</b>	<b>£ 394,696</b>

# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

## Taxicard – Future Funding and Governance

Item No: 08

<b>Report by:</b>	Stephen Boon	<b>Job title:</b>	Chief Contracts Officer
<b>Date:</b>	18 February 2021		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Joyce Mamode (TfL)		
<b>Telephone:</b>	0203 0544358	<b>Email:</b>	joyce.mamode@tfl.gov.uk

---

### Summary:

This report provides members with an update on TfL's public commitment in respect of Taxicard funding for the next financial year and beyond. It asks members to note the vital importance of TfL's funding to the future viability of Taxicard. It also asks members to approve TfL's request to begin discussions with London Councils to draft an amendment to the LCTEC agreement for consideration at either at the June or October 2021 TEC meeting clarifying TfL's role in the governance of Taxicard.

### Recommendations:

1. Members are asked to note TfL's commitment to ongoing future funding of the Taxicard scheme.
2. Members are asked to approve the commencement of discussions with London Councils over drafting an amendment to the LCTEC agreement clarifying the role of TfL in the governance of the Taxicard scheme.

## Background

1. The Taxicard scheme provides subsidised taxi and private hire vehicle (PHV) journeys to approximately 60,000 London residents with serious mobility impairments, or who are severely sight impaired.
2. Funding for Taxicard has, in the past been shared between the boroughs and TfL, with TfL bearing a steadily increasing proportion of overall funding. Since 2019-20, TfL has been the sole contributor to Taxicard funding and will be so again in 2020/21.
3. A summary of TfL's increasing share of Taxicard funding is shown in Table 1. below:

**Table 1.**

Year	Trips	TfL contribution	TfL % funding	Borough contribution	Borough % funding	Total scheme costs
2016/17	1,276,481	£9,577,486	83%	£1,958,792	17%	£11,536,278
2017/18	1,251,047	£9,873,391	86%	£1,559,570	14%	£11,432,961
2018/19	1,122,249	£9,860,934	99%	£136,854	1%	£9,997,788
2019/20	915,469	£8,281,709	100%	£0	0%	£8,281,709

## Introduction

1. Governance of the Taxicard scheme is set out in the LCTEC agreement which outlines the framework under which Taxicard is managed by London Councils on behalf of the boroughs. Despite being the majority funder of Taxicard for a number of years now, and the sole funder since 2019/20, it has no constitutional standing within the TEC agreement.
2. London Councils and TfL have, in recent years, worked on a number of initiatives of common interest in relation to the suite of Assisted Transport Services that exist in London to support those who need help in travelling around.
3. One such initiative was the joint procurement, completed during 2017, of a taxi and private hire supply framework, covering the delivery of the Taxicard service, the Capital Call service and the taxi and private hire supplement to the Dial-a-Ride service.
4. Another initiative was the proposed Assisted Transport Pilot, which although not ultimately progressed, helped to further develop the close working relationship between London Councils and TfL.
5. Most recently, London Councils and TfL have worked closely together during the Covid-19 pandemic to co-ordinate additional support for older and disabled Londoners provided through the Taxicard and Dial-a-Ride services respectively. This collaboration has enabled vulnerable Londoners to receive deliveries of food and medical supplies whilst shielding.

## Future funding of Taxicard

4. TfL has confirmed its indicative funding for Taxicard for the forthcoming financial year (2021 - 2022), based on the forecasts jointly agreed between TfL and London Councils. This figure is

only indicative at present, due to the uncertainty that still exists over TfL's overall funding position.

5. TfL is appreciative that the current financial uncertainty is far from ideal and has sought to offset this uncertainty to some extent by confirming its ongoing commitment to Taxicard funding. In light of Taxicard's key contribution to the suite of assisted transport services in London, TfL has confirmed that funding for Taxicard is considered to be part of its core transport commitments and as such there is no intention to cease this funding in future years.
6. The level of TfL funding for Taxicard will, however, continue to be the subject of negotiation year or year, in relation to changing levels of demand for the service and in relation to any changes in TfL's financial position.

### **Future governance of Taxicard**

7. Constitutionally, Taxicard is a borough scheme and although TfL now provides all of its funding, the current wording of the LCTEC agreement gives it no constitutional standing in respect of the Scheme.
8. In light of this, TfL would like to begin discussions with London Council officers to explore whether an amendment to the TEC agreement, with the purpose of creating a formal constitutional position for TfL in respect of Taxicard, equivalent to that of a participating borough would provide TfL with the best means of ensuring that its funding is able to be used to further TfL's aims in the field of assisted transport. This would enable TfL to initiate a discussion with the boroughs over potential changes to the scheme, such as greater harmonisation of the service offering across London.
9. Such harmonisation might include TfL's funding buying consistency regarding the following elements of the scheme (subject to consultation):
  - Taxicard members' trip allocation
  - The ability for Taxicard members to double-swipe
10. TfL understands that changing the TEC agreement is not without difficulty. Therefore, in the course of the consultation, other options will be considered. It is anticipated that consultation with boroughs could take a number of months. Therefore, should members agree to TfL's request, it would be TfL's intention to bring a further paper, through London Councils, to the transport and environment committee in June or October 2021.

### **Financial Implications for London Councils**

None

### **Legal Implications for London Councils**

At this stage, there are no legal implications in beginning consultation with boroughs. However, were a constitutional change to be proposed, legal advice would be needed by all parties.

### **Equalities Implications for London Councils**

None

## **Recommendations**

1. Members are asked to note TfL 's commitment to ongoing future funding of the Taxicard scheme.
2. Members are asked to approve the commencement of discussions with London Councils officers with the aim of drafting a proposed amendment to the LC TEC agreement, clarifying the role of TfL in Taxicard governance, to be brought to the June or October TEC 2021 meeting for consideration.

## **Background Papers**

TEC – Taxicard Update – 10 December 2020 (Item 11)

# London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

## TEC & TEC Executive Sub Committee Dates 2021/22

Item  
No: 09

**Report by:** Alan Edwards **Job title:** Governance Manager  
**Date:** 18 February 2021  
**Contact Officer:** Alan Edwards  
**Telephone:** 0207 934 9911 **Email:** Alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

**Summary:** This report notifies members of the proposed TEC and TEC Executive Sub Committee dates for the year 2021/22

**Recommendations:** It is recommended that Members:

- Note the proposed dates for TEC and TEC Executive Sub Committee meetings for the year 2021/22, which will be presented to full TEC in March 2021 for ratification.

### TEC (Main) Committee Proposed Dates

- Thursday 10 June 2021 (AGM)
- Thursday 14 October 2021
- Thursday 9 December 2021
- Thursday 24 March 2022

All the above meetings start at 2.30pm, with a pre-meeting for political groups at 1.30pm. All TEC (Main) Committee meetings will be held virtually until further notice.

### **TEC Executive Sub Committee Proposed Dates**

- Thursday 15 July 2021
- Thursday 9 September 2021
- Thursday 18 November 2021
- Thursday 10 February 2022

TEC Executive Sub Committee meetings start at 10:00am and will be held virtually until further notice.

### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that Members:

- To note the proposed dates for the TEC and TEC Executive Sub Committee meetings for the year 2021/22, which will be ratified at the full TEC meeting in March 2021.

### **Financial Implications**

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

### **Legal Implications**

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

### **Equalities Implications**

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



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

Minutes of a virtual meeting of the London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on **19 November 2020** at 10:00am.

### **Present:**

Mayor Phil Glanville (Chair)	LB Hackney
Councillor Krupa Sheth	LB Brent
Councillor William Huntington-Thresher	LB Bromley
Councillor Muhammad Ali	LB Croydon
Councillor Julian Bell	LB Ealing
Councillor Claire Holland	LB Lambeth
Councillor Sophie McGeevor	LB Lewisham
Councillor Manuel Abellan	LB Sutton
Councillor Richard Field	LB Wandsworth
Councillor Tim Mitchell	City of Westminster
Oliver Sells QC	City of London Corporation

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham) and Alastair Moss (City of London Corporation). Oliver Sells QC deputised for Alastair Moss.

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

LGA Member of Environment, Economy, Housing and Transport Board  
Mayor Phil Glanville (LB Hackney)

Member of SERA  
Mayor Phil Glanville (LB Hackney)

Labour Cycles  
Mayor Phil Glanville (LB Hackney)

### **3. TfL Update by Alex Williams, TfL**

Alex Williams, Director of Borough Planning, Transport for London, gave the following update:

- Revenue generated from fares had been severely affected since the Covid-19 outbreak.
- There were two phases of funding from the Government to TfL – H1 and H2. Both were for a period of 6 months. The H2 deal was agreed on 31 October 2020. The Government agreed a deal of up to £1.8 billion in order to keep TfL going. This was dependent on the fares income that was generated in the future.
- Changes to the Congestion Charge were staying as they were for now, and the removal of the Freedom Pass am peak concession would continue through to the end of the financial year.

- The need to remove free travel for U18s was dropped but if London wanted to retain free travel for the under 18s and the Oyster 60+ cards, then the Mayor would have to find a way to pay for them.
- There was still a £160 million funding gap, but TfL was confident it could get around this.
- DfT has asked that TfL come up with a financial stability plan by 11 January 2021. The current deal ends on 31 March 2021.
- Borough Chief Executives had been sent a letter regarding borough settlements. £75 million (£42 million for borough allocation) from the Government for Active Travel and £20 million from the DfT. LIP funding had been reinstated. The £20 million from the DfT did not have to be spent this year.
- Conversations needed to be had with the boroughs regarding deliverability, which was a challenge. Consultation needed to take place from now until the end of March 2021.
- The active travel group set up for H1, which Councillor Loakes was on, no longer existed. The issue now was how to oversee the H2 programme going forward, to deliver schemes and to track progress.

#### Q and As

The Chair thanked Alex Williams for his update. He said that it was good to see that LIP funding had been reinstated and the funding for Active Travel. He asked when the new consultation requirements would be signed off by TfL. Alex Williams said that the DfT was happy to leave the consultation requirements to TfL and the boroughs, although he would double check this with the DfT. He said that TfL would have preferred more clarity with regards to next year's settlement. TfL had asked for longer new deals (eg 18 months and longer) but had to settle for a deal every six months. Alex Williams said that the sustainability plan document on 11 January 2021 would provide more certainty going forward. He said that he would check back with his team with regards to the details of the £20 million funding from the DfT (Tranche 2).

Councillor Abellan asked when there would be more details available on the consultation, especially with regards to delivery and timings. He said that it would be very challenging to carry out the consultations by the end of March 2021. Councillor Abellan asked whether there was any budget to make some temporary schemes permanent. Alex Williams said that the approach to the consultation would be up to the boroughs. He said that the DfT would not get involved in this (although they did want an audit trail). Alex Williams said boroughs could make some temporary schemes permanent out of the borough allocation (ie shift from the use of plastics to something more permanent). He said that there were concerns that certain parts of junctions had not been done properly. Boroughs could use some of the H2 money to lock-in what they had already carried out, and use higher quality materials.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that a certain amount of the TfL settlement would be needed for the Mayor to set his budget. He said that Tranche 2 had provided the flexibility to make some temporary schemes permanent. Alex Williams said that more clarity regarding the Mayor's precept would be available in the document on 11 January 2021, as this would include financial plans. He said that increases in Council Tax would not fill the £3 billion that TfL needed to operate effectively.

Alex Williams said that LIP funds could also be used to make some temporary schemes permanent. He said that he would go back to TfL and investigate this further. Councillor Huntington-Thresher asked whether any more bids could be put in from Tranche 2. Alex Williams said that details of the £75 million for Active Travel

and £20 million from the DfT were in the letter that had been sent to boroughs in the week. He said that he would liaise with Spencer Palmer over the timings.

The Chair asked whether there would be flexibility in the current LIPs programme. Alex Williams said that a conversation was needed with the boroughs about what was realistic and practically possible to spend this year. Councillor Sheth asked what was happening to the funding of the Taxicard scheme. Alex Williams said he was aware that a Taxicard report would be going to TEC in December. He said that funding had been committed for this financial year, although there was no certainty after that. Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, confirmed that Taxicard was moving forward with the current level of expenditure, but after that would be dependent on what happens in the next financial year.

Spencer Palmer said that there was a real issue for the Taxicard scheme. He said that the lack of funding certainty would make it difficult to commit staff to administer the scheme next year. Alex Williams said that there was no funding certainty beyond the end of March 2021, although TfL was working hard to get funding for as much as possible.

The Chair said that Crossrail 2 was being mothballed. He said that there were issues on safeguarding and this had an impact on town centres. The proposal was to progress with safeguarding, confirming route alignment and to protect any revised scheme in the longer term. The decision was with the Secretary of State for Transport and the Treasury.

Councillor Bell asked whether there was any funding commitment to contractors beyond H2 (eg City Fleet for Taxicard). He asked how London Councils was managing the relationship with the contractors without that funding certainty. Spencer Palmer confirmed that there were funding commitments in place, although this would have to be looked at in terms of contractual commitments in the future. Stephen Boon informed members that the City Fleet contract expired in October 2021.

The Chair said that a meeting with TEC and the Transport Commissioner was due to take place on 18 December 2020. Councillor Holland said that the Transport Commissioner had cancelled the meeting in the last quarter. She said that it was important that the new Transport Commissioner commits to these meetings and ensures that they go ahead. Alex Williams said that the Transport Commissioner understands how important the relationship is with the boroughs and wants to work productively with London Councils and TEC. He said that the Transport Commissioner had already had discussions with ten borough Leaders so far. Alex Williams confirmed that the meeting scheduled for 18 December 2020 would definitely be taking place. Councillor Holland voiced concern that the boroughs had missed out on a whole quarter because the cancelled meeting had not been rescheduled.

The Chair said that there was so much out in the public realm at the moment, like temporary schemes versus permanent schemes and streetscaping around social distancing. He asked whether any assessments had been carried out on some of the most temporary schemes in place as a number of them appeared to be very confusing. Alex Williams said that this area of work was the one that had had the most change. He said that a few of these schemes had been removed. Some of the schemes appeared to be working well and discussions were taking place scheme by scheme. Alex Williams said that there was also the need to be mindful of freight services when considering making temporary schemes permanent. He said that school streets had been working very well and there was now an opportunity to make

these permanent. This had encouraged the take-up of walking and cycling to school and these schemes were less controversial.

Councillor Field said that it was good to hear about school streets, which had been a success in the borough of Wandsworth. However, he said that there were concerns around bus stop areas on TfL routes that also accommodated cycle lanes, as there were safety issues when crossing these lanes. Councillor Field said that TfL needed to correct the schemes where there were safety issues. Alex Williams said that there had been tricky design issues with regards to some temporary schemes that had been put in place quickly (like bus shelters almost in cycle lanes). He said that there was a need to get sensible layouts for these. Councillor Field said that there were particular issues that needed to be addressed on the A24 road/Balham High Road.

Councillor Field said that there were concerns with deliveries to local businesses, as there were difficulties with the deliveries getting through to them. Alex Williams said that TfL had issued guidance on these issues and some of these schemes were being amended. The Chair said that there were also some very good designs out there as well. He said that many European examples were far more challenging.

The Chair informed members that the boroughs had until 14 December 2020 if they wanted to be part of the e-scooter trials in 2021. Boroughs also needed to think about the storage of e-scooters and safety issues. The byelaw would be presented to TEC Main meeting on 10 December 2020. Paulius Mackela would engage with individual members going forward. The Chair thanked Alex Williams for his update on TfL.

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

- Agreed that Alex Williams would check directly with DfT regarding the responsibility for setting consultation requirements and report back to TEC;
- Agreed that Alex Williams would go back to his team to find out more details regarding the Tranche 2 funding of £20 million from the DfT;
- Agreed that Alex Williams would go back to TfL and feedback to Spencer Palmer about the timings regarding the £75 million for Active Travel and £20 million for DfT; and
- Noted that boroughs could use some of their H2 funding to make some successful temporary schemes permanent (and use higher quality materials rather than plastics).

#### **4. TEC & TEC Executive Sub Committee Roles & Stakeholder Engagement**

The TEC Executive received a report that set out the roles and arrangements for the Transport & Environment Committee (TEC Main) and the TEC Executive Sub Committee. The report also highlighted key engagement meetings and relationships with stakeholders such as Transport for London.

The Chair said that he had asked for this report, which set out the TEC and TEC Executive roles and key relationships with TEC stakeholders until the end of the year. Spencer Palmer introduced the report which was for discussing and noting. He said that the report also set out the composition of the TEC Executive Sub Committee and gave details on the TEC Urgency Procedure that went to the TEC Elected Officers (Chair and vice chairs). Spencer Palmer said that the report listed the main TEC stakeholders and other external bodies like LEDNet, the London Waste and

Recycling Board (LWARB) and the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (Thames RFCC).

Councillor Bell said that the paper did not detail the various one-to-one meetings that the Chair had with officers, like 6-monthly meetings with the TRFCC and meetings with the Chair of LWARB and LEDNet. Councillor Holland said that she was not aware of the relationship with LEDNet when she was acting Chair. She suggested that this should be formalised more in order to maximise the impact. The Chair said that good partnerships had been formed with TEC. He said that the issue of having virtual meetings also presented challenges.

Spencer Palmer said that some meetings were currently being set-up and some had been delayed due to the late TEC AGM. These included meetings with LEDNet and CELC. Spencer Palmer said that there would also be more joint events in the future. The Chair said that he was aware that these meetings were taking place and thanked Spencer Palmer for the helpful steers. He said that he would follow-up on some of these meetings and would report back to the TEC Executive on progress.

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

- Noted that in addition to the TEC stakeholder meetings there were also 6-monthly meetings with the Chair of TEC and the TRFCC, and meetings with the Chairs of LWARB and LEDNet; and
- Agreed that the Chair would let the TEC Executive know about these additional meetings and maximise informal discussions.

## **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 Q2 2020/21.

Spencer Palmer, Director of Transport and Mobility, London Councils, introduced the report, which went to every TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting. The following comments were made:

### London Tribunals – Environment & Traffic Adjudicators and RUCA

The targets for the average number of days to decide appeals had not been met because of the backlog caused by the closure of the hearing centre. Assurances had now been given that the appeals were now back on track.

### Freedom Pass Service – calls answered within 45 seconds and calls abandoned

The targets for the number of calls answered/abandoned was not met, as the contractor still have staff on furlough and with call volumes currently hard to predict, there were not enough staff at times to answer all the calls within the agreed target. Customer satisfaction remained high though.

### Taxicard

The Taxicard service had a very good performance. There were previously some issues with call answering and journey response times. Taxis were now carrying out the Taxicard work as a priority.

#### London European Partnership for Transport (LEPT)

The rating for LEPT was “amber” because the number of boroughs participating in LEPT was five and the target was seven. Engagement had also been affected over the year as a result of Covid-19.

Spencer Palmer said that he had received a number of complimentary letters from users of the Taxicard and the Freedom Pass. An extract from a couple of these letters can be found below:

#### *Stolen Freedom Pass Letter extract:*

*I would like to take this opportunity of thanking your good self.....*

*Your swift and truly exceptional actions have indeed helped restore the loss of faith in humanity, I have recently been experiencing.*

*After my initial phone call on Tuesday this week, when you listened patiently and understandingly to the problems I was having, it was a matter of only a few minutes before a gentleman called Andy called me to help resolve the issues I was having.*

*He did not just resolve the issues, it went far beyond that. It was his genuine concern that something had gone wrong and he wanted to put right in any way he could, and would not stop until he had done so. This level of “customer service”, in my experience, no longer exists in any business or service forum. Something you should be very proud of.*

*Being faced with the situation of a pending lockdown and no access to funds or transport. I was extremely concerned as to how I was going to ensure that I was able to follow the rules of the lockdown, and keep myself, and those I came into contact with, safe. Andy took care of those concerns, and enabled me to do, what needed to be done.*

*I have expressed my thanks to Andy over the phone, but I truly felt his efforts needed a little more than that. So please pass on my appreciation for what he did, and thank you for instigating his help.*

*I have never been in a position of wanting to write a letter of praise like this before, and you should take that as a compliment to the exemplary service London Councils provided me with.*

#### *Taxicard Message:*

*As a family, we would like to thank you so much for having this taxicard scheme. It made a huge difference to our aunt and to ourselves. Our aunt had a stroke in 2003 , and as the years went on, getting her to her medical appointments and out of her flat to see family or have a meal or to do shopping became harder and harder and more and more stressful for her until it became impossible.*

*Once we had the taxicard, a huge weight was lifted, the anxiety of getting our aunt to and from appointments disappeared and she was also able to enjoy a few precious family outings.*

*I know money is tight and must be spent wisely, but The taxicard scheme is such a wonderful gift (and necessary lifeline) to the recipient and their family/Carers. It totally transforms peoples' lives for the better.*

Spencer Palmer said that the Andy referred to was Andy Rollock, Mobility Services Manager in his team at London Councils. The Chair thanked Spencer Palmer, London Councils staff and Andy Rollock for the services that they provided.

Councillor McGeevor asked whether London Councils was planning for an increase in appeals due to more CCTV being used. Councillor Sheth asked for more details on LEPT. Spencer Palmer said that there had been a reduction in the number of appeals in the past six months. However, things were now picking up. He said that he was mindful that there might now be an increase in appeals. Spencer Palmer said that the administration of appeals was set-up and the adjudicators worked flexibly in order to deal with increases in demand.

Spencer Palmer said that LEPT was a service that London Councils had provided for many years, which sought EU funding for various transport related projects. LEPT was successful and shared good practice with other EU cities as well as sharing information with the boroughs. The work of LEPT had reduced over the years especially in light of the uncertainty of Brexit. Spencer Palmer said that funding for LEPT was provided by TfL via a top slice of the overall borough LIP allocation, and there was uncertainty with regards to funding after the next year.

The Chair asked whether there had been a drop in people applying for Freedom passes and whether there were any challenges for people that applied for a Freedom Pass or Taxicard. He also asked whether the Taxicard collection service would be extended beyond the 31 December 2020. Stephen Boon, Chief Contracts Officer, London Councils, said that applications continued to be received (paper and online applications), although the numbers were lower as a result of Covid-19 (people were travelling less). Regarding the collection and delivery service provided by Taxicard, Stephen Boon confirmed that a report would be going to the TEC Main meeting on 10 December 2020 for boroughs to consider extending this service. The Chair said that he welcomed this. He said that fewer people were losing their Freedom passes and this had a knock-on effect on TEC finances.

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

- Noted the performance information and the explanations for “red” ratings.; and
- Agreed that a paper would go to TEC on 10 December 2020 for members to consider whether to extend the collection and delivery Taxicard service beyond 31 December 2020.

## **6. TEC Month 6 Revenue Forecast 2020/21**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that outlined actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of September 2020 for TEC and provided a forecast of the outturn position for 2020/21. At this stage, a surplus of £200,000 was forecast over the budget figure. In addition, total expenditure in respect of Taxicard trips taken by scheme members was forecast to underspend by a net figure of £3.489 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 £1.901 million accruing to TfL.

Frank Smith introduced the half-year report, which showed a projected surplus of £200,000 for the year. He informed members that some enforcement functions had been suspended during the first lockdown, which had affected the projected levels of income for the year. These functions were now getting back to normal volumes and the surplus might continue to increase over the course of the remainder of the year. Frank Smith said that paragraph 4 of the report showed the main reasons for the forecasted surplus position.

The Chair asked whether there was a way to capture the impact of the Taxicard scheme with regards to reliable income for the taxi industry. The Chair also asked whether any new training had been given to the adjudicators that covered recent active travel changes and scheme innovation etc. Spencer Palmer said that he could bring information on the business share to the taxi industry to the TEC meeting in December. He said that adjudicators were independent office holders and it was for them to keep up to date with and apply the law. Spencer Palmer said that he would check with Caroline Hamilton, The Chief Adjudicator at London Tribunals, on what recent training had been given to the adjudicators.

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

- Noted the projected surplus of £200,000 for the year, plus the forecast net underspend of £3.489 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in this report;
- Noted 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;
- Agreed to bring a report to TEC on 10 December 2020 that captured set out the impact of the Taxicard Scheme with regards to reliable income for the taxi industry; and
- Agreed that Spencer Palmer would check with the Chief Adjudicator on what new training had been given to the adjudicators with regards to innovation scheme.

## **7. TEC Draft Revenue Budget & Borough Charges 2021/22**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2021/22. The Executive Sub-Committee was also 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 2020, where the detailed budget proposals and levels of subscriptions and charges for 2021/22 would be presented for approval.

The Chair informed members that the draft proposals included this report had already been discussed with the London Councils Executive and would be presented to the full TEC meeting in December, after being discussed here. Frank Smith said that the report would also go to Leaders' Committee on 8 December 2020. He said that the budget proposals were presented to the TEC Executive Sub Committee first for comment and suggested changes, before being presented to the full TEC meeting in December for final approval.



Frank Smith said that a significant proportion of the proposed budget figures were driven by trading activities, the volumes of which was generated by the boroughs and not London Councils. He informed members that there were no changes in the proposed charges to the boroughs for 2021/22, with the exception of the Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) charge, which had increased slightly due to increases in adjudicators' fees and variable unit cost contract charges. All other charges were recommended to be held at the current year's level. Some boroughs may see an increase in their overall charges compared to the current year, but this is due to borough specific metrics, such as the number of taxicard members and the number of PCNs issued compared to the London-wide total.

Frank Smith said that there is a projected reduction in revenue generated by income from replacement Freedom passes, and it was recommended that £150,000 be transferred from uncommitted general reserves to cover this expected reduction. A transfer of £199,000 from the special projects specific reserve is also included to cover the Committee's contribution to fund the 2.5 posts to undertake environmentally associated policy work, in accordance with the Committee's decision agreed last December.

Frank Smith said that paragraphs 51 onwards explained the position on Committee reserves up to April 2021 and moving forward. He informed members that the level of uncommitted reserves still exceeded the agreed 15% upper benchmark by 8.9%, which would reduce to an excess of 3.8% if the proposals in this report were agreed by the main Committee in December. Frank Smith said that there was a need to look at what further development in TEC policy areas would be taking place over the next 12 months when considering the excess reserves.

Frank Smith said that paragraph 56 in the report gave three options on what to do with the excess reserves. He said that a steer was now needed from the TEC Executive Sub Committee on the preferred option.

The Chair thanked Frank Smith for the update. Councillor Mitchell said that it was very useful for Frank Smith to take the TEC Executive through this report. He said that borough budgets were very tight, but members needed to be mindful when it came to the reserves. Councillor Mitchell said that the points around unforeseen circumstances were very well made (paragraph 55).

Councillor Mitchell said that it would be beneficial to have more details about ICT developments to go to TEC in December, and to be made aware of any financial implications regarding this. Stephen Boon said that there were a number of areas officers were keen to look at, like increasing the number of online appeals at London Tribunals. He said that it would be beneficial to offer the same online application process to all Freedom Pass and Taxicard passholders. There was also some work that would be looked at in the London Lorry Control Scheme (LLCS). Spencer Palmer said that more information about these work areas, including the Health Emergency Badge (HEB) scheme would go to TEC in December and this would include broad cost estimates.

Frank Smith said that paragraph 4 of the report gave a health warning with regards to pockets of TfL funding that London Councils was reliant on. He said that there would be questions on how TEC would continue to finance some of these services if TfL's funding was withdrawn. It was important, therefore, for TEC to maintain a healthy level of reserves to cover such eventualities.

Councillor Bell felt that it would be prudent to retain the current level of reserves, especially in light of any further Covid-19 developments. He said that his recommendation would be to wait and see what happens in the coming months (option 3, paragraph 56). Councillor Bell said that the TEC Executive might want to review what the maximum level of reserves should be in the future, and maybe increase the 15% upper benchmark reserve limit.

Frank Smith said that the future was uncertain and any disruption to TEC trading services would feed back into TEC income streams. He said that his recommendation would be to keep the reserves as they were and see what happens over the next 6 to 10 months. Frank Smith also suggested to hold off on increasing the 15% upper reserve limit until next year. He said that boroughs would only receive around £15,000 each should the projected £549,000 excess reserves be returned to boroughs, and he would not recommend this action.

The Chair asked whether the benchmark reserve position was a decision for TEC to make or across London Councils as a whole. Frank Smith confirmed that this was a TEC decision, although the position of TEC reserves is included as part of the overall London Councils' reserves position reported to Leaders' in December, where a view on the adequacy of overall level of reserves is provided. Overall reserves are projected to cover 37% of all London Councils' operating and trading expenditure in 2021/22 and are deemed adequate. Councillor Field said that his recommendation was also to take no action and to keep the reserves as they were.

**Decision:** The Executive-Sub Committee recommended that the main Committee approve at their meeting on 10 December 2020:

- The proposed individual levies and charges for 2021/22 as follows:
  - The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2020/21 - £1,500; paragraph 38);
  - The Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.3596 per PCN which will be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2019/20 (2020/21 - £0.3708 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 (2020/21 – nil charge; paragraph 15);
  - The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,000 in total (2020/21 - £338,000; paragraphs 17-18).
  - No charge to boroughs in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which was fully covered by estimated PCN income (2020/21 – nil charge; paragraphs 19-20);
  - Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) - charge of £27.84 per appeal or £24.06 per appeal where electronic evidence was provided by the

enforcing authority (2020/21 - £27.35/£23.63 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £22.15 for hard copy submissions and £21.40 for electronic submissions (2020/21 - £21.78/£21.04 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 (2020/21 - £12; paragraph 10);
- The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2020/21 - £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 (2020/21 - £15.23; paragraphs 29-35);
- The TEC<sup>1</sup> Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2020/21 - £0.175; paragraphs 29-35).
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £325.266 million for 2021/22, as detailed in Appendix A;
- Noted the provisional gross revenue income budget of £324.342 million for 2021/22, and agreed a recommended transfer of £199,000 from Specific reserves for previously agreed priorities, £150,000 from uncommitted reserves to cover a shortfall in replacement freedom pass income due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and £576,000 from uncommitted Committee reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B; and

The Executive Sub Committee recommended that there be no further action on uncommitted reserves in excess of the 15% upper benchmark, as set out in the options in paragraph 56 of the report (option 3).

The Executive-Sub Committee was also asked to note:

- the indicative total charges to individual boroughs for 2021/22, dependent upon volumes generated through the various parking systems, as set out in Appendix C.1.

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

It was noted that Cllr McGeevor's name was spelt incorrectly under agenda item 5 "Under 18 Travel" (paragraph 5). Subject to this amendment, the minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 10 September 2020 were agreed as an accurate record.

---

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

**9. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 15 October 2020 (for noting)**

Councillor Huntington-Thresher would send Alan Edwards a reworded version of the paragraph regarding textiles for the minutes. *(Post meeting note: This had been actioned)*. Subject to this rewording, the minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 15 October 2020 were noted;

It was noted that there were no Conservative leads on the key climate change themes. Six of the themes had already been covered and it would be beneficial to have a Conservative lead on the last remaining theme regarding Low Carbon Development before the TEC meeting on 10 December 2020

*Any members of the press and public were now asked to leave the meeting while the exempt part of the agenda was discussed.*

**The meeting finished at 11:50am**

## London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee (Virtual) – 10 December 2020

Minutes of a virtual meeting of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee held on Thursday 10 December 2020 at 2:30pm

### Present:

Council	Councillor
Barking and Dagenham	Cllr Syed Ghani
Barnet	Cllr Peter Zinkin
Bexley	Cllr Peter Craske
Brent	Cllr Krupa Sheth
Bromley	Cllr William Huntington-Thresher
Camden	Cllr Adam Harrison
Croydon	Cllr Muhammad Ali
Ealing	Cllr Julian Bell
Enfield	Cllr Guney Dogan
Greenwich	<b>Apologies</b>
Hackney	Mayor Phil Glanville
Hammersmith and Fulham	Cllr Wesley Harcourt
Haringey	Cllr Kirsten Hearn
Harrow	Cllr Varsha Parmar
Havering	Cllr Osman Dervish
Hillingdon	
Hounslow	Cllr Hanif Khan
Islington	Cllr Rowena Champion
Kensington and Chelsea	<b>Apologies</b>
Kingston Upon Thames	Cllr Hilary Gander
Lambeth	Cllr Claire Holland
Lewisham	<b>Apologies</b>
Merton	Cllr Martin Whelton
Newham	Cllr James Asser
Redbridge	<b>Apologies</b>
Richmond Upon Thames	Cllr Julia Neden-Watts (Deputy)
Southwark	Cllr Johnson Situ
Sutton	Cllr Manuel Abellan
Tower Hamlets	Cllr Asma Islam
Waltham Forest	Cllr Clyde Loakes
Wandsworth	Cllr Richard Field
City of Westminster	Cllr Tim Mitchell
City of London Corporation	<b>Apologies</b>
Transport for London	Alex Williams

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

### Apologies:

Cllr Sizwe James (RB Greenwich)  
Cllr Johnny Thalassites (RB Kensington & Chelsea)  
Cllr Sophie McGeevor (LB Lewisham)  
Cllr John Howard (LB Redbridge)  
Cllr Alexander Ehmann (LB Richmond)  
Alastair Moss (City of London Corporation)

### Deputies:

Cllr Julia Neden-Watts (LB Richmond)

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

### Freedom Pass

Cllr Peter Zinkin (LB Barnet)

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

Cllr Syed Ghani (LB Barking & Dagenham)  
Cllr Peter Zinkin (LB Barnet)  
Cllr James Asser (LB Newham)  
Cllr Julia Neden-Watts (LB Richmond)  
Cllr Johnson Situ (LB Southwark)

### London Sustainable Development Commission

Cllr Rowena Champion (LB Islington)

## **3. London Ambulance Service (LAS) & Borough Engagement – Talk by Khadir Meer, Chief Operating Officer for the LAS**

Khadir Meer, Chief Operating Officer, LAS, gave the following update to members about the LAS:

- LAS was looking at Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) and Streetscape schemes. LAS was one of the three blue light emergency services and had a workforce of 6,500 people.
- LAS supported efforts to reduce transport congestion, enhance air quality and to promote active travel. It was a challenge for the LAS to manage this.
- The LAS had four categories of responses – category one being life saving, like dealing with heart attacks (response time of 6.5 minutes), category two for other emergencies like strokes, and categories 3 and 4 for less urgent cases.
- The LAS was working with TfL and the boroughs on various schemes and had a strong working relationship with them.
- There were challenges with regards to obstructions to ambulances on the roads.
- Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) – issues encountered included hard closures, locked bollards and concrete blocks. Ambulance crews did not carry

keys to unlock bollards.

- Some pop-up cycle lanes caused concern, as well as narrower cycle lanes as ambulances were unable to get through these. These issues were now being addressed.
- The LAS had been working with TfL and a design group had been established, and an approach agreed (ie safety of cycle travel).
- The LAS had seen some challenges, post lockdown, regarding responding to incidents owing to traffic congestion. There was a need to reduce this congestion.
- On a broader plan, the LAS was committed to reducing emissions from its own fleet.

Darren O'Rourke, LAS, asked boroughs to contact the LAS if they had any concerns on their roads. The Chair asked if a current contact list of LAS officers could be circulated to TEC, along with a copy of the LAS presentation.

Councillor Bell thanked Khadir Meer for the presentation, which was very helpful. He said that his borough of Ealing had a close working relationship with the LAS. Councillor Bell asked when the LAS would be updating their sat nav systems. Councillor Abellan asked how the boroughs and the LAS could enhance their relationship further.

Khadir Meer said that there was some old infrastructure present in some of the LAS vehicles (ie sat navs). Darren O'Rourke said that the sat navs varied on the age of the fleet. The LAS was dependent on the software manufacturers for updating the sat navs, which were currently around 6 to 12 months old. Darren O'Rourke said that the LAS used one.network (Elgin) to update the maps. He said that there was no way to officiate road closures, which was challenging. Darren O'Rourke said that the system was in the process of being updated with "real time" mapping. Khadir Meer said that LAS vehicles would have an upgraded dispatch system by summer 2021.

Khadir Meer said that a number of schemes needed to catch-up quickly owing to the volume of changes during Covid-19. Darren O'Rourke said that there were historic schemes on the sat nav system now. One of the main issues related to crews not carrying keys to open bollards. He said that trials had been carried out to open these locks, but it delayed the response times by 2 to 3 minutes, which could prove fatal should someone be suffering from a medical emergency like a heart attack.

Councillor Loakes thanked Khadir Meer for the consistent work of the LAS. He said that these were some of the best people in London. Councillor Loakes said that it would be good for the boroughs to understand more about the navigational challenges that the LAS fleet was up against, and in what boroughs this was taking place. He also asked about the use of bicycles and motorbikes by the LAS during the pandemic, and whether more were being used. Councillor Mitchell said that the work that the LAS carried out was very much appreciated. He said that he had received a contact list from the LAS, which was very useful. Councillor Mitchell said that there would no doubt be further changes to come, along with individual borough initiatives.

Khadir Meer said that the LAS fleet was relatively new now. He said that the upgrading of the sat navs was about supplying a new software update and was not about the age of the LAS fleet. Khadir Meer said that all respondents had clinical expertise. He confirmed that the use of motorbikes was very limited and had been stepped down during Covid-19. This was because most people required an ambulance. Khadir Meer informed members that the vast majority of the fleet consisted of double crew ambulances. As Covid-19 cases eased, cycle response units had been put back into

central London, although the use of motorbikes had not been re-established. This was because an ambulance was needed in order to take people to hospital.

Councillor Loakes said that boroughs were trying to build infrastructure over the long term, although it had not been possible to test this out as 2020 had not been a normal type of year. The bulk of the call-outs had been Covid related. Khadir Meer said that in the borough of Merton there was a mobilised unit of paramedics all on electric bikes. These were not used for emergencies, but for other less urgent cases. He said that the LAS was very keen to promote the use of these bikes in other boroughs. Hopefully this would lessen the need for emergency responses. Khadir Meer said that it was important for the LAS to adjust responses in order to meet borough needs.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher thanked Khadir Meer for the presentation. He said that his borough of Bromley was on the periphery of London and asked what the average response times were as a result of this. Councillor Huntington-Thresher asked what boroughs were pulling down the average response times. He said that the emergency services had been consulted and had said that there were problems with responses in certain locations. Councillor Field asked whether the boroughs were consulting with the LAS on the ongoing roll-out of safer roads and road closures, especially around schools.

Khadir Meer said that the LAS measured response times in real times (live data), therefore the reality was that there would be variations in service provision across London. He said that the LAS provided a pan-London response and would do everything it could to meet these response times and variations across London. Khadir Meer said that a lot of service provision was dependent on need and geography, and the LAS was working on these challenges. He said that there was a large frail elderly population in the borough of Bromley and different levels of need were required. The objective was for the LAS to meet every patient on time. Khadir Meer said that it was important for the boroughs to know what LAS officers they needed to engage with. He said that it was also important to the LAS that they understood local government and were committed to this.

Councillor Holland said that she had already met with Khadir Meer when she was interim Chair of TEC. She said that the good work of the emergency services during and before the pandemic had been acknowledged. Councillor Holland said that engagement needed to continue on all sides and maintain efforts to reduce congestion on the roads. She said that it would be beneficial when the sat nav system was updated. The borough of Lambeth used ANPR. Councillor Holland said that any further dialogue could continue after the meeting.

The Chair said that he appreciated the time and commitment the LAS gave to TEC. He said that he would take forward and build on the relationship with the LAS and arrange for a meeting to take place early in the new year. He said that members would be sent round a structure chart and copy of the LAS presentation.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Agreed that Khadir Meer would send Alan Edwards a copy of the LAS presentation that went to TEC, along with a list of latest LAS contacts to distribute to TEC Members;
- Noted that Members should contact the LAS to discuss any specific problems in their boroughs, especially with regards to where obstructions to ambulances were occurring on their roads; and
- Noted that the Chair would arrange a meeting with the LAS in the new year and



continue this relationship between the boroughs and the LAS

#### **4. Flooding Partnerships Update**

The Committee received an annual update on the work of the seven London sub-regional flood partnerships, the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (Thames RFCC) and the Environment Agency.

Katharina Winbeck, Strategic Lead, Transport & Environment, London Councils, introduced the report, which was a regular update that went to TEC. She said that each partnership was working very hard to reduce flooding in their area. Katharina Winbeck said that there was concern all round about funding for flooding. Coastal erosion was also an additional risk.

Katharina Winbeck said that the Thames RFCC had confirmed funding for the next 6-years. Claire Bell, Environment Agency, informed members that the next capital programme was £5.2 billion for the next 6-years - £470 million of this was for the Thames programme, which was a big increase. She said that a process of restructuring was currently underway, and the £5.2 billion of capital investment was being delivered in the next 6-years.

Councillor Zinkin said that this was a good report, although he did have some concerns. He said that it was agreed to fix the flood levy for next year, but discussions would be taking place over the next 6-years regarding increases to the levy. Councillor Zinkin felt that the levy should not increase by inflation. He said that boroughs were already giving large sums of money to the Thames RFCC. Councillor Zinkin also voiced concern over how successful the schemes actually were and the amount of money that was being paid to consultants. He said that the relationship with Thames Water was not good as they did not seem to recognise the importance of partnership working. Councillor Zinkin said that the Thames RFCC needed to liaise with Thames Water at the highest level. He said that the Chair of the RFCC had similar views about Thames Water.

Councillor Zinkin said that the amount of money that the boroughs put into the RFCC did not necessarily determine what they got out of it. He said that it was important to ensure that all boroughs benefitted from the funds they put in. Claire Bell said that they were looking at the indicative allocation. She informed members that £105 million more in funding was required than what the levy received. Claire Bell said that the discussions about the levy were still ongoing and were not finished yet. She said that a risk-based approach was taken and schemes were over programmed. A bid had been put in for £130 million, which meant that 95% of the programme would go. Claire Bell said that the levy would be used to get the programme going. Other forms of revenue, like grants, would also be used. This resulted in moving money around which sometimes made it difficult to keep track of the levy.

Councillor Neden-Watts informed members that she was on the South West region of the RFCC. She said that there were complexities when it came to funding bids/mechanisms and a lack of resources to submit meaningful bids. Councillor Neden-Watts said that representatives from Thames Water did attend the RFCC, and the individuals were honest about the challenges that Thames Water faced. She said that although there were challenges in working with Thames water, there were also positive areas, like the desire to share expertise, biodiversity and natural and economic environments. Councillor Neden-Watts said that they were trying to build on the work of SUDs in school and to use natural flood management. The Chair asked for boroughs to let him know of any concerns before he had a meeting with the Chair of the Thames

RFCC, as he wanted to ensure that all boroughs felt represented.

Claire Bell said that there were ongoing issues with Thames Water. She said that Thames Water had now funded a 2-year post, mainly dealing with drainage. Conversations had also taken place with Thames Water to look at the possibility of making a joint bid in resilience funds. Thames Water was being asked to put money in to help towards SUDs schemes. This would improve accessibility to funding. The Chair said that he would take these issues up with Thames Water. He said that although there were still challenges in working with Thames Water, the relationship was now better than it had been.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Agreed that the boroughs would let the Chair of TEC know of any issues or concerns they wanted raising before he met with the Chair of the Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (RFCC); and
- Noted that the Chair of TEC would take-up borough issues with Thames Water

## **5. Chair's Report**

The Committee received a report that updated members on transport and environment policy since the last TEC meeting on 15 October 2020 and provided a forward look until the next TEC meeting on 25 March 2021.

The Chair informed TEC members that he had introductory meetings with Will Norman, the Walking and Cycling Commissioner and Heidi Alexander, the Deputy Mayor for Transport. More discussions would be taking place early next year on the next tranche of TfL funding (H3) and LIP funding. The Chair said that good progress had been made with regards to the delivery of EV charge points and London Councils had carried out some sterling work on communications. The Chair said that research had been carried out on what Londoners' views were about climate change. There were also blogs and an LGC article and lots of engagement was planned for early next year. The Chair said that a meeting with the Transport Commissioner was taking place on 18 December 2020. He said that Councillor Bell's work on the TfL Board was greatly valued.

Councillor Mitchell said that he looked forward to the Transport Commissioner meeting on 18 December 2020. He said that an update was needed on the conversations with the Mayor about his additional investment into EVs (paragraph 20). The Chair said that this would be picked-up with the Deputy Mayor the following week. Katharina Winbeck said that there was not a great deal to update at the moment. She said that discussions about the New Green Deal were ongoing.

Councillor Field said that this was a useful report. He said that it was important to keep progressing on 20mph speed limits as he did not want this to drop off the agenda. Councillor Abellan said that a very good TEC/LEDNet conference had taken place. He suggested that thoughts be given to reinstating the conferences in the new year. The Chair said that a great deal had taken place to showcase the work carried out by TEC. Katharina Winbeck said that plans were being made to have a joint meeting/conference in April/May 2021, and to also look at getting LEDNet more involved (eg maybe attending a TEC Executive meeting). The Chair reminded TEC about the restrictions of the pre-election period for the Mayoral elections from April to May 2021. [post meeting note, a 'climate roundtable' is being organized for the beginning of March, before the pre-election period.]

Councillor Loakes said that there would be a big focus on the UK in November 2021 as it was hosting the UN Climate Change Conference (COP26). He said that this would be a good opportunity for London Councils to arrange something to showcase in autumn 2021. The Chair said that the world would be looking at the UK then. He said that the Mayor wanted to showcase what London was doing with regards to climate change and this should be factored into TEC planning for next year.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Noted that the Chair would pick-up the discussion around GLA funding with the Deputy Mayor; and
- Noted that the UK was hosting the Climate Change Conference (COP26) in November 2021, and this would be a good opportunity to showcase what London is doing with regards to climate change. Agreed to factor this into TEC planning for next year

## **6. Climate Change Report**

The Committee considered a report that outlined progress of the climate programme in its first year and proposes priorities for work in 2021, with further detail provided on the results of our inaugural polling on Londoners' attitudes to climate change.

Kate Hand, Head of Climate Change, London Councils, introduced the report, which aimed to bring TEC up to date with progress that had happened this year. She said that LB Hackney and LB Tower Hamlets had come forward to be the lead boroughs on the Low Carbon Development work. Kate Hand said that a great deal of the work on climate change had taken place during the pandemic and this was a huge testament to the boroughs and could now be the engine for a green recovery.

Kate Hand said that recent polling that had been conducted on climate change showed strong support across London, and the public believed that everyone was accountable. She said that the climate programme would continue to be supported in 2021, along with the support for a green recovery. Kate Hand said that it would be necessary to present TEC with a report asking for further resources in the new year. The Chair thanked Kate Hand for the huge amount of work that had been carried out on climate change. He said that a strong role was needed for local government, along with the need to take Londoners with us on climate change issues.

Councillor Situ said that a great deal of work had been carried out on this. He felt that the policy and advisory roles were very good. There was also the need for a degree of coordinated asks from the Government, along with a borough communications strategy. Councillor Gander said that she welcomed the collaboration across London on climate change action. She said that there was concern about climate change, the level of funding and access to this funding. Councillor Gander asked whether this was a role for the Mayor's central team.

Councillor Abellan thanked Kate for the report. He said that he thoroughly recommended the climate capability training, which was excellent. Councillor Abellan asked whether the green recovery would be imbedded in the London Recovery Board. He also asked whether any further discussions had taken place with the LGA regarding the Government's ten-point plan. Kate Hand said that the climate capability training was a readily available resource designed to help officers. She said that lobbying for funding was key, along with getting up to speed with what the Government was doing. Kate

Hand informed members that the Recovery Board would co-lead the Green New Deal Mission (the green recovery sat across every mission). She said a lot of this was a complicated process and the GLA would be taking this forward. The Chair said that there was no cross-party consensus for the Blueprint, although there was strong support at an officer level. Individual boroughs were now signing up.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Commented on the progress of the climate programme in its first year and proposed priorities for 2021 (paragraphs 1 – 4); and
- Endorsed the borough lead for #2 Low Carbon Development (paragraph 6).

## **7. Future Mobility Agenda: London E-Scooter Trial & Dockless Parking Byelaw**

The Committee received a report that provided an update to TEC on TfL & London Councils' work on the upcoming multi-borough rental e-scooter trial and the dockless parking byelaw.

Katharina Winbeck introduced the report. She said that the boroughs and TfL were working extensively for the e-scooter trials to take place in London. Safety was the top priority from all parties. Katharina Winbeck informed members that TfL and London Councils had launched a procurement process to select up to three operators for a London e-scooter trial, all of which needed to have strict safety and high operating standards. She said that it was up to the boroughs to decide where e-scooters could park in the trials. It was also entirely up to the individual boroughs to decide on whether they wanted to take part in the trials.

Katharina Winbeck said that "go slow" and no parking areas would have to be designated. The officer working group meetings set-up to discuss the trials would need to carry on convening. Engagement was also taking place with the Royal National Institute for Blind People (RNIB) and the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association, and a full consultation would take place in the new year.

Katharina Winbeck informed members that London Councils was in the process of getting legal advice with regards to the dockless bike byelaw. A more comprehensive update would be given at the next TEC meeting. The Chair said that there should be a separate informal meeting set-up to discuss the multi-rental e-scooter trial in London, as there was not sufficient time to have a full debate on this at this meeting.

Councillor Mitchell said that the priority was to have the dockless bike byelaw in place. Katharina Winbeck confirmed that London Councils was progressing with this. Councillor Khan said that he welcomed the report. He asked whether the organisations that took part in the trial would be responsible about climate change. Katharina Winbeck said that she would follow this up with the procurement team.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Noted that an update regarding the dockless parking byelaw would be presented to the next TEC meeting;
- Agreed to follow-up with the procurement team to ensure that the three operators taking part in the trials acted responsibly with regards to climate change; and
- Agreed to set up an informal meeting with TEC members to discuss the multi-

borough rental e-scooter trial in London.

## **8. Traffic Signals Budget**

The Committee considered a report that set out the forecasted costs to boroughs of maintaining traffic signals in London in 2021/22 and sought agreement to the apportionment of those costs to each authority.

Spencer Palmer, Director of Transport and Mobility, London Councils, said that the report set out the discussions that had taken place with TfL, along with a savings adjustment. Members were also asked to note the error relating to the site locations listed for the City of London, whereby TfL had included duplicate entries for each location. Spencer Palmer said that the budget represented an overall reduction in costs. He said that he was happy to take questions outside of this meeting if there were any that could not be considered today.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Agreed the total cost to boroughs for maintaining traffic signals in London for 2021/22, which is £10,899,655.93 as shown in Appendix 2;
- Agreed that this cost was apportioned between boroughs based on the agreed formula and transition arrangements, as shown in Appendix 5; and
- Noted the error relating to the site locations listed for the City of London, whereby TfL had included duplicate entries for each location.

## **9. London Borough of Bromley Approval to Commence Moving Traffic Enforcement**

The Committee received a report that sought approval for the London Borough of Bromley to commence enforcement of moving traffic contraventions under the London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2003.

Spencer Palmer said that it was the responsibility of TEC to approve borough commencement of moving traffic enforcement. He said that Bromley was now the last borough to seek approval to commence moving traffic enforcement. Councillor Huntington-Thresher thanked TEC officers for producing the report.

**Decision:** The Committee agreed that permission be given to the London Borough of Bromley to enforce moving traffic contraventions using CCTV.

## **10. London Lorry Control Scheme (LLCS) Retender**

The Committee considered a report that requested permission from TEC to either go to market (if necessary) to procure ANPR cameras and/or associated back-office systems for the enforcement of the London Lorry Control Scheme, or to explore camera sharing with other enforcement authorities for the same purposes.

Spencer Palmer informed members that the LLCS was a long-standing scheme that managed the movement of lorries at night and at the weekend in order to limit the level of noise disturbance to residents. London Councils was now exploring a more modern scheme and an ANPR system had now been successfully trialed. Spencer Palmer said that procurement and camera sharing was now being looked at. He said that a further

update on this would be presented to members at a future TEC meeting.

Councillor Zinkin said that it was important when meeting the Transport Commissioner to mention the need to eliminate any obstructions when it came to camera sharing. Spencer Palmer said that London Councils would do all that it could regarding this matter, as it was by far the most favourable way forward. The Chair said that it was important to simplify data sharing (eg by making use of the London Office of Technology and Innovation – LOTI). Councillor Field said that existing cameras should be utilised. He said that not all roads would have cameras. Spencer Palmer said that locations on the TfL road network were of particular interest to London Councils.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Approved the use of ANPR in enforcing the London Lorry Control Scheme;
- Approved London Councils exploring camera sharing with other enforcement authorities (including TfL); and
- Agreed, in principle, to London Councils' going to market for the purchase of ANPR technology, subject to final approval by TEC.

## **11. Taxicard Update**

The Committee received a report that provided members with a progress update on the Taxicard scheme, including analysis of current performance levels. It also provided information on how the pandemic has impacted the taxi industry and the financial situation of the Taxicard scheme.

Stephen Boon, Chief Contracts Officer, London Councils, introduced the report which had already been discussed at the TEC Executive Sub Committee and raised with the Deputy Mayor for Transport. He said that the report gave an update on the scheme management, the collection and delivery service, a performance update and any call center concerns. Stephen Boon said that the report also provided members with predictive spend and the uncertainty on the future of Taxicard funding. He said that the recommendation was to extend the Taxicard collection and delivery service. Stephen Boon confirmed that each borough would have to sign their consent to extend this service.

**Decision:** The Committee agreed to the continuation of the collection and delivery service until 31 March 2021, subject to gaining further signed consent from each borough to do so.

## **12. Concessionary Fares 2021/22 Settlement & Apportionment**

The Committee considered a report that informed members of the outcome of negotiations with transport operators (Transport for London (TfL), the Rail Delivery Group (RDG) and independent bus operators) regarding compensation for carrying concessionary passengers in 2021/22. The report also sought members' approval to the proposed settlement and apportionment of £295.152 million.

The Chair said that the outcome of the concessionary fares settlement represented good news for the boroughs. Stephen Boon confirmed that the outcome of the negotiations with the transport operators represented a reduction of approximately £47 million. He said that the recommendation was to agree the TfL settlement of £275.975 for 2021/22. The payment to the Rail Delivery Group (RDG) had now been confirmed and represented a

reduction of approximately £4 million.

Councillor Zinkin said that accurate estimates were needed next year to help boroughs with their budget setting, and London Councils needed to get this information from TfL in order for boroughs to plan ahead. Stephen Boon said that these figures would be updated regularly and could be circulated to boroughs once the new figures were known.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Agreed the TfL settlement of £275.975 million for 2021/22;
- Agree to the RDG settlement of £16.5591 million for 2021/22;
- Agreed a budget for non-TfL bus services of £1.1 million;
- Agreed the reissue budget for 2021/22 of £1.518 million;
- Agreed the borough payments for 2021/22 of £295.152 million;
- Agreed the payment profile and dates on which boroughs' contributions are paid as 3 June 2021, 2 September 2021, 2 December 2021 and 3 March 2022;
- Agreed the 2021/2022 London Service Permit (LSP) bus operators (non-TfL buses) Concessionary Scheme; and
- Agreed to update the figures on a regular basis and circulate to members, as and when the new figures were known.

### **13. Proposed TEC Revenue Budget & Borough Charges 2021/22**

The Committee received a report that detailed the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2021/22. These proposals were considered by the Executive Sub-Committee at its meeting on 19 November. The Executive Sub-Committee agreed to recommend that the main Committee approves these proposals.

Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, introduced the report. He said that the TEC budget for 2021/22 had produced an exceptional result, including a reduction of £42.788 million from the Freedom Pass settlement. This excellent result was down to the good work of Stephen Boon and his team. Frank Smith said that due scrutiny would be given to the reduction. He informed members that there was only one increase in charges for the Environment and Traffic Adjudicator (ETA) appeals, and this was because of an increase in operating costs. There were no increases to any other charges which was also very good news for the boroughs.

Frank Smith said that one of the key issues was the level of reserves (paragraphs 51 to 56). The level of reserves were in excess of the agreed 15% benchmark (£549,000). This report had already been presented to the TEC Executive for their consideration and had been noted by Leaders' Committee. Councillor Mitchell had also requested an estimate on the costs of TEC special projects and this was included in the second bullet point in paragraph 55 of the report. The Chair thanked Frank Smith and his team for the huge amount of work that had been carried out on the TEC revenue budget and borough charges.

**Decision:** The Committee approved the proposed individual levies and charges for 2021/22 as follows:

- The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL

(2020/21 - £1,500; paragraph 38);

- The Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.3596 per PCN which will be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2019/20 (2020/21 - £0.3708 per PCN; paragraphs 36-37);
- No charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass Administration Charge, which was covered by replacement Freedom Pass income (2020/21 – nil charge; paragraph 15);
- The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,000 in total (2020/21 - £338,000; paragraphs 17-18);
- No charge to boroughs in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which was fully covered by estimated PCN income (2020/21 – nil charge; paragraphs 19-20);
- Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) - charge of £27.84 per appeal or £24.06 per appeal where electronic evidence was provided by the enforcing authority (2020/21 - £27.35/£23.63 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £22.15 for hard copy submissions and £21.40 for electronic submissions (2020/21 - £21.78/£21.04 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 (2020/21 - £12; paragraph 10);
- The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2020/21 - £7.53; paragraphs 29-35);
- The TRACE (Fax/Email) Charge of £7.70 per transaction, which was levied in addition to the electronic charge of £7.53 per transaction, making a total of £15.23 (2020/21 - £15.23; paragraphs 29-35); and
- The TEC Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2020/21 - £0.175; paragraphs 29-35).
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £318.372 million for 2021/22, as detailed in Appendix A;
- Agreed the provisional gross revenue income budget of £317.447 million for 2021/22, with a recommended transfer of £199,000 from Specific reserves for previously agreed priorities, £150,000 from uncommitted reserves to cover a shortfall in replacement freedom pass income due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and £576,000 from uncommitted Committee reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B; and
- Agreed that there be no immediate action on the level of uncommitted reserves in excess of the 15% upper benchmark, as set out in the options in paragraph 56 of the report, but that a rationale be developed for consideration by members to increasing the upper benchmark level for reserves to 20% in the future.

The Committee was also asked to note:

- The indicative total charges to individual boroughs for 2021/22, dependent upon volumes generated through the various parking systems, as set out in Appendix C.1.



**14. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting held on 19 November 2020 (for noting)**

The minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting held on 19 November 2020 were noted.

**15. Minutes of the TEC AGM meeting held on 15 October 2020 (for agreeing)**

The minutes of the TEC AGM meeting held on 15 October 2020 were agreed as an accurate record/

*Members of the press and public were asked to leave this virtual meeting while the exempt part of the agenda was considered.*

**The meeting finished at 16:40pm**