

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

Thursday 9 December 2021 at 2:30pm

Virtual & Informal

Important Note:

Part 5A of the Local Government Act 1972 covers public access to meetings, agendas and reports and applies to London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee as a Joint Committee. Now that the modifications introduced by the Emergency Regulations, made under section 78 of the Coronavirus Act 2020, 2020 Regulations have expired, the legislation prohibits formal meetings taking place virtually. This means that in order to participate in discussions and vote on decisions or recommendations, Members must be present physically at the meeting at which the matter is considered.

However, London Councils' lead Members have agreed that until the legislation is changed or all social distancing restrictions are lifted, formal committee business is to be dealt with by holding an informal virtual meeting in the first instance to ascertain the general view of a committee or sub-committee with a formal decision to be then taken by way of London Council's Urgency Procedure.

Paragraph 19 of London Councils' Standing Orders deals with urgency: If at any time the Acting Director of Transport and Mobility of London Councils considers that any matter is urgent and should be decided on prior to the next meeting of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee (TEC), then he/she shall consult the Elected Officers of the Transport and Environment Committee. If at least two of the Elected Officers of the Transport and Environment Committee, of whom one will be the Chairman, if available, and the other will be from another political party or no party, agree that the matter is urgent and agree on the Acting Director of Transport and Mobility's recommendation, then the decision shall be taken by the Acting Director of Transport and Mobility in accordance with such recommendation, subject to the decision being recorded in writing and signed by the Elected Officers of the Transport and Environment Committee agreeing the recommendation and the Acting Director of Transport & Mobility.

This means that the Acting Director of Transport and Mobility will take all formal decisions in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chairs shortly after the virtual committee meeting and informed by any comments and discussion at the meeting. No formal decisions will be taken at the meeting itself. The virtual meetings will continue to be public meetings, broadcasted live via the London Councils' website.

Labour Group: Virtual at 1.30pm

Conservative Group: Virtual at 1.45pm

Liberal Democrat Group: Virtual at 1.30pm

Contact Officer: Alan Edwards

Telephone: 020 7934 9911
Email: alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Part One: Items of Business

1	Apologies for Absence and Announcement of Deputies	-
2	Declarations of Interests*	
3	Re-Appointment of Parking & Traffic Adjudicator	
4	Proposed TEC Revenue Budget & Borough Charges 2021/22	
5	Concessionary Fares 2022/23 Apportionment & Settlement	
6	TfL Finance – Presentation by Patrick Doig, TfL	
7	Flooding Partnerships Update – by Samuel Nicholson, Principal Officer, Flood Risk, Environment Agency (EA)	
8	Chair’s Report	
9	Transport Funding Sub-Group – Membership & Terms of Reference	
10	Climate Change Strategy	
11	Traffic Signals Maintenance Budget 2022/23	
12	Items Considered under the TEC Urgency Procedure	
13	Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 17 November 2021 (for noting)	
14	Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 14 October 2021	

Declarations of Interest

* 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

London Councils

Tel: 020 7934 9911

Email: alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

TEC Declarations of Interest as at 9 December 2021

Freedom Pass Holders/60+ Oyster Cards/Taxicard

Cllr Peter Zinkin (LB Barnet), Cllr Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham),

North London Waste Authority

Cllr Peter Zinkin (LB Barnet), Cllr Adam Harrison (LB Camden), Cllr Mike Hakata (LB Haringey), and Cllr Rowena Champion (LB Islington).

Western Riverside Waste Authority

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

East London Waste Authority

Cllr Syed Ghani (LB Barking & Dagenham), Cllr Osman Dervish (LB Havering), Cllr James Asser (LB Newham), and Cllr Jo Blackman (LB Redbridge).

West London Waste Authority

Cllr Krupa Sheth (LB Brent)
Cllr Deidre Costigan (LB Ealing)

South London Waste Partnership

Cllr Manual Abellan (LB Sutton).

London Energy Ltd (Non-Executive Directors)

Cllr Peter Zinkin (LB Barnet)
Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Waltham Forest)

London Waste & Recycling Board (LWARB)

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

London City Airport Consultative Committee (LCACC)

Cllr James Asser (LB Newham)

Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (RFCC)

Cllr Syed Ghani (LB Barking & Dagenham), Cllr Peter Zinkin (LB Barnet), Cllr Johnny Thalassites (RB Kensington & Chelsea), and Cllr James Asser (LB Newham),

London Cycling Campaign

Cllr Rowena Champion (LB Islington).

London Road Safety Council (LRSC)

Cllr Krupa Sheth (LB Brent), Cllr Ian Barnes (LB Enfield), and Cllr Rowena Champion (LB Islington)

Trustee Wandle Valley Regional Park

Cllr Sarah McDermott (LB Wandsworth)

LGA Board Member of Environment, Economy, Housing and Transport Board

Mayor Phil Glanville (LB Hackney)

British Cycling

Mayor Phil Glanville (LB Hackney)

Member of SERA

Mayor Phil Glanville (LB Hackney)
Cllr Jo Blackman (LB Redbridge)

Labour Cycles & CCIC Board

Mayor Phil Glanville (LB Hackney)

London Sustainable Development Commission

Cllr Rowena Champion (LB Islington)

Transport and Environment Committee

Re-appointment of Environment & Traffic Adjudicators

Item
No: 03

Report by: Caroline Hamilton

Job title: Chief adjudicator ETA

Date: 9th December 2021
Contact

Officer: Caroline Hamilton

Telephone: 0207 520 7200 **Email:** Properofficer@londontribunals.gov.uk

Summary

This report proposes the re-appointment of one environment and traffic adjudicator under the terms of the Traffic Management Act 2004.

Recommendation

That adjudicator Ms Belinda Pearce is re-appointed for a period of 5 years from 6th December 2021.

Background

1. Under section 81 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the accompanying regulations, adjudicators are appointed for a term not exceeding five years, remaining eligible for re-appointment on expiry of that term.

An adjudicator may be removed from office only for misconduct or on the ground that that he is unable or unfit to discharge his function, but otherwise holds and vacates office in accordance with the terms of appointment.

The regulations provide that the relevant enforcement authorities shall appoint such number of adjudicators for the purpose of the 2004 Act on such terms as they may decide. Any decision by the authorities not to re-appoint shall not have effect without the consent of the Lord Chancellor and of the Lord Chief Justice.

Under the terms and conditions of appointment issued by the Committee, there are five grounds for non-renewal:

1. Misconduct.
2. being unable or unfit to discharge the function of an adjudicator.
3. Persistent failure to comply with the sitting commitment (without good reason).
4. Failure to comply with training requirements.
5. Part of a reduction in numbers because of changes in operational requirements.

A decision not to renew on ground 5 and the extent to which it will be used is taken after consultation with the Chief Adjudicator with the concurrence of the Lord Chief Justice.

2. Financial Implications

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

3. Legal Implications

There are no legal implications for London Councils.

4. Equalities Implications

There are no equalities implications from this report.

5. Recommendation

That adjudicator Ms Pearce is re-appointed to 6th December 2026.

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

Proposed Revenue Budget and Borough Charges 2022/23

Item
No: 04

Report by:	David Sanni	Job title:	Acting Director of Corporate Resources
Date:	9 December 2021		
Contact Officer:	David Sanni		
Telephone:	020 7934 9704	Email:	David.sanni@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary

This report details the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2022/23.

These proposals were considered by the Executive Sub-Committee at its meeting on 17 November. The Executive Sub-Committee agreed to recommend that the main Committee approves these proposals.

Recommendations

Members of this Committee are asked to note and discuss the recommendations set out in this report. All decisions will be made following the meeting under the Committee's urgency procedure:

- The proposed individual levies and charges for 2022/23 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 £0.3751 per PCN which will be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2020/21 (2021/22 - £0.3596 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 (2021/22 – nil charge; paragraph 15);
 - The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,000 in total (2021/22 - £338,000; paragraphs 17-18).

- No charge to boroughs in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which is fully covered by estimated PCN income (2021/22 – nil charge; paragraphs 19-20);
- Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) - charge of £29.36 per appeal or £25.55 per appeal where electronic evidence is provided by the enforcing authority (2021/22 - £27.84/£24.06 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £23.64 for hard copy submissions and £22.88 for electronic submissions (2021/22 - £22.15/£21.40 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 (2021/22 - £12; paragraph 10);
- The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2021/22 - £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 (2021/22 - £15.23; paragraphs 29-35);
- The TEC¹ Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2021/22 - £0.175; paragraphs 29-35).
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £238.371 million for 2022/23, as detailed in Appendix A;
- On the basis of the agreement of all the above proposed charges as outlined in this report, the provisional gross revenue income budget of £237.215 million for 2022/23, with a recommended transfer of £275,000 from specific reserves for previously agreed priorities, £160,000 from uncommitted reserves to fund a new programme director to support boroughs on climate change and £721,000 from uncommitted Committee reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B; and
- To consider the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 52-56 and Table 8 of this report.

The Committee is also asked to note:

- the indicative total charges to individual boroughs for 2022/23, dependent upon volumes generated through the various parking systems, as set out in Appendix C.1.

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

Introduction

1. This report details the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2022/23. These proposals were considered by the TEC Executive Sub-Committee at its meeting on 17 November. The TEC Executive Sub-Committee agreed to recommend that the main Committee approves these proposals.
2. The report will, therefore, examine the key features of the proposed budget for 2022/23 and make proposals as to the level of charges for the Committee's consideration. It sets out the investment made by Boroughs to benefit London's residents, including significant economic benefits to eligible older and disabled people by meeting the cost of their use of local bus and other transport services, along with a contribution toward environmental priorities such as climate change.

Budgetary pressures

3. There are several significant budgetary pressures that will impact on the revenue budget for 2022/23. These are:
 - An estimated amount of £48,000 due to 2% pay award, subject to negotiations, from April 2022;
 - An estimated increase of £19,000 in employers national insurance contributions 1.25% for 2022/23;
 - Further inflationary increases on contract commitments for 2022/23; and
 - Several staff positions within London Councils working on TEC related activities are directly funded by TfL. There is therefore, a financial and operational risk that this support may be reduced due to financial pressures experienced by TfL, should further funding settlements not be agreed with central government.

Proposed Revenue Budget 2020/21 – Provisional Overview

4. As well as having to accommodate the effect of the budgetary pressures outlined in paragraph 3, the budget proposals in this report incorporate the following assumptions, leading to the following levels of subscriptions, charges and specific budget totals being recommended to the Committee for consideration:

- A provisional reduction in the TfL element of the Freedom Pass settlement for 2021/22 of £78.625 million, or 28%. This significant reduction reflects assumptions made around the continuing impact of the Covid-19 on trip levels (paragraph 6);
- A provisional decrease in the Rail Delivery Group element of the freedom pass settlement of £9.011 million, which equates to 54%. (paragraph 7);
- Maintain the reduced budget for payments to other bus operators for local journeys originating in London, following projections for 2022/23, based on current claim trends being lodged by operators and the ongoing impact of Covid-19 on trip levels. (paragraph 8);
- No change in the annual Freedom Pass survey and reissue costs budget to remain at the current year's level of £1.518 million, which will include the cost of the annual pass eligibility review that yields significant cost savings for boroughs (paragraph 9);
- No change in the unit cost of a replacement Freedom Pass of £12; however, the income budget of has been increased by £150,000 to £750,000 in 2022/23, which is in line with pre pandemic budget. This reflects the current year recovery of this income budget during 2021/22 (paragraph 10);
- A continued nil charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass administration fee, which remains fully funded by income receipts

from replacing Freedom Passes that are lost or damaged (paragraph 15);

- A reduction £947,000 in the TfL and borough contributions to the taxicard scheme budget to £8.850 million and £650,000 respectively compared to the current revised budget, which will be subject to confirmation by all parties in early 2022. The indicative budgetary provision for the taxicard trips contract with ComCab (London), will, therefore, be an amalgam of the TfL and borough funding, currently equating to £9.5 million for 2022/23 (paragraph 16);
- The total Taxicard administration charge of £338,000 being held at the current year's level, requiring a subsidy from TEC reserves of £150,000, which will be apportioned to boroughs in accordance with the total active scheme membership as at 30 September 2021. (paragraphs 17-18);
- A continued nil charge to boroughs in respect of the London Lorry Control scheme, which remains fully financed from PCN income receipts. The income budget for such receipts is being maintained at £1 million for 2022/23, based on actual and forecast outturn receipts over recent financial years. A sum of £50,000 will remain in the budget to fund further work on the development of the Lorry Control scheme during 2022/23, in order to continue to implement the outcome of the scheme review (paragraphs 19-20);
- The indicative hard copy unit ETA appeal cost for 2022/23 is £29.36, an increase of £1.52 or 5.47% on the charge of £27.84 for 2021/22. For appeals where electronic evidence is provided by an enforcing authority, the unit cost will increase by £1.50 or 6.22% to £25.55. Users will continue to pay a differential charge for the processing of ETA statutory declarations. For hard copy statutory declarations, the proposed unit charge will be £23.64 compared to the charge of £22.15 for the current year, which represents an

increase of £1.48, or 6.7%. For electronic statutory declarations, the proposed unit charge will be £22.88, an increase of £1.48, or 6.9% on the electronic appeal unit charge for the current year of £21.40 (paragraphs 26-27);

- A continuation of the current agreement for TfL/GLA to reimburse London Councils on an actual cost-recovery basis for the variable cost of RUCA appeals which include the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) scheme, rather than on a unit cost basis. Continuation of this agreement will ensure that a breakeven position continues in respect of these transactions. (paragraph 28);
- A nil increase in the charges to boroughs for TEC and TRACE electronic transactions and the continued phasing out of TRACE fax and email transactions for purposes other than disaster recovery². (paragraphs 29-35)
- An increase in the Parking Enforcement service charge of £0.0155 per PCN, or 4%, which will be apportioned to boroughs and TfL in accordance with the total number of PCNs issued by enforcing authorities in 2020/21 (paragraphs 36-37);
- The Parking Core administration charge being held at the 2021/22 level of £1,500 (paragraph 38);
- A call on Specific reserves of £275,000 to cover the costs of work associated with Environmental Initiatives, previously agreed by Members, along with a reduction of £5,000 to £721,000 in the recommended transfer from uncommitted reserves required to deliver a balanced budget for 2022/23. A new programme director post to co-ordinate and support work with member boroughs on the delivery of the seven programmes on climate change and other initiatives in this area

² London Councils will continue to accept TRACE email and fax during the 2022/23 financial year, but notices sent in this way will continue to be charged the fax / email rate in addition to the electronic rate, as this method causes significant additional resources for London Councils and its contractor.

has been built into the budget and if agreed by members this will be funded from uncommitted TEC Reserves at a cost of £160,000 (paragraph 49);

- An estimated 2% cost of living increase on all officer salary costs to reflect the potential pay award, A provision of 3% (3% for 2021/22) is also required to cover the employers' pension contributions for adjudicators who have been automatically enrolled into a pension scheme and have elected to remain within the scheme. The overall staffing budget continues to include a £30,000 provision for maternity cover and the vacancy level remains at 2%; and
 - An estimated 2% inflationary increase on contracts, but all other running cost budgets for 2022/23 to be held at the 2021/22 level.
5. The following paragraphs detail the main proposed budget headings for 2022/23 and highlight any significant changes over 2021/22. The proposed level of expenditure for 2022/23 amounts to £230.729 million. A sum of £215.498 million relates to direct expenditure on the transport operators providing the Freedom Pass and the Taxicard schemes, leaving £15.231 million relating to expenditure on parking and traffic related traded service and other operating expenditure. This compares to a sum of £14.874 million for the current year, an increase of £357,000, or 2.4%, much of which is matched by additional income.

Freedom Pass

6. The provisional main settlement with TfL for concessionary travel on its service is estimated to be £197.350 million, representing a provisional reduction of £78.625 million, or 28%, on the figure of £275.975 million for 2021/22. The reduction is significant and represents estimates considering the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic. This reduction is provisional and officers continue to negotiate with TfL on the final settlement figure.

7. The Rail Delivery Group (RDG) settlement is still being negotiated.
Estimates are for a reduction of costs of £9.011 million, reducing this element to £7.548 million compared to the current budget of £16.559 million. However, this is subject to confirmation by the RDG and DfT.
8. The budget for payments to other bus operators for local journeys originating in London has been maintained at £1.1 million, following projections for 2022/23, based on the 2020/21 outturn position and the current year to date.
9. The budget for the freedom pass issuing costs was £1.518 million for 2021/22. For 2022/23, it is proposed that the budget remains at this level, which will include the cost of an annual pass eligibility review that yields significant cost savings to boroughs.
10. For income in respect of replacement Freedom Passes, current trends indicate that income is forecasted to recover to pre-lockdown levels. The 2022/23 income budget has therefore been increased to £750,000 and there is no proposed change to the unit cost of £12 for a replacement pass. As stated in paragraph 4 and detailed in paragraph 15 below, it is proposed that the in-house cost of administering the Freedom Pass scheme will be fully funded by this income stream and uncommitted reserves in 2022/23.
11. As agreed by this Committee in December 2014, any annual surplus arising from both the freedom pass issuing costs budget of £1.518 million (paragraph 9 above) and replacement Freedom Passes income budget of £750,000 (paragraph 10 above) will be transferred to a specific reserve to accumulate funds to offset the cost of future major pass renewal exercises. The current projected balance on this element of the specific reserve is £987,000, as highlighted in paragraph 51.
12. Final negotiations on the actual amounts payable to operators will be completed in time for the meetings of the Leaders' Committee on 7

December and the main TEC Committee on 9 December; any late variations to these provisional figures will be shared at these meetings.

13. A summary of the provisional freedom pass costs for 2022/23, compared to the actual costs for the current year, are summarised in Table 1 below:

Table 1 – Comparative cost of Freedom Pass 2022/23 and 2021/22

Estimated Cost of Freedom Pass	2022/23(£000)	2021/22(£000)
TfL Settlement	197,350	275,975
RDG Settlement	7,548	16,559
Non TfL Bus Operators Settlement	1,100	1,100
Support services and issue costs	1,518	1,518
Total Cost	207,516	295,152

14. The total cost of the scheme is fully funded by boroughs and the estimated cost payable by boroughs in 2022/23 is £207.516 million, compared to £295.152 million payable for 2021/22. This represents a reduction of £87.6 million or 29.7% which reflects significant reductions in anticipated usage of the schemes due to the ongoing impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. The majority of costs payable by boroughs will be apportioned in line with usage data, in accordance with the agreed recommendations of the arbitrator in 2008.

15. The administration of the freedom pass covers London Councils in-house costs in negotiating the annual settlements and managing the relationships with transport operators and contractors. For 2022/23, the total cost is estimated to be £521,000 which is consistent with 2021/22 costs of £520,000. This equates to £15,775 per borough. However, it is proposed to continue to use income accruing from the replacement of lost and damaged Freedom Passes (refer paragraph 10) to continue to levy a nil charge in 2022/23, which members are asked to recommend to the main Committee. This position will be reviewed annually to ensure forecast income streams continue to cover the in-house costs of administering the scheme.

Taxicard Scheme

16. As stated in paragraph 4, it is assumed that TfL will provide an estimated fixed contribution of £8.850 million, a £9,000 reduction from 2021/22. The total borough contribution towards the Taxicard scheme in 2022/23 is estimated to be £650,000, a reduction of £938,000 from the current year, although the decision on boroughs' contributions is a matter for boroughs to take individually and will be confirmed in February 2022. The indicative budgetary provision for the taxicard trips contract with ComCab (London), will, therefore, be an amalgam of the TfL and borough funding, currently equating to £9.500 million for 2022/23. However, several factors such as usage of the scheme particularly considering the ongoing impact of Covid-19 could influence the final outturn position for 2022/23.
17. The gross cost of administration of the Taxicard Scheme is estimated to be £630,000 in 2022/23 compared to £599,000 in 2021/22. After excluding an estimated separate contribution from TfL towards these administrative costs of £124,000 and anticipated income of £18,000 from charging for replacement taxi cards, the net cost chargeable to boroughs in 2022/23 is £488,000. However, it is proposed to continue to use uncommitted general reserves held by the Committee of £150,000 to hold the total charge to boroughs at the 2022/23 level of £338,000.
18. The active Taxicard total membership as at 30 September 2021 is 57,426, compared to 58,534 as at 30 September 2020, a marginal decrease of 1,108, or 1.9% which reflects the continuing impact of Covid-19. The decrease in the spreading base and the recommended use of reserves of £150,000 has increased the underlying subsidised unit cost of a scheme member from £5.78 to £5.89 per member.

London Lorry Control Scheme

19. The total charge is calculated in the same manner as the Freedom Pass and taxicard administration charge, although it is apportioned to boroughs in accordance with the ONS mid-year population figures for, in the case of 2021/22, June 2020. The total cost of administering the scheme is estimated to be £767,635 in 2022/23, compared to £769,704 in 2021/22.

This figure includes a sum of £50,000 that has been retained in anticipation of further development of the scheme in 2022/23.

20. After consideration of projected income of £1 million from the enforcement of the scheme, it is proposed that there will be no borough or TfL contribution in 2022/23, as for the current year. Again, this position will be reviewed annually to ensure forecast income streams continue to cover the costs of administering the scheme.

Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) Fees

21. The budget for adjudicators' fees and training will be maintained at the 2021/22 rates in line with the recommendation of the Senior Salaries Review Board to freeze pay. This mechanism, which was agreed by TEC in November 2001, keeps the Adjudicators' pay at 80% of that for Group 7 full-time judicial appointments outside London. However, a 1.25% National Insurance Contribution rate increase has been included, which increases the hourly rate by £0.53 from £67.18 to £67.71. All adjudicators have been entitled to be provided with a workplace pension scheme from August 2017. The employers' contribution to the scheme offered to the adjudicators will be 3% in 2022/23 which is no change to 2021/22. Current analysis indicates that 80% of ETA adjudicators are eligible to remain in the scheme under current earnings eligibility rules and this is included in the hourly rate of £67.71.
22. The estimated volume of Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) appeals for 2022/23, based on indicative volumes to date in 2021/22, is 48,820, compared to the budgeted figure of 43,995 for the current year. The actual number of appeals represented by corresponding financial transactions posted in the accounts in 2020/21 was 39,076 including Statutory Declarations, Moving Traffic Offences and Lorry Control Appeals, however, this was significantly impacted upon by the national lockdown and ETA appeals have now steadily increased.

23. The average throughput of appeals to date for the current year is 3.53 appeals heard per hour, compared to 3.79 appeals per hour when the current year budget was set in December 2020. This average figure takes account of all adjudicator time spent on postal and personal appeal hearing and also non-appeal 'duty adjudicator' activities. The slight decrease in throughput is attributable to several reasons including the impact that Covid-19 has had on working arrangements. Based on this forecast figure including an increase in the number of appeals and allowing for increased to National Insurance the ETA adjudicator fees base budget of £780,000 has, therefore, been increased to £937,000 for 2022/23.

Road User Charging Adjudicators (RUCA) Fees

24. For RUCA Appeals, the estimated volume of appeals for 2022/23, based on 2021/22 actual volumes to date and taking in to account the expansion to the scheme from 25 October 2021 is 24,244, compared to 19,478 for the current year. Under the terms of the contract, TfL/GLA will reimburse London Councils on a cost-recovery basis for the variable cost of RUCA appeals, ensuring that a break-even position continues in respect of these variable transactions.

25. Based on the estimate level of appeals and anticipated increase in hourly rates the budget for RUCA adjudicators' fees has been increased by £385,000 to £917,000 which reflects the associated costs forecasted as a result of the scheme expansion. The Committee will be fully reimbursed at cost by the GLA/TfL for the hearing of RUCA/ULEZ appeals under the current contract arrangements, subject to the potential risk highlighted in the paragraph 3 surrounding TfL funding.

Appeals Unit Charges 2022/23

26. The estimated overall cost for hearing appeals for 2022/23 is laid out in Table 2 below:

Table 2 – Proposed Unit Cost for Appeals 2022/23

	ETA	RUCA	Total
--	------------	-------------	--------------

Estimated Appeal Nos.	48,820 (67%)	24,244 (33%)	73,064 (100%)
Average Case per hour	3.53	1.79	
Adjudicator Hours	13,830	13,544	27,374
Expenditure			
Adjudicators Fees	937,224	917,350	1,854,574
Northgate Variable Cost	310,757	139,950	450,707
Total	1,247,981	1,057,300	2,305,281
Income			
Hearing Fees	1,247,981	1,057,300	2,305,281
Average Indicative Unit Cost of Appeal	25.56	43.61	31.55

27. For ETA appeals, based on an estimated 48,820 appeals and a projected throughput rate of 3.53 cases being heard per hour during 2022/23, it is proposed that the indicative hard copy unit ETA appeal cost for 2022/23 is £29.36, an increase of £1.52 or 5.47% on the charge of £27.84 for 2021/22. For appeals where electronic evidence is provided by an enforcing authority, it is proposed that the unit cost will increase by £1.50 or 6.22% to £25.55. The lower charge to boroughs recognises the reduced charge from London Councils contractor for processing electronic appeals, demonstrating that there remains a clear financial incentive for boroughs to move towards submitting electronic evidence under the current contract arrangements. boroughs will pay a differential charge for the processing of ETA statutory declarations. For hard copy statutory declarations, the proposed unit charge will be £23.64 compared to the charge of £22.15 for the current year, which represents an increase of £1.49, or 6.7%. For electronic statutory declarations, the proposed unit charge will be £22.88, an increase of £1.48, or 6.9% on the electronic appeal unit charge of £21.40 for the current year. The Executive Sub-Committee is asked, therefore, to recommend that the main Committee approve these appeal charges to users for 2022/23.

28. London Councils is contracted to provide the RUCA appeals service until January 2022 (TfL can extend this arrangement by two further years and London Councils is currently in negotiations to do so) under the current contract arrangements effective from 1 January 2017. Under the terms of the contract, TfL/GLA will reimburse London Councils on a cost-recovery basis for the variable cost of RUCA appeals, ensuring that a break-even

position continues in respect of these variable transactions. The rechargeable level of fixed costs associated with this contract is £1.188 million for 2022/23; a significant increase of £352,000 on the 2021/22 budgeted level of £836,000 (subject to agreement by TfL), which reflects the associated costs forecasted as a result of the scheme expansion (paragraph 24).

Parking Managed Services – Other Variable Charges to Users

29. These variable charges form part of the parking managed service contract provided by Northgate, the volumes of which the Committee has no control. The individual boroughs are responsible for using such facilities and the volumes should not, therefore, be viewed as service growth. The volumes are based on those currently being processed by the contractor and are recharged to the boroughs, TfL and the GLA as part of the unit cost charge. Trends suggest that transaction volumes appear to be reducing for the use of the TRACE electronic systems but are increasing for the use of the TEC system. TRACE electronic transactions are projected to decrease and TRACE Fax transactions will be consistent with the current year budget figures set in December 2020. The estimated effect on expenditure trends are illustrated in Table 3 below:

Table 3 – Estimated expenditure on variable parking services 2022/23 and 2021/22

2022/23	Estimated Volumes (Nos)	Contractor Charge (£)	Expenditure Budget (£)
TRACE (Electronic)	33,636	1.851/1.888	63,205
TRACE (Fax Transaction)	3,745	4.047/4.157	15,477
TEC	1,267,202	0.0977/0.0997	125,738
Total			204,419
2021/22	Estimated Volumes (Nos)	Contractor Charge (£)	Expenditure Budget (£)
TRACE (Electronic)	45,187	1.838/1.871	84,176
TRACE (Fax Transaction)	3,755	4.047/4.128	15,460
TEC	1,126,413	0.097/0.099	110,934
Total			210,570

30. The estimated decrease in expenditure between 2021/22 and 2022/23 based on the actual transaction volumes and estimated movement in contract prices is £6,151.

31. The corresponding estimated effect on income trends are illustrated in Table 4 below:

Table 4 – Estimated income accruing from variable parking services 2022/23 and 2021/22

2022/23	Estimated Volumes (Nos)	Proposed Unit Charge (£)	Income Budget (£)
TRACE (Electronic)	33,636	7.53	253,279
TRACE (Fax Transaction)	3,744.50	7.70	28,833
TEC	1,267,202	0.175	221,760
Total			503,872
2021/22	Estimated Volumes (Nos)	Proposed Unit Charge (£)	Income Budget (£)
TRACE (Electronic)	45,187	7.53	340,258
TRACE (Fax Transaction)	3,755	7.70	28,914
TEC	1,126,413	0.175	197,122
Total			566,294

32. The estimated effect on income, between 2021/22 and 2022/23, based on the actual transaction volumes in the first 6 months of the current year and a zero increase in charges to users, is a decrease of £62,422. As stated above, however, there is a marginal decrease in expenditure. The net overall decrease in budgeted income is £56,271. The charging structure historically approved by TEC for the provision of the variable parking services (excluding appeals) includes a marginal profit element in each of the charges made to boroughs and other users for these services. However, based on current volumes, it is proposed that there should be no increase in the three charges to boroughs for 2022/23.

33. Members will recall that the measures were approved by TEC from 2018/19 to begin the phasing out of TRACE fax and email service as a default means for enforcement authorities to notify the service of vehicles that have been moved.
34. In order to encourage enforcement authorities to use the electronic notification systems by default and thereby reduce processing time, all TRACE fax and email notifications were, therefore, charged at the electronic rate (£7.53) plus the fax/email rate (£7.70) making a total of £15.23 per transaction and the dual charging mechanism is recommended for continuation for 2022/23.
35. The Committee is asked, therefore, to approve via urgency procedure the following non-appeal charges to users for 2022/23:
- The TRACE (Electronic) charge of £7.53 per transaction, no change on the current year;
 - The TRACE (Fax/email) Charge of £7.70 per transaction, in addition to the electronic charge of £7.53 per transaction, making a total of £15.23, no change on the current year;
 - The TEC charge of £0.175 per transaction, no change on the current year.

Parking Enforcement Service Charge

36. The majority of this charge is made up of the fixed cost element of the parking managed service contract provided by Northgate and the provision of accommodation and administrative support to the appeals hearing centre. The total fixed cost is allocated to users in accordance with the number of PCNs issued, which for 2021/22 will be the 5,289,447 PCNs issued by enforcing authorities during 2020/21, which is detailed in Appendix D. For 2022/23, expenditure of £3.172 million needs to be recouped, compared to £3.060 million for 2021/22, with the increase relating to cost associated with the extension of the ULEZ scheme. This is detailed in Table 5 below:

Table 5 – Breakdown of Parking Enforcement Charge 2022/23

	2022/23 (£000)	2021/22 (£000)
Fixed Contract Costs	1,295	1,308
Hearing Centre Premises Costs	621	621
Direct Staffing Costs	637	599
General Office Expenditure	46	46
Central Recharges	573	486
Total	3,172	3,060

37. After top-slicing the amount for the estimated fixed costs of £1.188 million attributable to the contract with the GLA/TfL in respect of road user charging appeals (RUCA) and ULEZ, a total of £1.984 million remains to be apportioned through the 5.289 million PCN's issued by boroughs and TfL in 2020/21 in respect of parking, bus lane and moving traffic offences, compared to 6.187 million issued in 2019/20. The reduction in the number of PCNs issued over the two comparative years reduces the cost spreading base, which leads to a marginal increase in the actual unit charge to boroughs and TfL of £0.016 per PCN, or 4%, from £0.3596 to £0.3751 per PCN for 2022/23. In addition, under the terms of the contract with Northgate, there is a separate fixed cost identified in respect of the borough use of the TRACE and TEC systems. For 2020/21, this sum was £97,000 and is estimated to increase to £98,000 in 2022/23. This sum will be apportioned to boroughs in accordance with volumes of transaction generated on each system by users.

Parking Core Administration Charge

38. The core subscription covers a proportion of the cost of the central management and policy work of the Committee and its related staff, accommodation, contract monitoring and other general expenses. It is charged to boroughs and TfL at a uniform rate, which for 2021/22 was £1,500 per borough. As there is limited scope for additional savings or efficiencies to be identified from within the £51,000 this levy raises for the Committee, it is recommended that this charge be held at the current level of £1,500 per borough and TfL for 2022/23.

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

39. Expenditure in respect of the registration of debt related to parking penalties is directly recouped from the registering borough, so the transactions have a neutral effect on the financial position of the Committee. The Court Service last increased the £8 unit fee to £9 in October 2021, although no further increases are envisaged during 2022/23. Volumes generated by users registered parking debt is expected to be maintained at £4 million for the current year, so it is, therefore, proposed keep both the income and expenditure budgets for 2022/23 at £4 million.

Estimated individual borough costs for 2022/23 covering the proposed charges highlighted in paragraphs 15-39 above, are detailed in Appendix C.1 and can be compared against the estimated charges for the current year at Appendix C.2, forecast at the budget setting stage for the current year 12 months ago.

Contractual Commitments

40. **Staffing Costs** -The proposed staffing budget for TEC for 2022/23 is illustrated in Table 6 below:

Table 6– TEC Indicative Staffing Budget 2022/23	£000
2021/22 Revised Budget	2,424
Addition Environmental Officer covered by reserves/TfL	-
0.25% reduction to 2021/22 estimated pay award	(6)
Increase to Employers NI	19
2% pay award 2022/23	48
Incremental salary drift/other adjustments	(20)
2022/23 Base Budget	2,465
Split between:	
Services - Parking and Traffic	112
Services - ETA	360
Services - RUCA	277
Services - Transport and Mobility	855
PAPA - Policy	460
PAPA - Communications	273
Chief Executive - Committee Servicing	62
Chief Executive - DP/FOI work	66
2021/22 Base Budget	2,465

41. In line with other London Councils funding streams, the vacancy level for 2022/23 remains at 2%. The salary figures include an estimated 2% cost of living increase on all costs for 2022/23 along with an increase on the Employers Pension NI rate payable from 13.8% to 15.05%. In addition to the salaries figure of £2.465 million shown in Table 6, the £19,000 budgetary provision for member's allowances has been maintained at the 2021/22 level, as has the provision for maternity cover of £30,000.

42. Accommodation Costs – Chancery Exchange – The appeals hearing centre at Chancery Exchange, EC4 has been operational since July 2015. The budget for 2021/22 of £500,097 includes the full year cost of the leasehold agreement plus other premises running costs. In addition, a budget for depreciation in respect of the refurbishment costs of Chancery Exchange of £103,502 is required, along with the continuation of a provision for potential redecoration, dilapidation and reinstatement costs payable at the end of the Chancery Exchange lease of £18,195 per annum. The total Hearing Centre premises costs are therefore £621,793. These costs are fully recovered as part of the Parking Enforcement service charge (refer paragraphs 36-37).

43. Accommodation Costs - Southwark Street – These are included as part of central recharges cost. These costs are spread based on number of FTE's directly chargeable to the TEC funding stream. The recharges in respect of the Southwark Street accommodation forms part of the administration charge for the direct services– for the freedom pass, taxicard, health emergency badge and the London lorry control scheme, as detailed in paragraphs 6-20 of this report.

Discretionary Expenditure

44. Research Budget – It is recommended that the budget for 2022/23 is maintained at the current year's level of £40,000.

45. General/Office Costs - The budgetary provision of £492,000 for 2022/23 is broken down in Table 7 below:

Table 7 – TEC General/Office costs budget 2020/21	£000
2021/22 Revised Budget	474
General/office costs inflation	18
2022/23 Base Budget	492
Split between:	
System Developments	100
General/Office costs – postage, telephones, copiers, etc.	167
Appeals related legal costs	26
External audit fees*	28
City of London finance, legal, HR and IT SLA*	171
2021/22 Base Budget	492

*forms part of central recharge costs

46. The increase primarily relates to a slight increase in general office running and IT SLA costs.

47. Inflation of 2% has been allowed for 2022/23 on some elements of general running costs, except where there are contractual commitments. This factor has been applied to all London Councils budgets.

Central Recharges

48. Southwark Street accommodation costs (paragraph 43), the Parking Enforcement Charge (paragraph 36) and general office costs (paragraph 45) all contain significant element of central recharge costs, which are apportioned to all London Councils functions in accordance with a financial model that is subject to annual review by London Councils external auditors. The premises costs of the hearing centre are split between the ETA and RUCA functions, as detailed in paragraphs 36-37. Of the total central costs to be apportioned to TEC in 2021/22 (excluding LEPT) of £1,614,112, a sum of £1,077,709 feeds into the recharges for the direct services administration charges based at Southwark Street and for the ETA and RUCA services at the appeals hearing centre. The residual £536,403 relates to the TEC policy, communication and administrative functions based at Southwark Street. A further sum of £621,793 relates to the premises costs at Chancery Exchange.

Transfer from Reserves

49. As detailed in paragraph 52 below, it is proposed that this Committee approve the transfer of a sum of £721,000 from uncommitted general reserves to cover direct service costs and balance the budget to smooth the effect of the underlying increase to direct service costs. This is a decrease of £5,000 on the £726,000 approved transfer for the current year, although 2021/22 includes a £150,000 allowance to cover reductions in replacement freedom pass income. With regards to the Taxicard Scheme, the recommended use of a sum of £150,000 will increase the underlying subsidised unit cost of a scheme member from £5.78 to £5.89 per member. The boroughs will pay no more in 2022/23 than the £338,000 paid towards administering the Taxicard Scheme in the current year, as detailed in paragraphs 17-18 above. Should members agree, a further use of £160,000 from uncommitted reserves will be used to fund a new programme director to support boroughs on climate change.

Other Income

50. **Miscellaneous Income** – It is estimated that income of £74,000 will continue to accrue from two main sources in 2020/21. Firstly, £43,000 is expected to accrue for the administration of the Health Emergency badge (HEB) in the form of registration fees and charges for badges to medical professionals. This will enable this service to be provided at no cost to boroughs. Secondly, £31,000 is expected to accrue from TfL for secretarial services provided by the Committee during the Freedom Pass negotiations.

Committee Reserves

51. Table 8 below updates the Committee on the revised projected level of reserves as at 1 April 2022, if all current known liabilities and commitments are considered:

Table 8– Analysis of Estimated Uncommitted Reserves as at 1 April 2022

	General Reserve	Specific Reserve	Total

	£000	£000	£000
Pre Audited reserves at 1 April 2021	3,877	2,129	6,006
Amount carried forward from 2020/21	(141)	-	(141)
Approved use in setting 2021/22 budget	(726)	(199)	(925)
Projected Budget Surplus 2021/22 @ M6	522	195	717
Specific Reserves – Environmental Policy work	-	(60)	(60)
Specific Reserves – System Developments	-	(382)	(382)
Projected uncommitted reserves as at 31 March 2022	3,532	1,683	5,215
Proposed use in setting 2022/23 budget	*(881)	(275)	(1,156)
Estimated uncommitted reserves as at 1 April 2022	2,651	1,408	4,059
TEC priority projects	-	(421)	(421)
Estimated uncommitted reserves following potential 2022/23 commitments	2,651	987	3,638

*includes £160,000 proposal for Climate Change programme director

52. The projected level of uncommitted general reserves as at 1 April 2022 assumes that the draft proposals as laid out in this report is agreed by this Committee. It is proposed that a sum of £881,000 be transferred from general reserves, £160,000 of which relates to a new programme director on climate change, which is subject to member approval. The remainder is to cover the full cost of direct service charges and to balance the budget.

53. In addition, the overall reserves position also reflects the projected amount expected to be held in the specific reserve as at 1 April 2022 of £987,000 which will be used to fund future Freedom Pass renewal exercises. The remaining specific reserves of £421,000, highlighted Table 8, will be called upon in 2022/23 and 2023/24 to continue to provide policy support to deliver the Climate Change policy work and the EV and car club coordination functions, which have previously been agreed by members, or other future priority projects agreed by members.

54. After considering the proposed use of general TEC reserves of £1.156 million in setting the 2022/23 budget, subject to agreement of main TEC meeting on 9 December, uncommitted general TEC reserves are forecast reduce to £2.651 million, or 17.4% of proposed operating and trading expenditure of £15.231 million. This figure exceeds the Committee's formal

policy on reserves, agreed in December 2015 that reserves should equate to between 10-15% of annual operating and trading expenditure.

55. The holding of reserves of 2.4% above the 15% upper benchmark level equates to £365,000. In considering options for the use of this resource, the Executive Sub-Committee is asked to consider the following factors:

- The likelihood of unforeseen events arising in the remainder of the current financial year, given that the projected surplus for the current year of £717,000 feeds directly into uncommitted general reserves;
- As detailed in paragraph 49 above, it is proposed a sum of £721,000 is transferred from uncommitted general reserves in order to present a balanced budget for 2022/23, along with the additional transfer of £160,000 in relation to the Climate Change Programme Director. Clearly this is not sustainable in the medium to long term so measures will need to be considered by members to bring total income and total expenditure more in to balance. In the short term the excess reserves could be used, as proposed, until a balanced budget is achieved.

Summary

56. This report details the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2022/23. The Executive Sub-Committee agreed to recommend that this Committee approves these budget proposals. The proposed level of expenditure for 2022/23 amounts to £230.729 million. A sum of £215.498 million relates to direct expenditure on the transport operators providing the Freedom Pass and the Taxicard schemes, leaving £15.231 million relating to expenditure on parking and traffic related traded service and other operating expenditure. This compares to a comparable sum of £14.874 million for the current year, an increase of £357,000 or 2.4%, much of which relate general inflationary increases.

Financial Implications for London Councils

None, other than those detailed in the report

Legal Implications for London Councils

None

Equalities Implications for London Councils

None

Appendices

Appendix A – Proposed revenue expenditure budget 2022/23;

Appendix B – Proposed revenue income budget 2022/23;

Appendix C.1 – Indicative charges to boroughs 2022/23;

Appendix C.2 – Indicative charges to boroughs 2021/22; and

Appendix D – Parking Enforcement statistics 2020/21.

Background Papers

TEC Budget Working Papers 2021/22 and 2022/23;

TEC Final Accounts Working Papers 2020/21;

TEC Revenue Budget Forecast Working Papers 2021/22; and

London Councils Consolidated Budget Working Papers 2021/22 and 2022/23.

TEC Expenditure Base Budget 2022/23

	Revised 2021/22 £000	Develop- ments £000	Base 2021/22 £000	Inflation £000	Original 2022/23 £000
Payments in respect of Concessionary Fares					
TfL	275,975	-78,625	197,350	0	197,350
RDG	16,559	-9,011	7,548	0	7,548
Other Bus Operators	1,100	0	1,100	0	1,100
Freedom Pass issue costs	1,518	0	1,518	0	1,518
Freedom Pass Administration	520	-1	519	2	521
City Fleet Taxicard contract	10,447	-947	9,500	0	9,500
Taxicard Administration	598	35	633	-3	630
	306,717	-88,549	218,168	-1	218,168
Grant Payments to Voluntary Organisations	0	0	0	0	0
TEC Trading Account Expenditure					
Payments to Adjudicators- ETA	780	139	919	18	937
Payments to Adjudicators - RUCA	532	367	899	18	917
Northgate variable contract costs - ETA	304	0	304	7	311
Northgate variable contract costs - RUCA	174	0	174	-34	140
Northgate variable contract costs - Other	211	0	211	-7	204
Payments to Northampton County Court	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000
Lorry Control Administration	911	-142	769	-1	768
ETA/RUCA Administration	3,060	-2	3,058	114	3,172
HEB Administration	43	0	43	0	43
	10,015	363	10,378	115	10,493
Sub-Total	316,732	-88,186	228,546	115	228,661
Operating Expenditure					
Contractual Commitments					
Capital Ambition/RIEP project costs	0	0	0	0	0
Contribution to LOTI	0	0	0	0	0
RPG Regional/Provider Activities	0	0	0	0	0
Southwark Street Leasehold Costs	0	0	0	0	0
Leases for photocopiers	0	0	0	0	0
GLE European Contract	0	0	0	0	0
NG Fixed Costs	97	0	97	1	98
External audit fees	0	0	0	0	0
CoL Finance/Legal/HR/IT SLA	0	0	0	0	0
Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0
Grants GIFTS system support	0	0	0	0	0
	97	0	97	1	98
Salary Commitments					
Non-operational staffing costs	786	-2	784	-11	773
Members	20	0	20	0	20
Maternity/Paternity Provision	30	0	30	0	30
	836	-2	834	-11	823
Discretionary Expenditure					
Staff training/recruitment advertising	0	0	0	0	0
Staff travel	0	0	0	0	0
Other premises costs	0	0	0	0	0
SS ICT support	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies and services	157	0	157	1	158
Digital Enablement	0	0	0	0	0
Research	40	0	40	0	40
Contribution to health related work	0	0	0	0	0
One off payment to boroughs	0	0	0	0	0
System Developments	382	-382	0	0	0
Other 3rd party payments	84	-84	0	68	68
Additional Climate Change	60	-60	0	345	345
Premises recharge	0	0	0	0	0
	723	-526	197	414	611
Total Operating Expenditure	1,656	-528	1,128	404	1,532
Central Recharges	567	-1	566	-30	536
Total Expenditure	318,955	-88,715	230,240	489	230,729

TEC Income Base Budget 2022/23

	Revised 2021/22 £000	Develop- ments £000	Base 2021/22 £000	Inflation £000	Original 2022/23 £000
Borough contributions to TfL	275,975	-78,625	197,350	0	197,350
Borough contributions to RDG	16,559	-9,011	7,548	0	7,548
Borough contributions to other bus operators	1,100	0	1,100	0	1,100
Borough contributions to surveys/reissue costs	1,518	0	1,518	0	1,518
Borough contributions to freedom pass administration	0	0	0	0	0
Income from replacing lost/faulty freedom passes	600	150	750	0	750
Income from replacing lost/faulty taxicards	18	0	18	0	18
Borough contributions to Taxicard scheme	1,588	-938	650	0	650
TfL contribution to Taxicard scheme	8,859	-9	8,850	0	8,850
Borough contributions to taxicard administration	324	0	324	0	324
TfL Contribution to taxicard administration	124	0	124	0	124
	306,665	-88,433	218,232	0	218,232
Borough contribution to grants payments	0	0	0	0	0
ESF Grant Income	0	0	0	0	0
TEC trading account income					
Borough contributions to Lorry ban administration	0	0	0	0	0
Lorry control PCNs	1,000	0	1,000	0	1,000
Borough ETA appeal charges	967	0	967	105	1,072
TfL ETA appeal charges	118	0	118	58	176
RUCA appeals income	706	0	706	351	1,057
Borough fixed parking costs	2,051	0	2,051	-244	1,807
TfL fixed parking costs	270	0	270	5	275
RUCA fixed parking costs	836	0	836	352	1,188
Borough other parking services	566	0	566	-62	504
Northampton County Court Recharges	4,000	0	4,000	0	4,000
	10,514	0	10,514	565	11,079
Sub-Total	317,179	-88,433	228,746	565	229,311
Core borough subscriptions					
Joint Committee	46	0	46	0	46
Grants Administration	0	0	0	0	0
TEC (inc TfL)	51	0	51	0	51
LFEP/MPA subscription	0	0	0	0	0
	97	0	97	0	97
Other Borough charges					
Central Bodies subscription (REO)	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Ambition ICT/e-government core charge	0	0	0	0	0
Borough contributions towards RPG functions	0	0	0	0	0
Borough contributions towards ESF/NRF	0	0	0	0	0
Borough contributions towards LSRAs	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0
Other Income					
CLG grant for Capital Ambition/RIEP strategy	0	0	0	0	0
DFE grant towards YPES direct costs	0	0	0	0	0
LEP funding towards YPES direct costs	0	0	0	0	0
GLA grant for CHIN/CAREBASE	0	0	0	0	0
TfL contribution to LEPT/LBPN	0	0	0	0	0
EU contribution towards LEPT related activities	0	0	0	0	0
ESF contribution towards NRF grants	0	0	0	0	0
Capacity Builders Grant	0	0	0	0	0
MPS contribution to LCSB	0	0	0	0	0
MPS contribution to Sexual Exploitation Scheme	0	0	0	0	0
LCP seminars	0	0	0	0	0
Various grants towards externally funded projects	0	0	0	0	0
Other contributions towards externally funded projects	0	0	0	0	0
Investments	0	0	0	0	0
Room bookings	0	0	0	0	0
Letting of office space	0	0	0	0	0
Deskspace charge to funded groups	0	0	0	0	0
Sales of publications	0	0	0	0	0
I&E trading account income	0	0	0	0	0
TfL secretariat recharge	31	0	31	0	31
Sales of Health Emergency badges	42	1	43	0	43
Miscellaneous income	98	-7	91	0	91
	171	-6	165	0	165
Transfer from Reserves	1,508	-834	674	482	1,156
Central Recharges	0	0	0	0	0
Total Income Base Budget	318,955	-89,273	229,682	1,047	230,729

Indicative Charges to Boroughs 2022/2023

Appendix C.1

BOROUGH	Core Parking (£)	Fixed Parking (£)	Con.Fares Admin. (£)	Taxicard Admin. (£)	Lorry Ban Admin. (£)	Parking Appeals (£)	TRACE Electronic (£)	TRACE FAX (£)	TEC (£)	Total Estimate 2022/23 (£)	Total Estimate 2021/22 (£)	Estimated Movement (£)
Barking & Dagenham	1,500	55,054	0	6,115	0	38,589	907	992	0	103,158	82,984	20,174
Barnet	1,500	58,542	0	11,589	0	20,006	30	33	10,604	102,303	148,915	-46,612
Bexley	1,500	18,656	0	5,138	0	9,876	0	0	0	35,170	36,778	-1,608
Brent	1,500	59,557	0	14,232	0	14,275	17,133	114	0	106,811	126,480	-19,669
Bromley	1,500	21,494	0	6,622	0	9,001	178	0	0	38,795	41,883	-3,088
Camden	1,500	63,093	0	13,484	0	29,977	11,987	1,821	11,273	133,136	188,730	-55,594
Croydon	1,500	78,344	0	12,625	0	63,183	2,394	1,838	13,071	172,955	138,560	34,395
Ealing	1,500	67,978	0	13,514	0	58,228	297	98	11,019	152,633	126,760	25,872
Enfield	1,500	58,197	0	7,375	0	21,301	7,332	33	3,904	99,641	89,270	10,371
Greenwich	1,500	22,069	0	10,430	0	12,694	357	390	5,961	53,401	47,864	5,536
Hackney	1,500	64,636	0	14,450	0	35,172	7,540	1,903	27,815	153,016	117,285	35,731
Hammersmith & Fulham	1,500	89,784	0	8,323	0	21,654	21,297	130	22,131	164,820	152,223	12,597
Haringey	1,500	62,678	0	12,284	0	39,997	16,791	1,691	15,835	150,776	170,743	-19,967
Harrow	1,500	42,532	0	13,225	0	21,049	0	0	7,868	86,174	128,131	-41,957
Havering	1,500	33,012	0	12,766	0	17,063	15	16	0	64,373	79,908	-15,535
Hillingdon	1,500	21,931	0	5,439	0	7,865	223	244	4,187	41,389	51,710	-10,321
Hounslow	1,500	40,698	0	9,553	0	22,639	6,529	276	1,722	82,918	92,283	-9,365
Islington	1,500	98,327	0	15,703	0	38,150	19,810	293	18,134	191,918	203,781	-11,863
Kensington & Chelsea	1,500	40,123	0	10,053	0	11,523	20,554	390	4,523	88,666	150,597	-61,931
Kingston	1,500	29,665	0	9,135	0	8,906	15	16	0	49,236	65,420	-16,184
Lambeth	1,500	91,822	0	10,565	0	93,332	6,752	7,025	15,447	226,444	193,552	32,892
Lewisham	1,500	58,607	0	9,959	0	43,348	0	0	0	113,414	67,983	45,431
Merton	1,500	33,421	0	9,788	0	21,720	15	16	0	66,460	78,736	-12,277
Newham	1,500	79,521	0	12,037	0	134,749	37,583	439	0	265,828	235,383	30,445
Redbridge	1,500	59,653	0	14,373	0	41,631	0	0	12,541	129,698	113,500	16,199
Richmond	1,500	27,669	0	10,206	0	13,438	461	504	2,055	55,834	53,541	2,292
Southwark	1,500	61,927	0	14,409	0	71,977	6,708	1,268	13,905	171,693	97,048	74,645
Sutton	1,500	18,040	0	7,416	0	3,325	0	0	3,022	33,303	31,950	1,353
Tower Hamlets	1,500	41,381	0	9,329	0	17,427	16,538	244	0	86,419	92,972	-6,553
Waltham Forest	1,500	82,872	0	7,504	0	46,477	30,533	553	0	169,440	152,047	17,393
Wandsworth	1,500	56,917	0	9,105	0	17,332	14,575	7,822	3,120	110,372	123,688	-13,316
City of Westminster	1,500	88,591	0	10,853	0	32,571	5,875	439	13,625	153,454	175,287	-21,833
City of London	1,500	58,641	0	400	0	27,643	208	228	0	88,619	75,022	13,597
	49,500	1,785,431	0	338,000	0	1,066,120	252,640	28,816	221,760	3,742,267	3,731,016	11,251
Transport for London - Street Management	1,500	196,762	0	0	0	178,743	0	0	0	377,006	528,369	-151,363
Transport for London - Congestion Charging	0	1,188,489	0	0	0	1,057,300	0	0	0	2,245,790	1,542,071	703,718
Lorry Control	0	1,715	0	0	0	3,117	640	16	0	5,488	5,622	-134
TEC/TRACE fixed costs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98,000	97,000	1,000
Registration of Debt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,000,000	4,000,000	0
Transfer from Reserves	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	51,000	3,172,397	0	338,000	0	2,305,281	253,279	28,833	221,760	10,468,550	9,904,078	564,472

Indicative Charges to Boroughs 2021/2022

Appendix C.2

BOROUGH	Core Parking (£)	Fixed Parking (£)	Con.Fares Admin. (£)	Taxicard Admin. (£)	Lorry Ban Admin. (£)	Parking Appeals (£)	TRACE Electronic (£)	TRACE FAX (£)	TEC (£)	Total Estimate 2021/22 (£)
Barking & Dagenham	1,500	41,626	0	6,393	0	33,146	158	162	0	82,984
Barnet	1,500	87,407	0	11,577	0	32,602	30	31	15,766	148,915
Bexley	1,500	24,327	0	5,219	0	5,731	0	0	0	36,778
Brent	1,500	69,400	0	13,941	0	23,648	17,259	732	0	126,480
Bromley	1,500	28,203	0	6,832	0	5,348	0	0	0	41,883
Camden	1,500	91,471	0	12,901	0	49,032	21,453	1,109	11,264	188,730
Croydon	1,500	63,956	0	12,612	0	46,833	1,152	0	12,507	138,560
Ealing	1,500	65,980	0	13,398	0	34,607	1,611	177	9,487	126,760
Enfield	1,500	49,714	0	6,670	0	18,688	7,982	123	4,592	89,270
Greenwich	1,500	23,844	0	10,398	0	8,759	474	485	2,404	47,864
Hackney	1,500	53,431	0	14,595	0	26,842	8,110	1,232	11,575	117,285
Hammersmith & Fulham	1,500	85,544	0	8,745	0	24,234	24,194	169	7,837	152,223
Haringey	1,500	85,899	0	12,057	0	37,004	21,995	2,441	9,846	170,743
Harrow	1,500	61,826	0	13,849	0	35,077	0	0	15,880	128,131
Havering	1,500	39,011	0	12,976	0	26,406	8	8	0	79,908
Hillingdon	1,500	29,714	0	5,416	0	9,290	821	601	4,368	51,710
Hounslow	1,500	47,635	0	9,427	0	22,630	6,340	154	4,596	92,283
Islington	1,500	107,940	0	15,357	0	39,983	26,754	347	11,900	203,781
Kensington & Chelsea	1,500	71,000	0	10,103	0	18,684	39,608	939	8,762	150,597
Kingston	1,500	44,695	0	9,184	0	10,026	8	8	0	65,420
Lambeth	1,500	88,006	0	10,404	0	69,180	8,772	924	14,766	193,552
Lewisham	1,500	34,534	0	10,161	0	19,204	0	0	2,584	67,983
Merton	1,500	46,611	0	10,069	0	20,557	0	0	0	78,736
Newham	1,500	106,003	0	11,982	0	40,531	64,991	4,805	5,571	235,383
Redbridge	1,500	53,743	0	14,334	0	33,472	0	0	10,451	113,500
Richmond	1,500	29,727	0	10,421	0	9,143	399	408	1,943	53,541
Southwark	1,500	43,454	0	14,277	0	15,149	13,366	2,202	7,100	97,048
Sutton	1,500	16,454	0	7,606	0	5,010	0	0	1,379	31,950
Tower Hamlets	1,500	42,320	0	9,572	0	18,987	18,238	2,356	0	92,972
Waltham Forest	1,500	84,036	0	7,578	0	29,196	28,682	1,055	0	152,047
Wandsworth	1,500	64,193	0	9,150	0	18,153	15,693	7,292	7,709	123,688
City of Westminster	1,500	114,072	0	10,629	0	22,560	10,828	862	14,835	175,287
City of London	1,500	57,639	0	491	0	14,828	279	285	0	75,022
	49,500	1,953,415	0	338,327	0	824,542	339,204	28,906	197,122	3,731,016
Transport for London - Street Management	1,500	269,631	0	0	0	257,238	0	0	0	528,369
Transport for London - Congestion Charging	0	835,798	0	0	0	706,273	0	0	0	1,542,071
Lorry Control	0	1,719	0	0	0	2,841	1,054	8	0	5,622
TEC/TRACE fixed costs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97,000
Registration of Debt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,000,000
Transfer from Reserves	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	51,000	3,060,563	0	338,327	0	1,790,894	340,258	28,914	197,122	9,904,078

Parking Enforcement Fixed Costs 2022/23
(based on PCNs issued for 2020/21)

Appendix D

Enforcing Authority	Total PCNs	Parking Fixed Costs
		0.3751
Barking & Dagenham	146,784	55,054.13
Barnet	156,082	58,541.53
Bexley	49,740	18,655.93
Brent	158,789	59,556.84
Bromley	57,306	21,493.71
Camden	168,218	63,093.36
City of London	156,346	58,640.54
Croydon	208,879	78,344.04
Ealing	181,240	67,977.51
Enfield	155,163	58,196.84
Greenwich	58,839	22,068.69
Hackney	172,332	64,636.40
Hammersmith & Fulham	239,381	89,784.40
Haringey	167,110	62,677.79
Harrow	113,397	42,531.70
Havering	88,016	33,012.08
Hillingdon	58,472	21,931.04
Hounslow	108,509	40,698.37
Islington	262,157	98,326.97
Kensington & Chelsea	106,974	40,122.63
Kingston	79,091	29,664.59
Lambeth	244,814	91,822.15
Lewisham	156,257	58,607.16
Merton	89,106	33,420.90
Newham	212,016	79,520.64
Redbridge	159,045	59,652.85
Richmond	73,770	27,668.84
Southwark	165,108	61,926.90
Sutton	48,097	18,039.70
Tower Hamlets	110,330	41,381.37
Waltham Forest	220,952	82,872.25
Wandsworth	151,752	56,917.48
Westminster	236,200	88,591.31
Transport for London Street Management	524,603	196,762.34
London Councils London Lorry Control Scheme	4,572	1,714.82
Total	5,289,447	1,983,908

London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee

Concessionary Fares 2022/23 Settlement and Apportionment

Item
no: 05

Report by: Stephen Boon **Job title:** Chief Contracts Officer
Date: 9 December 2021
Contact Officer: Stephen Boon – Chief Contracts Officer
Telephone: 020 7934 9951 **Email:** stephen.boon@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary This report informs the Committee 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 2022/23. It also seeks members' approval to the proposed settlement and apportionment of £207.516 million.

Recommendations The Committee is recommended to:

1. Agree the TfL settlement of £197.350 million for 2022/23.
2. Agree to the RDG settlement of £7.548 million for 2022/23
3. Agree a budget for non-TfL bus services of £1.1 million.
4. Agree the reissue budget for 2022/23 of £1.518 million
5. Agree the borough payments for 2022/23 of £207.516million
6. Agree the payment profile and dates on which boroughs' contributions are paid as 2 June 2022, 1 September 2022, 1 December 2022 and 2 March 2023.
7. Agree the 2021/2022 London Service Permit (LSP) bus operators (non-TfL buses) Concessionary Scheme.

Background

1. London Councils administers the Freedom Pass scheme on behalf of the 32 boroughs and the City of London Corporation. In line with London Councils shared ambitions, it is an example operating at the pan-London level where it adds real value to London and Londoners.
2. The past 21 months have been unprecedented in the history of the Freedom Pass scheme. COVID-19, consequent restrictions, and less demand for travel have significantly reduced journey volumes by Freedom Pass holders. As a result, next year's settlement will cost almost 40% less than this year's.
3. Furthermore, because the settlement with TfL uses the average of the previous two-years' journey volumes¹, this settlement includes 15 months' of COVID-19 impact. It includes the biggest level of reduction in costs that boroughs will enjoy as a result of the pandemic. And while the effect of the reduction in passenger numbers will continue to be felt over the next two settlement years, the costs of the scheme will increase over the coming years.
4. Ordinarily, the Freedom Pass gives free travel concessions 24 hours a day to eligible older and disabled residents on Transport for London (TfL) services, independently operated bus services in Greater London and after 9.30am on most National Rail services.
5. Freedom Pass is largely funded by boroughs with some grant support from Government. Under normal circumstances, TfL fund the concession for older people in the weekday morning peak on TfL services (between 04:30 and 09:00). However, TfL has suspended free travel for Freedom Pass holders during the morning peak. Normally, this would account for around 5% of the cost of the concession overall.

Negotiations with Transport Operators

6. Each year, negotiations take place between London Councils Transport and Environment Committee (on behalf of boroughs) and TfL for buses, tubes, DLR, Tram, London Overground and TfL Rail to determine the cost of the scheme on the basis that both parties are neither better nor worse off. This is based on:
 - The revenue foregone by the operators i.e. the revenue which if the concessionary fares scheme did not exist would be collected from Freedom Pass holders. This excludes fares income from generated travel; and
 - The additional costs to the operator i.e. generated travel by permit holders for which operators receive no fares revenue but do receive the cost of increasing the service to allow for the extra trips made.
7. The resulting settlement with TfL is based on:
 - a) The estimated average number of journeys made by Freedom Pass holders over the previous two years (where two years' worth of data is available). In estimating these journey volumes; Oyster data, passenger surveys and automated passenger count information are used.

¹ The concessionary journey year runs from July-June.

- b) Previous work to calculate expected average fares per trip, which are the actual adult fares paid in the absence of the scheme taking into account fares increases and decreases within a 'basket of fares'. This basket of fares is modelled to be an accurate reflection of typical fares paid across TfL ticket types.
8. If the overall cost of the TfL elements of the scheme (regardless of whether there has been a change to any part of the scheme) is not agreed by the 31 December the reserve free scheme described in the GLA Act 1999 comes into effect in relation to TfL services. This scheme would be significantly more expensive than the proposals contained within this paper.
9. Negotiations are also carried out with RDG for the cost of the Freedom Pass usage on national rail services excluding the London Overground and Crossrail network which is managed by TfL. This year was the third year of the new journey-based model.
10. This year, the bus and tube negotiations (93% of the value of the settlement) with TfL went back to the full models used prior to the fares freezes that had been introduced by the mayor, with other modes (the remaining 7% of the value of the TfL settlement) building on the simplified model agreed during the past four years. Officers checked the continued validity of this approach and found it to be appropriate for these smaller modes.
11. After several years of indicating that it would like to move to a journey-based model, the RDG made this step two years ago. The settlement for 2022/23 reflects the significant reductions in passenger numbers seen on the train network in London.
12. Concessions are also offered on local bus services in Greater London outside the TfL bus network. The statutory entitlement is provided under the Transport Act 2000 as amended by the Concessionary Bus Travel Act 2007. The draft Scheme was published on London Councils' website before the 1st of December 2021 to meet the statutory notice required to the bus operators². Special payment arrangements, as agreed by members in 2020 are still in place, but will be phased out in 2022/23.
13. Overall, the 2022/23 settlement value is £207.516 million (a 30% decrease compared with 2021/22) 1 - see

² LSPs have the right to challenge this scheme until April 2022.

14. Table 1. Settlement Overview (below). This is made up by a £78.625 million decrease (-28% for TfL, which accounts for just under 95% of the total cost, a decrease of £9.011 million (-54%) for the RDG, no change in respect of LSPs, and no change in respect of support services and issue costs. A further explanation of each element is provided below.

Table 1. Settlement Overview

Operator	2021/22 (£million)	2022/23 (£million)	2020/21 weight	2022/23 weight
TfL	275.975	197.350	93.5%	95.10%
RDG	16.559	7.548	5.61%	3.64%
LSP	1.1	1.1	0.37%	0.53%
Reissue	1.518	1.518	0.51%	0.73%
Total	295.152	207.516	100%	100%

Settlement with Transport for London for 2020/21

15. The TfL settlement is £197.350 million, which is a 28% decrease on 2021/22. The model used for the 2022/23 settlement of bus and underground is consistent with last year's. Instead of using the simplified model that had been in use in previous settlements, London Councils and TfL agreed again to undertake a more fundamental review of these modes, which make up 93% of the settlement with TfL. The primary reason for this was to better reflect the impact of COVID-19 on the scheme. As secondary reason was the anticipation of possible, but so far unconfirmed, fares rises next year.
16. The elements that were reviewed include:
 - a. Inflation
 - b. Fare levels
 - c. Demand effects – which include price elasticities to understand how many journeys are generated by the scheme;
 - d. The number of trips and average fare per trip – to understand how many journeys would have happened in the absence of the scheme i.e. those that should be paid for in this settlement, and finally;
 - e. Payment calculations including any additional costs that are incurred by TfL in the provision of the scheme.
17. For the remaining TfL modes (except the Elizabeth Line), the approach taken was similar to last year's and includes two years' worth of data for the additional service, TfL Rail West (Paddington to Heathrow), which TfL took over from Great Western Railways in preparation for the completion of Crossrail. This simplified model has two main elements.
18. First, this element of the model considers the change in journey volumes from year to year. Second, the model calculates changes in real fares demand based on the forecast rate of inflation and the assumed price elasticities for each mode used in the 2017/18 settlement.
19. Officers have sense checked both the full and simplified models against the models used in previous years and are confident that it is a robust basis upon which to make the settlement. The sections below set out at a high level first, the inputs of the full models for bus and underground, and then, the inputs for the simplified models.

Bus and Underground

Inflation, Fares Increases and Journey Numbers

20. For the purposes of the settlement, RPI inflation of 3.6% has been used to estimate the demand for the period of Apr 22-Mar 23. This is consistent with TfL's planning assumptions for its wider business and is broadly in line with the range of Treasury estimates for next year. The nominal fares increase at 1st March 2022 is RPI+1%, where the RPI reference point is the July 2021 ONS CHAW inflation figure, at 3.8%. The nominal fares increase from 1st March 2022 is therefore 4.8%. The increase in fares is expected to have a slight dampening effect on demand, which offsets fares increases to a small extent in the settlement.
21. Year on year reductions in two-year average journey volumes for bus (-31.61%) and underground (-27.21%) were significant. In total, the 2022/23 settlement includes 81.806 million fewer journeys on bus and underground than in 2021/22. Officers anticipate that as the two-year averaging works its way through subsequent years' settlements, journey volumes will begin increasing again from next year. However, it is too early to say whether they will reach pre-pandemic levels.

Table 2. Bus and Underground Journeys (to be read alongside table 3)

Journeys in million	2021/22	2022/23	% change
Bus	229.307	156.827	-31.61%
London Underground	40.855	24.951	-38.9%

Average fare per trip and additional costs

22. The inflation estimate outlined above feeds directly through to average fare calculations for bus and underground, taking average fares paid by the scheme for these modes to £1.10 and £2.57 respectively (up from £1.109 and £2.42). All else being equal, these average fares increases would have pushed up the cost of the settlement had they not been offset by the significant reduction in journeys.
23. However, reductions to the settlement as a result of income earned by TfL on commissions from sales of Oyster cards and season tickets added an additional £1.68 (on bus and LU) million to the overall settlement in TfL's favour. This reflects the increasing popularity of contactless payments, which now make up the majority of paid for tickets on TfL's network. In other words, in the absence of the scheme, TfL would receive less income from ticket sales commissions and therefore, for the purposes of the settlement, boroughs receive less financial easement from such commissions.

Other TfL Modes (Simplified Model)

Journey numbers

24. Overall, year-on-year journey volumes on other TfL modes were down by 4.469 million journeys (-31.7%) in comparison to the previous year. The distribution in the reductions of journey numbers is not consistent across the various TfL modes where the simplified model has been used. This is set out in table 3 below, which reflect the levels of reduction after two-year averaging has been applied:

Table 3. Journeys on other TfL Modes (to be read alongside Table 2)

Journeys in million	2021/22	2022/23	% change
DLR	4.322	2.921	-32.4%
London Overground	3.029	2.297	-24.2%
Tramlink	3.906	2.771	-29.1%
Crossrail	1.284	0.634	-50.6%
Greater Anglia	1.163	0.795	-31.6%
TfL Rail West	0.415	0.232	-44.1%

Real Fares Demand Change

25. The next element of the simplified model used to calculate the settlement is real fares demand change. This is derived from two elements. First, fare increase forecasts (4.8%) and second, price elasticity by mode. The fares increase rate is multiplied by the assumed price elasticities for each mode used in the 2021/22 settlement to provide real fares demand change ratio.
26. Real fares demand change accounts for the relationship between price changes in the wider economy and the cost of travel on TfL modes and their impact on assumed passenger behaviour. In short, as the settlement model assumes if TfL fares rise faster than prices in the wider economy, transport on TfL modes will become relatively more expensive, and therefore, demand will be slightly suppressed.

The effect of this factor on next year's settlement is to flatten journeys on modes by the real fares demand change ratios for each mode, as shown in

27. Table 4. Real Fares Demand Change (below). In 2022/23 fares are assumed to rise at faster than inflation, as a result, it is assumed this will dampen demand.

Table 4. Real Fares Demand Change

Mode	Fares increase forecast	Elasticity by Mode (as used in 17/18)	Real Fares Demand Change in 2022/23 (Ratio Change)	Gross Revenue Change
DLR	4.8%	0.37	0.996	1.048
London Overground	4.8%	0.35	0.996	1.048
Tramlink	4.8%	0.28	0.997	1.048
Crossrail	4.8%	0.39	0.995	1.048
Greater Anglia	4.8%	0.39	0.995	1.048

Elizabeth Line

28. Sections of the Elizabeth line are due to be opened in 2022/23. Therefore, TfL and London Councils have agreed to include forecast revenue for the Elizabeth Line in the 2022/23 settlement. The amount to be settled is based on an agreed estimate, which is likely to be subject to a retrospective adjustment in 2023/24 to account for observed demand and the actual timing of opening various sections of the line. This could mean boroughs either receive money back or have to pay more than outlined below.
29. This approach is consistent with previous treatment of new TfL lines. It allows TfL to receive cashflow in respect of Freedom Pass passengers carried until two years' worth of journey data is available, after which, the methodology for settling with TfL will fall in line with other modes.
30. When fully opened, the Elizabeth Line could add £10-15 million to the annual Freedom Pass settlement. However, the proposed amount (£1.65 million) to be included in the 2022/23 settlement is significantly less than this. It is based on the following assumptions. First, that the Paddington to Abbey Wood section of the line will open in June 2022, and second, it ascribes a 50% probability that the Shenfield to Paddington section of the line will open in late 2022.
31. London Councils officers have worked closely with TfL to ensure that the revenue estimates for Freedom Pass are realistic and based on sound assumptions. Officers can confirm that the following factors have been addressed:
 - a. impact of COVID-19 (assumes 85% of pre-covid demand next year),
 - b. uncertainty about the timing of the opening of each section,
 - c. fare adjustments for journeys outside of the London boundary,
 - d. A lower proportion of Freedom Pass passengers than within the London boundaries; and
 - e. discounting journeys that would have taken place on other modes.
32. Therefore, officers are happy to recommend a settlement figure of £1.65 million in respect of the Elizabeth Line in 2022/23.

Settlement

33. The final settlement with TfL of £197.350 million for 2022/23 is presented in Table 5 TfL Settlement (below).

Table 5 TfL Settlement

Mode	Settlement 2021/22 (£m)	Settlement 2022/23 (£m)	% change
Bus	192.134	140.342	-38%
London Underground	66.795	42.886	-44%
DLR	4.710	3.321	-34%
Tramlink	3.790	2.808	-34%
London Overground	4.395	3.478	-25%
Crossrail East	2.125	1.094	-56%
Greater Anglia	1.923	1.371	-36%
TfL Rail West	0.687	0.400	-31%
2019/20 adjustment for TfL Rail West	-0.584		
Elizabeth Line	0	1.650	n/a
Total	275.975	197.350	-39%

Settlement with RDG for 2020/21

34. The Rail Delivery Group's (RDG) proposed settlement for 2022/23 is £7.548 million (as at 23 November 2020). This represents a £9.011 million (61%) decrease on 2020/21.
35. As previously reported to TEC, boroughs moved to a new settlement model two years ago. This journey-based model of settlement used a single year's worth of journey volumes (unlike TfL's which uses the average of the last two years). It had been both parties' intentions to move to two-year averaging this year. However, as the existing agreement referred to a single year, and given the impact of COVID-19, it was decided to defer this decision for the time being.
36. Last year's settlement with the RDG was calculated on the basis of 11.886 million journeys. This gave a settlement value of £16.559 million. This year's settlement and uses 5.442 million journeys, a reduction of 6.474 million (-54.5%).

Settlement with other bus operators for 2020/21

37. Bus companies operating eligible services outside the TfL bus network have to seek reimbursement under an agreed scheme. The proposed scheme for 2022/23 remains unchanged in principle from the 2021/22 scheme. Under the Transport Act 2000 provisions it is not possible to agree in advance with those bus operators the actual cash sums they will receive and payments are normally paid on the basis of invoiced journeys per quarter.
38. However, since COVID-19 restrictions have been in place, boroughs have agreed to make special payments to non-TfL bus operators in line with DfT guidance. Rather than paying operators for actual journeys, payments have been made

based on pre-COVID-19 levels of patronage adjusted for the level of service being operated (capped at 100%). For example, if an operator was offering services at 85% of pre-COVID-19 levels, it would be paid at 85% of previous demand. This support has been an important element in ensuring the viability of operators and routes while patronage has been reduced.

39. DfT has suggested that local authorities begin to phase out this approach in 2022/23, reducing extraordinary payments by 5% every two months until they reach 65% in February 2023. DfT believes that in effect, this trajectory will see travel concessionary authorities paying for actual journeys again by late 2022.
40. In this context, officers propose a budget of £1.1 million for payments to non-TfL bus operators for local journeys originating in London. This represents no change compared to last year is based on a review of the previous two years' actual costs and building in a buffer in case of price rises and/or a faster recovery.
41. Members are recommended to agree the budget of £1.1 million for 2022/23 in order to leave sufficient headroom for continued special payments, fluctuations in demand, or new operators and/or routes. This will be kept under review in the light of the level of actual claims being made by providers.

Administration and re-issue costs

42. The total cost of London Councils' administration of the Freedom Pass will be £521,000 in 2022/23 compared to the subsidised £519,000 in 2020/21. This equates to £15,775 per borough. However, after determining the overall financial position of the Committee through the range of charges proposed and taking account levels of replacement card income, for 2020/21 a nil charge is recommended (to be kept under review annually).
43. This amount covers London Councils' costs in negotiating the annual settlements and managing the relationships with transport operators and contractors. This is notionally billed separately as part of the subscriptions and does not form part of the settlement apportionment. The budget for the administration and pass issuing costs, which largely pays for contractor costs, has been maintained at £1.518 million.
44. Any annual surplus arising from both the Freedom Pass administration and issuing costs budget of £1.518 million and replacement Freedom Pass income budget of £750,000 (net of administration costs) will be transferred to a specific reserve to accumulate funds to offset the cost of future large-scale improvements or pass reissue exercises scheduled for 2024/25 pending the committee's approval of the budget proposals elsewhere on the agenda. This position will be reviewed annually to ensure forecast income streams continue to cover the in-house costs of administering the scheme

Summary of settlement to be apportioned

45. The 2022/23 Freedom Pass Scheme cost to be apportioned is as follows:

Table 6 Settlement to Be Apportioned

	2022/23 (£m)
TfL	197.350
RDG	7.548
Non TfL Bus	1.1
Administration and Reissue Cost	1.518
Total Cost	207.516

46. The total estimated cost payable by boroughs towards the scheme in 2022/23 of £207.516 million compared to the £295.152 million payable for 2021/22, represents a decrease of £87.636 million.

Apportionment of 2020/21 costs between boroughs

47. In order to apportion costs between boroughs, London Councils has obtained usage data from Oyster clicks on the various transport modes; bus, underground, DLR, tram, London Overground and National Rail. The following paragraphs set out how this data is used when apportioning costs to boroughs. They also consider factors determining borough-level apportionment. Further detail is provided at Appendices 1 and 2.

Usage data – general principles

48. On the bus and underground, there is a very close match between total usage data derived from Oyster clicks and the total number of estimated journeys outlined in the paragraphs above. On these modes, which largely require customers to tap their passes on readers, 95% of the concessionary journeys are captured electronically. This gives officers a high level of confidence regarding the accuracy of apportionment of costs to boroughs for these two main modes, which account for 88% of the total concessionary fares costs.
49. On the other modes, the proportion of journeys captured electronically is lower, either because there is no requirement for Freedom Pass holders to touch in on the readers and/or because there are still ungated stations. On London Overground, 77% of journeys are captured, on National Rail the figure is 67% and for the DLR and tram modes only about 13% of concessionary journeys are captured.
50. Nevertheless, officers closely scrutinise the profile of journeys shown by the usage data that is available and are confident that it is sufficiently robust i.e. in line with expected observations, to be used for the purposes of apportionment. In simple terms, for example, the data shows that residents of boroughs nearest to tram and DLR services use these modes more than residents of boroughs who reside further away from these services.
51. However, it should be noted that because the Elizabeth line is an entirely new service with no historical journey information, borough apportionment has been made in line with underground and rail weightings. The actual split of journeys from borough to borough is likely to differ from this and will be subject to retrospective

adjustment once actual journey patterns can be determined. This may mean that in 2023/24 some boroughs receive a rebate, while others may have to pay more.

Distribution of transport modes – impact on individual borough settlements

52. The fact that the individual modes of transport included in the Freedom Pass settlement are not evenly geographically distributed means that while the overall settlement is down by 30%, some boroughs will see a larger, and some a smaller level of decrease.
53. The range of decrease varies from 24% in Hackney to 39% in the Royal borough of Kingston Upon Thames. There are 17 boroughs that will see increases above the average. The reason for this is that they are predominantly served by national rail.
54. The remaining 16 boroughs, where decreases were less pronounced, are in most cases served more by TfL services than national rail and in particular by TfL modes where reductions in passenger numbers were lower.

Payment dates and profiling

55. The payment dates and profile of payments are agreed as part of the apportionment. The proposed payment dates on which boroughs' contributions are paid are 2 June 2022, 1 September 2022, 1 December 2022 and 2 March 2023. The proposed profile for TfL takes into account an assumed fares increase in 2022. The RDG, the non-TfL operators and other charges e.g. re-issue, are in equal instalments of 25% each quarter. Appendix 2 shows the apportionment per borough by quarter.

Financial Implications

56. The financial implications arising from the Freedom Pass settlement negotiations for 2022/23 have been fully reflected in the proposed revenue budget report for 2022/23, which is a separate report to this Committee.

Legal implications

57. There is a legislative requirement as set out in this report for London boroughs to fund concessionary travel for eligible London residents on the TfL network and eligible residents of England on buses in Greater London. Failure to agree a settlement with TfL by 31 December in any year would enable TfL to invoke the free reserve scheme and to set the cost of this scheme for each borough.

Equalities implications

58. Concessionary fares schemes, as exemplified by London's Freedom Pass scheme, provide a major economic benefit to eligible older and disabled people by meeting the cost of their use of local bus services. In London this benefit is substantially enhanced as a consequence of the additional modes available in the scheme.

Recommendations

The Committee is recommended to:

1. Agree the TfL settlement of £197.350 million for 2022/23.
2. Agree to the RDG settlement of £7.548 million for 2022/23
3. Agree a budget for non-TfL bus services of £1.1 million.
4. Agree the reissue budget for 2022/23 of £1.518 million
5. Agree the borough payments for 2022/23 of £207.516million
6. Agree the payment profile and dates on which boroughs' contributions are paid as 2 June 2022, 1 September 2022, 1 December 2022 and 2 March 2023.
7. Agree the 2021/2022 London Service Permit (LSP) bus operators (non-TfL buses) Concessionary Scheme.

Appendices

Appendix 1: 2022/23 apportionment by mode and borough

Appendix 2: 2022/23 apportionment by quarter and borough

Background papers

Transport & Environment Committee: 6 December 2018: Item 10 - Concessionary Fares Settlement Apportionment for 2019-20

Transport & Environment Committee: 5 December 2019: Item 8 - Concessionary Fares Settlement Apportionment for 2020-21

Transport & Environment Committee: 10 December 2020: Item 12 - Concessionary Fares Settlement Apportionment for 2021-22

Appendix 1: 2022/23 Apportionment by mode and borough

BOROUGH	Bus Boardings	Bus Charge	CR East Charge	EL Charge	Total TFL charges	% NR Exits	NR Charge	Formula Funding Percentage	Non TFL buses and Reissue charges	Non TFL service charges	Total overall	2021/22	Change	Change %
Barking & Dagenham	1.69%	£2,369,887	£97,612	£33,309	£3,330,194	0.68%	£51,658	1.71%	£44,813	£96,470	£3,426,665	£4,614,382	£1,187,718	-26%
Barnet	4.16%	£5,833,341	£4,161	£98,519	£8,711,170	1.47%	£111,041	4.64%	£121,528	£232,569	£8,943,739	£13,347,435	£4,403,696	-33%
Bexley	1.99%	£2,791,701	£2,082	£9,158	£3,175,583	4.43%	£334,063	2.02%	£52,782	£386,845	£3,562,428	£5,525,046	£1,962,618	-36%
Brent	4.80%	£6,742,447	£4,862	£97,753	£9,854,470	1.59%	£119,760	4.68%	£122,483	£242,243	£10,096,713	£13,819,358	£3,722,645	-27%
Bromley	2.99%	£4,199,875	£2,249	£20,421	£5,105,408	10.36%	£781,888	2.93%	£76,649	£858,536	£5,963,944	£9,474,561	£3,510,616	-37%
Camden	3.31%	£4,648,086	£6,928	£77,901	£7,356,272	1.46%	£110,038	3.79%	£99,225	£209,263	£7,565,535	£10,473,960	£2,908,425	-28%
City of London	0.07%	£102,993	£2,480	£5,939	£279,425	0.12%	£8,872	0.13%	£3,389	£12,262	£291,686	£431,768	£140,082	-32%
Croydon	4.07%	£5,705,179	£3,539	£23,403	£8,158,672	12.23%	£922,886	3.87%	£101,301	£1,024,187	£9,182,859	£13,487,329	£4,304,471	-32%
Ealing	4.67%	£6,556,719	£4,507	£85,537	£9,081,834	0.97%	£73,136	4.42%	£115,732	£188,868	£9,270,702	£13,064,768	£3,794,066	-29%
Enfield	3.45%	£4,838,379	£12,890	£50,760	£6,643,001	2.00%	£151,114	3.40%	£88,883	£239,997	£6,882,998	£9,874,766	£2,991,768	-30%
Greenwich	2.99%	£4,190,485	£5,817	£22,615	£5,332,593	4.78%	£360,862	2.82%	£73,727	£434,588	£5,767,181	£8,320,480	£2,553,298	-31%
Hackney	4.07%	£5,718,718	£29,943	£36,766	£7,483,506	0.79%	£59,377	3.77%	£98,568	£157,945	£7,641,450	£10,075,280	£2,433,829	-24%
Hammersmith & Fulham	2.68%	£3,764,224	£3,132	£65,314	£5,732,843	0.82%	£61,550	2.71%	£71,059	£132,609	£5,865,452	£7,905,612	£2,040,159	-26%
Haringey	4.55%	£6,391,244	£8,084	£75,852	£8,760,936	1.54%	£116,055	4.31%	£112,759	£228,814	£8,989,750	£12,085,070	£3,095,320	-26%
Harrow	2.52%	£3,541,080	£3,309	£65,247	£5,521,222	0.47%	£35,243	2.71%	£70,849	£106,093	£5,627,314	£8,590,798	£2,963,483	-34%
Havering	2.18%	£3,062,436	£316,536	£39,490	£4,196,940	1.64%	£123,497	2.50%	£65,456	£188,953	£4,385,892	£6,774,373	£2,388,481	-35%
Hillingdon	2.31%	£3,241,240	£13,547	£57,191	£4,877,684	0.27%	£20,670	2.52%	£65,929	£86,599	£4,964,283	£7,137,831	£2,173,548	-30%
Hounslow	2.80%	£3,933,441	£2,053	£35,213	£4,964,880	2.33%	£176,087	2.68%	£70,242	£246,329	£5,211,210	£7,770,210	£2,559,001	-33%
Islington	3.75%	£5,261,689	£14,039	£63,790	£7,302,820	1.09%	£82,224	3.27%	£85,573	£167,797	£7,470,617	£9,932,170	£2,461,553	-25%
Kensington & Chelsea	2.43%	£3,413,279	£2,544	£63,224	£5,259,713	0.65%	£48,991	2.61%	£68,382	£117,373	£5,377,086	£7,465,152	£2,088,066	-28%
Kingston	1.51%	£2,115,367	£946	£12,302	£2,497,846	4.41%	£333,117	1.53%	£40,179	£373,296	£2,871,142	£4,692,089	£1,820,947	-39%
Lambeth	4.23%	£5,939,270	£6,013	£60,130	£7,761,871	5.42%	£408,799	4.26%	£111,549	£520,348	£8,282,218	£11,352,813	£3,070,595	-27%
Lewisham	3.58%	£5,022,291	£4,064	£22,425	£6,217,592	6.34%	£478,351	3.49%	£91,322	£569,673	£6,787,265	£9,584,287	£2,797,022	-29%
Merton	2.28%	£3,201,924	£1,435	£39,780	£4,733,076	5.28%	£398,646	2.40%	£62,825	£461,471	£5,194,546	£7,768,106	£2,573,560	-33%
Newham	3.63%	£5,087,945	£183,903	£70,969	£7,811,197	0.67%	£50,753	3.21%	£83,914	£134,667	£7,945,864	£10,517,604	£2,571,740	-24%
Redbridge	2.30%	£3,220,878	£251,652	£69,598	£5,206,362	0.49%	£36,623	2.61%	£68,329	£104,952	£5,311,314	£7,909,459	£2,598,145	-33%
Richmond	2.15%	£3,010,394	£918	£28,495	£3,854,289	6.49%	£489,586	2.21%	£57,867	£547,453	£4,401,742	£7,149,380	£2,747,638	-38%
Southwark	4.16%	£5,835,408	£8,528	£49,013	£7,521,798	4.43%	£334,692	3.80%	£99,611	£434,303	£7,956,101	£10,722,120	£2,766,019	-26%
Sutton	1.80%	£2,529,716	£785	£14,201	£3,105,236	5.03%	£379,443	1.77%	£46,412	£425,855	£3,531,091	£5,542,577	£2,011,486	-36%
Tower Hamlets	2.18%	£3,056,222	£41,734	£54,628	£6,007,371	0.81%	£60,853	2.25%	£58,784	£119,636	£6,127,008	£8,125,975	£1,998,967	-25%
Waltham Forest	2.94%	£4,129,674	£43,374	£52,681	£6,204,744	0.68%	£50,952	2.66%	£69,736	£120,688	£6,325,432	£8,665,400	£2,339,967	-27%
Wandsworth	4.17%	£5,853,706	£2,905	£63,495	£7,788,104	8.62%	£650,933	4.23%	£110,704	£761,637	£8,549,741	£12,336,835	£3,787,094	-31%
Westminster	3.59%	£5,032,764	£7,431	£84,882	£7,511,349	1.67%	£126,278	4.10%	£107,440	£233,719	£7,745,068	£10,615,007	£2,869,939	-27%
Total	100%	£140,342,000	£1,094,000	£1,650,000	£197,350,000	100%	£7,548,037	100%	£2,618,000	£10,166,037	£207,516,037	£295,152,000	£87,635,963	-30%

NOTE

1. TFL settlement does not include the cost of the am journeys
2. Bus, Tram, Underground, DLR, TFL rail and NR costs are apportioned by respective usage.
3. Due to unavailable trips on Elizabeth Line, the cost is apportioned using the total journeys on London Underground, Cross Rail East and Cros Rail West. The apportionment on this line will be reconciled next year to adjust for the actual journeys by borough
4. Non TFL buses and reissue elements are apportioned by proportion of the 2013/14 Formula Funding allocated to boroughs (as calculated by Central Government, which is fixed till 2020)

Mode	Settlement
Bus	£140,342,000
London Underground	£42,886,000
DLR	£3,321,000
Tramlink	£2,808,000
London Overground	£3,478,000
Crossrail East	£1,094,000
Greater Anglia (LO)	£1,371,000
Crossrail West	£400,000
Elizabeth Line	£1,650,000
Total	£197,350,000

Appendix 2: 2022/23 Apportionment by quarter and borough

Authority	First payment 02/06/2022 (£) Paid to TFL	First payment 02/06/2022 (£) Paid to London Councils	Second payment 01/09/2022 (£) Paid to TFL	Second payment 01/09/2022 (£) Paid to London Councils	Third payment 01/12/2022 (£) Paid to TFL	Third payment 01/12/2022 (£) Paid to London Councils	Fourth payment 02/03/2023 (£) Paid to TFL	Fourth payment 02/03/2023 (£) Paid to London Councils	Total per borough (£) Paid to TFL	Total per borough (£) Paid to London Councils	Total per borough (£)
Barking & Dagenham	822,668.54	24,117.57	822,668.54	24,117.57	822,668.54	24,117.57	862,188.76	24,117.57	3,330,194.38	96,470.29	3,426,664.67
Barnet	2,151,948.18	58,142.17	2,151,948.18	58,142.17	2,151,948.18	58,142.17	2,255,325.72	58,142.17	8,711,170.26	232,568.67	8,943,738.93
Bexley	784,474.44	96,711.25	784,474.44	96,711.25	784,474.44	96,711.25	822,159.83	96,711.25	3,175,583.15	386,845.01	3,562,428.16
Brent	2,434,381.10	60,560.78	2,434,381.10	60,560.78	2,434,381.10	60,560.78	2,551,326.46	60,560.78	9,854,469.76	242,243.11	10,096,712.87
Bromley	1,261,205.25	214,634.08	1,261,205.25	214,634.08	1,261,205.25	214,634.08	1,321,792.36	214,634.08	5,105,408.11	858,536.32	5,963,944.43
Camden	1,817,243.23	52,315.75	1,817,243.23	52,315.75	1,817,243.23	52,315.75	1,904,541.89	52,315.75	7,356,271.58	209,263.01	7,565,534.59
City of London	69,027.16	3,065.38	69,027.16	3,065.38	69,027.16	3,065.38	72,343.15	3,065.38	279,424.63	12,261.53	291,686.16
Croydon	2,015,462.83	256,046.65	2,015,462.83	256,046.65	2,015,462.83	256,046.65	2,112,283.77	256,046.65	8,158,672.26	1,024,186.60	9,182,858.86
Ealing	2,243,514.32	47,217.10	2,243,514.32	47,217.10	2,243,514.32	47,217.10	2,351,290.63	47,217.10	9,081,833.59	188,868.39	9,270,701.98
Enfield	1,641,041.77	59,999.21	1,641,041.77	59,999.21	1,641,041.77	59,999.21	1,719,875.85	59,999.21	6,643,001.16	239,996.82	6,882,997.98
Greenwich	1,317,327.47	108,647.10	1,317,327.47	108,647.10	1,317,327.47	108,647.10	1,380,610.62	108,647.10	5,332,593.03	434,588.40	5,767,181.43
Hackney	1,848,674.25	39,486.23	1,848,674.25	39,486.23	1,848,674.25	39,486.23	1,937,482.82	39,486.23	7,483,505.57	157,944.91	7,641,450.48
Hammersmith & Fulham	1,416,202.56	33,152.21	1,416,202.56	33,152.21	1,416,202.56	33,152.21	1,484,235.60	33,152.21	5,732,843.28	132,608.85	5,865,452.13
Haringey	2,164,242.00	57,203.42	2,164,242.00	57,203.42	2,164,242.00	57,203.42	2,268,210.13	57,203.42	8,760,936.13	228,813.69	8,989,749.82
Harrow	1,363,925.05	26,523.13	1,363,925.05	26,523.13	1,363,925.05	26,523.13	1,429,446.74	26,523.13	5,521,221.89	106,092.54	5,627,314.43
Havering	1,036,783.43	47,238.16	1,036,783.43	47,238.16	1,036,783.43	47,238.16	1,086,589.52	47,238.16	4,196,939.81	188,952.66	4,385,892.47
Hillingdon	1,204,949.75	21,649.80	1,204,949.75	21,649.80	1,204,949.75	21,649.80	1,262,834.39	21,649.80	4,877,683.64	86,599.19	4,964,282.83
Hounslow	1,226,490.22	61,582.30	1,226,490.22	61,582.30	1,226,490.22	61,582.30	1,285,409.67	61,582.30	4,964,880.33	246,329.21	5,211,209.54
Islington	1,804,038.86	41,949.25	1,804,038.86	41,949.25	1,804,038.86	41,949.25	1,890,703.18	41,949.25	7,302,819.76	167,797.01	7,470,616.77
Kensington & Chelsea	1,299,323.64	29,343.32	1,299,323.64	29,343.32	1,299,323.64	29,343.32	1,361,741.92	29,343.32	5,259,712.84	117,373.29	5,377,086.13
Kingston	617,050.85	93,323.99	617,050.85	93,323.99	617,050.85	93,323.99	646,693.40	93,323.99	2,497,845.95	373,295.96	2,871,141.91
Lambeth	1,917,439.70	130,086.92	1,917,439.70	130,086.92	1,917,439.70	130,086.92	2,009,551.70	130,086.92	7,761,870.80	520,347.70	8,282,218.50
Lewisham	1,535,951.48	142,418.29	1,535,951.48	142,418.29	1,535,951.48	142,418.29	1,609,737.16	142,418.29	6,217,591.60	569,673.18	6,787,264.78
Merton	1,169,226.78	115,367.69	1,169,226.78	115,367.69	1,169,226.78	115,367.69	1,225,395.33	115,367.69	4,733,075.67	461,470.74	5,194,546.41
Newham	1,929,624.94	33,666.71	1,929,624.94	33,666.71	1,929,624.94	33,666.71	2,022,322.32	33,666.71	7,811,197.14	134,666.84	7,945,863.98
Redbridge	1,286,144.10	26,238.06	1,286,144.10	26,238.06	1,286,144.10	26,238.06	1,347,929.26	26,238.06	5,206,361.56	104,952.25	5,311,313.81
Richmond	952,137.28	136,863.25	952,137.28	136,863.25	952,137.28	136,863.25	997,877.05	136,863.25	3,854,288.89	547,453.02	4,401,741.91
Southwark	1,858,133.82	108,575.74	1,858,133.82	108,575.74	1,858,133.82	108,575.74	1,947,396.81	108,575.74	7,521,798.27	434,302.97	7,956,101.24
Sutton	767,096.38	106,463.65	767,096.38	106,463.65	767,096.38	106,463.65	803,946.96	106,463.65	3,105,236.10	425,854.61	3,531,090.71
Tower Hamlets	1,484,020.11	29,909.12	1,484,020.11	29,909.12	1,484,020.11	29,909.12	1,555,311.03	29,909.12	6,007,371.36	119,636.49	6,127,007.85
Waltham Forest	1,532,777.78	30,171.97	1,532,777.78	30,171.97	1,532,777.78	30,171.97	1,606,410.96	30,171.97	6,204,744.30	120,687.89	6,325,432.19
Wandsworth	1,923,920.17	190,409.25	1,923,920.17	190,409.25	1,923,920.17	190,409.25	2,016,343.48	190,409.25	7,788,103.99	761,637.00	8,549,740.99
Westminster	1,855,552.56	58,429.71	1,855,552.56	58,429.71	1,855,552.56	58,429.71	1,944,691.53	58,429.71	7,511,349.21	233,718.84	7,745,068.05
Overall Total	48,752,000.00	2,541,509.25	48,752,000.00	2,541,509.25	48,752,000.00	2,541,509.25	51,094,000.00	2,541,509.25	197,350,000.00	10,166,037.00	207,516,037.00

TFL Instalments	Dates	Value mil
First	02/06/2022	£48,752,000
Second	01/09/2022	£48,752,000
Third	01/12/2022	£48,752,000
Fourth	02/03/2023	£51,094,000
Total for 2021/22 Scheme		£197,350,000

24.70%
24.70%
24.70%
25.89% 4.80%

London Councils Instalments		
First	02/06/2022	£2,541,509
Second	01/09/2022	£2,541,509
Third	01/12/2022	£2,541,509
Fourth	02/03/2023	£2,541,509
Total for 2021/22 Scheme		£10,166,037

Schedule 1
Concessionary Fares 2022/2023

Authority	First payment 02/06/2022 (£)	Second payment 01/09/2022 (£)	Third payment 01/12/2022 (£)	Fourth payment 02/03/2023 (£)	Total per borough (£)
Barking & Dagenham	822,668.54	822,668.54	822,668.54	862,188.76	3,330,194.38
Barnet	2,151,948.18	2,151,948.18	2,151,948.18	2,255,325.72	8,711,170.26
Bexley	784,474.44	784,474.44	784,474.44	822,159.83	3,175,583.15
Brent	2,434,381.10	2,434,381.10	2,434,381.10	2,551,326.46	9,854,469.76
Bromley	1,261,205.25	1,261,205.25	1,261,205.25	1,321,792.36	5,105,408.11
Camden	1,817,243.23	1,817,243.23	1,817,243.23	1,904,541.89	7,356,271.58
City of London	69,027.16	69,027.16	69,027.16	72,343.15	279,424.63
Croydon	2,015,462.83	2,015,462.83	2,015,462.83	2,112,283.77	8,158,672.26
Ealing	2,243,514.32	2,243,514.32	2,243,514.32	2,351,290.63	9,081,833.59
Enfield	1,641,041.77	1,641,041.77	1,641,041.77	1,719,875.85	6,643,001.16
Greenwich	1,317,327.47	1,317,327.47	1,317,327.47	1,380,610.62	5,332,593.03
Hackney	1,848,674.25	1,848,674.25	1,848,674.25	1,937,482.82	7,483,505.57
Hammersmith & Fulham	1,416,202.56	1,416,202.56	1,416,202.56	1,484,235.60	5,732,843.28
Haringey	2,164,242.00	2,164,242.00	2,164,242.00	2,268,210.13	8,760,936.13
Harrow	1,363,925.05	1,363,925.05	1,363,925.05	1,429,446.74	5,521,221.89
Havering	1,036,783.43	1,036,783.43	1,036,783.43	1,086,589.52	4,196,939.81
Hillingdon	1,204,949.75	1,204,949.75	1,204,949.75	1,262,834.39	4,877,683.64
Hounslow	1,226,490.22	1,226,490.22	1,226,490.22	1,285,409.67	4,964,880.33
Islington	1,804,038.86	1,804,038.86	1,804,038.86	1,890,703.18	7,302,819.76
Kensington & Chelsea	1,299,323.64	1,299,323.64	1,299,323.64	1,361,741.92	5,259,712.84
Kingston	617,050.85	617,050.85	617,050.85	646,693.40	2,497,845.95
Lambeth	1,917,439.70	1,917,439.70	1,917,439.70	2,009,551.70	7,761,870.80
Lewisham	1,535,951.48	1,535,951.48	1,535,951.48	1,609,737.16	6,217,591.60
Merton	1,169,226.78	1,169,226.78	1,169,226.78	1,225,395.33	4,733,075.67
Newham	1,929,624.94	1,929,624.94	1,929,624.94	2,022,322.32	7,811,197.14
Redbridge	1,286,144.10	1,286,144.10	1,286,144.10	1,347,929.26	5,206,361.56
Richmond	952,137.28	952,137.28	952,137.28	997,877.05	3,854,288.89
Southwark	1,858,133.82	1,858,133.82	1,858,133.82	1,947,396.81	7,521,798.27
Sutton	767,096.38	767,096.38	767,096.38	803,946.96	3,105,236.10
Tower Hamlets	1,484,020.11	1,484,020.11	1,484,020.11	1,555,311.03	6,007,371.36
Waltham Forest	1,532,777.78	1,532,777.78	1,532,777.78	1,606,410.96	6,204,744.30
Wandsworth	1,923,920.17	1,923,920.17	1,923,920.17	2,016,343.48	7,788,103.99
Westminster	1,855,552.56	1,855,552.56	1,855,552.56	1,944,691.53	7,511,349.21
Overall Total	48,752,000.00	48,752,000.00	48,752,000.00	51,094,000.00	197,350,000.00

London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee

Flood Partnerships Update

Item
No: 07

Report by:	Katharina Winbeck	Title:	Strategic Lead for Transport and Environment Policy
Date:	9 December 2021		
Contact Officer:	Simon Gilby		
Telephone:	020 7934 9792	Email:	simon.gilby@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: As part of the TEC and Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (Thames RFCC) Joint Working Arrangements, TEC receives an annual update on the work of the seven London sub-regional flood partnerships, the Thames RFCC and the Environment Agency. This report also includes an update on work undertaken in response to the July flooding events.

Recommendations: The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report.

Flood Partnerships Update

Introduction

1. This report updates members on activities and progress from the seven flood partnerships in London, as well as the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (Thames RFCC) and Environment Agency (EA). It is the sixth such report TEC has received since the Joint Working Arrangements¹ with the Thames RFCC² were agreed.
2. London is vulnerable to a number of different types of flooding:
 - Tidal flooding, because the River Thames is an estuary. Protection against tidal surges is given by the Thames Barrier and associated tidal walls, embankments and gates;
 - River flooding, from the River Thames (to the west of London) but also the many other rivers in London such as the Ravensbourne, Wandle, Lee, Roding, Crane and Brent;
 - Surface water flooding, which typically happens after heavy rainfall because the water cannot drain away as London is so heavily urbanised and many places do not have natural drainage (e.g. green space);
 - Groundwater flooding, this occurs when the ground is saturated and the water table rises up to the surface including the flooding of basements and properties;
 - Sewer flooding, this should never happen, but does on occasion because of the age and capacity constraints of the sewerage network.
3. The Thames RFCC is a statutory committee established by the EA under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 that brings together Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs), the EA and Thames Water. The Thames RFCC has catchment responsibilities that include London, Oxfordshire, Hampshire, Surrey, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Hertfordshire, and parts of Essex and Warwickshire.
4. Every London borough is responsible for flooding as a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). They work in partnership with the EA, Thames Water and other stakeholders to manage flood risk. LLFAs must identify the flood risks in their area, what interventions could help to mitigate those risks and apply for funding for interventions where there is a good business case.
5. London has seven sub-regional partnerships which are each represented on the Thames RFCC by a lead member. These appointments are agreed by TEC each June. They are:
 - a. Central North (covers Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea, City of Westminster, City of London, Camden and Islington) represented by Cllr Johnny Thalassites.
 - b. Central South (covers Lambeth and Southwark) represented by Cllr Catherine Rose.

¹ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/25362>

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/thames-regional-flood-and-coastal-committee>

- c. Lea Valley (previously called the North Partnership, covers Hackney, Tower Hamlets, Haringey, Enfield, Waltham Forest and Newham) represented by Cllr James Asser.
- d. North East (covers Havering, Barking and Dagenham and Redbridge) represented by Cllr Syed Ghani.
- e. North West (covers Hillingdon, Hounslow, Ealing, Brent, Harrow and Barnet) represented by Cllr Peter Zinkin.
- f. South East (covers Bromley, Lewisham, Greenwich and Bexley) represented by Cllr Sarah Merrill.
- g. South West (covers Richmond upon Thames, Kingston upon Thames, Sutton, Merton, Wandsworth and Croydon) represented by Cllr Julia Neden-Watts.

Sub-Regional Flood Partnership Updates

Central North Partnership

Summary of key themes / issues discussed at partnership

- 6. This partnership holds regular meetings to discuss the following: relevant legislation and guidance updates, modelling work results, application of project updates, opportunities for pooled training, other relevant experiences, and difficulties and successes in application of planning policies. It also focuses on actively participating in regional bodies and networks.
- 7. Meetings are considered very useful for officers to share knowledge, best practice and answer queries, as well as providing an opportunity to stay in direct contact with the Environment Agency and Thames Water. For officers working as the LLFA (normally one officer per LLFA or less) the partnership also provides the opportunity to share contacts and comments/advice on Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS), Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRAs) and other flood risk documents.

Projects in this partnership – brief update

- 8. In LB Camden Thames Water has provisionally approved SuDS project co-funding in the August round of their Surface Water Management Programme for Mount Pleasant Pocket Park; there are also plans for community infrastructure levy (CIL)-funded street SuDS in flood-impacted South Hampstead. The City of London has drafted and consulted on its riverside strategy, with adoption planned for mid-November. LB Hammersmith and Fulham has a SuDS and greening project proposal in Eelbrook Common and the surrounding street through to the second round of Green Resilient Fund. RB Kensington and Chelsea is delivering a SuDS project in Portobello Court in 2022, which is being implemented with Thames RFCC levy funding.
- 9. LB Camden supported a City of London-led joint expression of interest to the Flood and Coastal Resilience Innovation Programme earlier in 2021 to fund SuDS projects and original research into hydraulic links between Hampstead Heath, the rest of Camden borough, and surface water hotspots in the City of London, but the bid was not successful.

Sustainable drainage

- 10. The partnership reported some difficulties in accessing funding for SuDS projects. A key barrier is the time-consuming application process as compared to the likelihood of success. It would be helpful to have a preliminary assessment of likely success in order to justify the commitment of time and resources to the bid process?

11. SuDS Strategies for major schemes are frequently inadequate and require a lot of officer time to improve. Normally LLFAs input is required at various stages of the application rather than as a one-off interaction.
12. There is an increasing problem where applications that have been approved are returning at the discharge of details stage with substantial differences between the details and the original application emerging. Such issues include unexpected deletion of SuDS measures or claims that such measures are no longer feasible. This has created further strains on officer time to resolve.
- 13.

Central South Partnership

Summary of key themes / issues discussed at partnership

14. Key issues discussed at the partnership meetings include: reported flooding incidents, Councillor updates, and cross-boundary LLFA issues. Data has been shared between LB Lambeth and LB Southwark as part of LB Southwark's surface water management plan (SWMP) update. Partnership meetings have dropped off in 2021, with the next meeting to be announced. It is hoped that regular meetings can be reintroduced going forward.

Projects in this partnership – brief update

15. LB Southwark is undertaking several flood alleviation schemes, including within Local Authority Housing, at Peckham Rye, as well as investigating the possibility of drainage repair work at Dulwich Park.
16. Innovative Resilience Funding bid submitted by London Boroughs of Lambeth, Lewisham and Southwark, but the bid was unsuccessful. An expression of interest has been submitted for the second round of funding allocations.

Sustainable drainage

17. Steady amount of planning applications received over the year. LB Southwark are delivering several flood alleviation schemes that are implementing SuDS features and provide flood risk / drainage betterment across the borough.

North Partnership

Summary of key themes / issues discussed at partnership

18. Key issues discussed within this partnership include: surface water flood risk, latest EA climate change allowance, and the lack of funding and resources. There is particular concern regarding the continuing uncertainty regarding Defra LLFA funding – this has now been joined to other central government funding making it more difficult to protect and ensure it is used for the intended purpose of reducing flood risk.
19. The partnership shared knowledge of flood risk management asset maps, SuDS designs, frequency of gully cleaning borough-wide and cyclical gully cleaning programmes.

Projects in this partnership – brief update

20. Wetlands projects are being delivered in LB Waltham Forest and LB Enfield as part of wider flood alleviation measures. There are SuDS retrofit projects across the partnership, including natural flood management in LB Enfield and LB Haringey.
21. No partnership projects are being undertaken currently. A joint bid to the EA's Innovative Resilience Fund was unsuccessful despite strong support from local EA, Thames21, and other stakeholders. Nevertheless, the partnership is working together to update the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) across the partnership and implement online mapping access.

Sustainable drainage

22. The number of planning applications is increasing across the area putting increased strain on workload and resources.

North West Partnership

Summary of key themes / issues discussed at partnership

23. Key issues discussed within this partnership include: Section 19 flood reports, flooding schemes, climate change, new evaluation methods from the Thames RFCC, flood risk management, Thames Water surface water flood risk management capacity, and different approaches to tackling flooding events for flood risk combined with operations.

Projects in this partnership – brief update

24. There has been scope modelling for a potential scheme in Woodcock Park as well as a consideration of the possibility of a joint scheme involving the Silk Stream in LB Barnet and LB Harrow.

Sustainable drainage

25. The partnership has found that there has been a consistently high volume of development across the partnership, with major developments increasing their use of green SuDS. The partnership is also monitoring non-permeable spaces in small developments.

South East Partnership

Summary of key themes / issues discussed at partnership

26. Officers from three of the four boroughs in the partnership met in January, March and October 2021. Issues discussed include the Environment Agency Flood Risk Management Plan process and Ravensbourne Asset Management Plan, Thames Water's Drainage and Water Management Plan, the London Resilience Group findings from the July London floods, and borough issues including the Vitbe Sluice, Danson Reservoir, Marsh Dykes, Beckenham Place Park, Higher Green Cemetery and Baulkwood Court. The partnership also discussed ongoing capacity pressures on each of the Lead Local Flood Authorities. Participating boroughs continue to appreciate the value of sharing information and having opportunities to engage with the Environment Agency and Thames Water on a regular basis.

Projects in this partnership – brief update

27. Each of the boroughs has flood mitigation schemes being undertaken. There are no current joint projects but there are catchment benefits to the work of the individual Lead Local Flood Authorities.

Sustainable drainage

28. The partnership has found that initial applications are often poor but with further engagement there are often opportunities to integrate SuDS into developments. Planning work has remained at a high level during the last year. A key challenge remains resolving practical and financial issues involved in SuDS on highways and in the public realm.

South West Partnership

Summary of key themes / issues discussed at partnership

29. Key issues discussed within this partnership include: Thames RFCC updates and key issue; updates from EA and EA Thames Flood Advisors (projects, training, funding opportunities); updates from Thames Water such as responses to summer flood events; Flood events and Section 19s (particularly around summer flood events); progress on ongoing Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) projects; London Drainage Engineers Group (LoDEG) and GLA updates (policy, training, funding opportunities); statutory consultee role; upcoming training; local flood risk management strategies; and surface water management plans.
30. The partnership has shared knowledge from strategic meetings and documents such as the Thames RFCC and conferences with Thames Water as well as best practice around technical activities such as conducting Section 19s, initiating surface water management plans (SWMP) and local flood risk management strategies (LFRMS) and assessing planning applications.

Projects in this partnership – brief update

31. The partnership shares updates on a mixture of EA and council-led projects, the majority of which have progressed gradually throughout the year; projects are at a variety of stages from feasibility study to outline business case (OBC) and construction. LB Croydon and Surrey are cooperating on a project at Caterham Hill. Surveys are being carried out and property agreements to be determined. The project is making good progress.
32. LB Croydon and LB Lambeth are working together on the Norbury Park flood alleviation scheme. Designs are being reconfigured to reduce costs and benefits are being reassessed according to partnership funding guidance.
33. LB Merton and LB Wandsworth are collaborating on a project at Southfields grid. A feasibility study has been issued and funding sources are being explored.

Sustainable drainage

34. LLFAs within this partnership are taking opportunities to implement SuDS where they can, but larger-scale SuDS projects are difficult to initiate due to resourcing and funding issues.
35. LLFAs continue to assess major planning applications to ensure that SuDS are incorporated where possible, but the guidelines on minor planning applications are unclear. The partnership has had many discussions about which minor applications they may choose to assess outside of statutory duties due to their impact on flood risk (e.g. developments within flood risk areas, developments of more than a couple of properties).

Common themes from the sub-regional partnerships

36. The partnerships value the sharing of information and learning plus the engagement of key partners; the EA and Thames Water. However, some partnerships are finding it difficult to resource the meetings themselves now and ensuring that there are regular meetings with stakeholders in attendance. Ensuring that actions and responsibilities defined in the meetings are followed up by relevant parties can also be difficult.
37. All partnerships are concerned about the lack of resources and uncertainty of future funding. Flood risk funding allocations from central government are no longer ring-fenced and can be allocated to other council activities. Funding for cross-boundary schemes continues to be difficult.
38. Dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic has strained officer resources and budgets are being cut in response. Workloads are increasing and planning applications can be increasingly complicated and time consuming to assess and agree.

39. Many boroughs experience difficulty recruiting officers with appropriate experience. Although the Thames Flood Advisors can give some expertise in this area, more support to promote SuDS/local flood risk management work as a career is needed.
40. The July flooding affected some partnerships severely. Already stretched resources are being critically strained with the extra work (such as responses to residents, businesses, and others, and S19 investigations).

Responses to the July Flooding Events

41. On the 12th and 25th July London saw surface water and sewer flooding due to heavy rainfall disrupting businesses, homes, and transport networks. There is not an adequate surface water forecasting and warning service for these incidents which makes responding to them extremely difficult. Rainfall intensity varied greatly within small areas, such as intensity varying from 1 in 10 to 1 in 100-year event in the same local authority. As water companies have to plan only for rainfall events up to 1 in 30-year event, some assets may not have been designed to withstand this sort of event, however, as climate change evolves, these may become more frequent.
42. Following these flooding events, in addition to the incident response and associated activity around evaluating those, three roundtables have been convened by the GLA and chaired by the Mayor or Deputy Mayors and discussions were had by officers with relevant stakeholders. All agreed that there were issues concerning both the immediate emergency response and the integration of surface water flood risk management into longer term climate change adaptation. For the longer term, it was agreed that governance, funding, Communications and evidence are key areas of concern.
43. In order to develop an initial plan for a longer-term response to London's surface water flood risk, Mayor Philip Glanville is co-chairing a surface water task and finish group with Charlotte Wood (Area Director London, Environment Agency).
44. Following the initial meeting of the group, an officers' group was established to further investigate the issues involved and make initial recommendations. The officers' group reported to the task and finish group on the 23rd November. Officers presented draft papers and initial recommendations on the areas as follows:
- Governance
 - Information on the roles and responsibilities, governance and contacts in each organisation should be collected and kept up to date by a single point of contact.
 - The Task and Finish group should feed into reviews of surface water being undertaken by the National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) and The Chartered Institution for Water and Environmental Management (CIWEM)
 - Funding
 - Review emerging and existing grant funding opportunities, identifying what worked well in securing money and how best to strengthen applications
 - Garner insights for full project and programme lifecycles from across our organisations to understand successes, challenges and what tools, evidence, etc. are needed to better embed adaptation as business as usual
 - Identify what is needed to better include adaptation in emerging private finance initiatives
 - Provide guidance and recommendations for improving case making
 - Advocate for inclusion of infrastructure in the funding calculator used by Defra.
 - Evidence
 - Evidence on identifying the risk (modelling), assets and managing principles as well as records of flooding from all London Boroughs, Water utilities and other infrastructure providers are collected in an agreed template (to be developed) and provided to be collated to form a London wide understanding.

- Develop a memorandum of understanding for sharing data between organisations during and after incidents.
 - Public Communications
 - Consider ways in which better communication and working relationships can be developed between emergency preparedness and LLFA and water utilities etc
 - Promotion of surface water at London Flood Awareness/ Rivers Week etc.
 - London Resilience Communications Group developing consistent comms for a surface water flooding event.
 - Investigate provision of surface water flooding warning.
 - Strategic Plan
 - Produce a strategy and plan for managing surface water flood risk:
 - Gather a sub-group to sketch out a high-level scope of work, including objectives, tasks, timelines, budget, outcomes, and governance
 - Identify funding
 - Invite consultants to tender
 - Consider outputs of Thames Water independent assessment
45. The final recommendations of the task and finish group and other meetings as appropriate will be reported to the TEC Executive meeting in February.

Thames Flood Advisors Team Update

46. The Thames RFCC committed to allocate Local Levy funding to create a team of Flood Advisors to support LLFAs in developing and delivering projects to reduce flood risk. The team were created in 2015 and in 2020 the Thames RFCC agreed to fund the team for another 6 years (until April 2027). The team has five advisors supporting projects in London, led by Alice Dinsdale-Young, while a further six are supporting those outside of London, led by Ciaran Roe. There is also one Support Officer working across both teams. The team share skills and resources across the Thames catchment.



Supporting Delivery of the Programme

47. The Thames Flood Advisors maintain a list of priority, LLFA-led projects. This identifies projects which, with Thames Flood Advisor support, can have the greatest impact for the delivery of the Thames RFCC's capital programme. This list is reviewed quarterly, for assurance, and was last presented to their Project Board in September 2021. The list currently contains 29 LLFA led projects across the catchment, including 19 projects in London. Examples of the current benefits being provided to Local Authorities include:
- Technical flood risk input to projects, such as assessing the multiple benefits that could be associated with a project;
 - Working with the LLFAs to achieve financial assurance for projects by developing outline business cases;

- Assisting with funding applications and project updates to the Environment Agency (the Environment Agency allocates funding in line with Government policy);
 - Supporting LLFAs with their engagement to local groups and stakeholders of their projects.
48. It is always a high priority to ensure that Government Grant in Aid (GiA) funding for flood projects is spent on time and in year, however this has been under even more scrutiny this year following the financial pressures brought by Coronavirus. The Thames Flood Advisors are helping to reduce the risk of underspend by:
- Ensuring the LLFAs progress their projects and claim the money they have requested in a timely manner;
 - Prioritising support and guidance for those projects with GiA allocated this year
 - Where projects with a funding allocation are delayed or unable to progress, exploring other opportunities for funds to be reinvesting in other projects.
 - Identifying efficiencies that allow for funds to be reinvested on other projects.

Developing a Strong Pipeline of Projects

49. The Thames Flood Advisors continue to support local authorities to submit new projects that will be realised in future years of the capital programme. This summer, 14 new LLFA-led projects were added to the next capital programme. This is fewer than previous years and can most likely be attributed to it being the first year of the 6-year programme. In comparison, there were 24 new projects added in 2020 as there was a natural priority to identify new projects prior to the start of the new programme. Advisors continue to work with LLFAs to gain more detail about future projects and increase confidence in their delivery.
50. The London Strategic Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) Pilot Study (LSSPS) was supported by the Thames Flood Advisor team and concluded at the end of the 2016-2021 programme in April, although further monitoring is continuing. The Advisors provided a project coordination function and worked on the final technical report for the pilot, presented at Thames RFCC in April. In July, the study won an award for 'Mainstreaming SuDS' at the Flood & Coast Excellence awards, which identified the team's contribution. The Pilot identified two suitable delivery methods for distributed SuDS, optimised delivery and opportunistic delivery. The advisors are now supporting the next phase of the Pilot, the SuDS Delivery Pilot (SDP) with project coordination and technical input. The SDP aims to further test delivery of SuDS in London following the study phase; focusing on effective engagement, delivery and financial assurance processes. This will aim to increase delivery of distributed SuDS projects and test a more proportionate and timely funding assurance process to enable this. The key other partners in the SDP are Thames RFCC, Thames Water, LB Enfield, the Greater London Authority and Environment Agency.
51. The Thames Flood Advisors actively build LLFA capacity through the provision of general support, guidance and training to enable them to develop projects. They also host more formal training which is open to all LLFAs. This year there has been training on feasibility studies, delivering Sustainable Drainage Systems, natural capital approach and an introduction to the carbon calculator. The training plan is currently being written for next year based on feedback from LLFAs. It is likely to include training on understanding and calculating risk, natural flood management and further carbon training. The Advisors will also collate existing training from previous years and remind LLFAs of where to access this.

Building Relationships with Thames Water

52. The team have been working with Thames Water to develop their relationship and understanding of Thames Water's capital investment process. This enables the Advisors

to share new key material with LLFAs and feedback any questions or issues from LLFAs to Thames Water. Most recently, the Thames Flood Advisors have been supporting LLFAs with their applications to the Thames Water Surface Water Management Programme (SWMP). Thames Water have approximately £3 million to allocate to surface water management projects that disconnect or attenuate surface water flows from Thames Water sewers.

53. Thames Water have been funding an additional FTE of a Thames Flood Advisor since July 2020. This is to support the engagement work on the creation of the first Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP). The Advisors have been working with Thames Water to plan engagement for LLFAs, using their knowledge of LLFA priorities and resources to make it as informative and efficient as possible. The Thames Flood Advisors are currently facilitating workshops with the LLFAs and other local stakeholders to complete the optioneering phase of the plan creation. Other engagement completed this year include 2 webinars, newsletters and drop-in sessions. The Advisors will be supporting Thames Water and LLFAs with the DWMP process through to public consultation next summer, 2022.

Engagement with Lead Local Flood Authorities

54. The Thames Flood Advisors attend strategic partnership meetings. A 'KnowledgeHub' website³ is regularly used by LLFAs to access a library of resources and guidance shared by the team. This allows the Advisors to have an internet presence and communicate with stakeholders⁴. The Advisors' governance documents are also available on this site.
55. The KnowledgeHub website also contains links to previous training the Advisors have developed, which allows LLFA officers the ability to refresh themselves on training at times most valuable to them.

Impact of Coronavirus

56. Prior to Coronavirus restrictions the Advisors used to regularly co-locate with LLFA officers, working and solving challenges together. While physical co-location has been paused during Coronavirus restrictions, the team will be resuming this as an option for LLFAs in the New Year. Over the past 18 months, the Advisors have been using virtual means of communication, predominantly through MS Teams. It is expected that the Advisors will continue to use this approach to work with LLFAs in the future, alongside co-location.
57. Some project progression has been delayed due to Coronavirus. There are several reasons for this, including delays in construction and some LLFA officers being diverted to deal with the emergency response. The full impact on the capital programme continues to be discussed at the Thames RFCC meetings.
58. The training run by the Advisors in 2021 was planned virtually and has not been impacted by coronavirus restrictions. Only the training on Natural Flood Management, which was already postponed from 2020, has been postponed again. This training intended to have a site visit, which was not possible this year. The training plan for 2022 will include face-to-face activities, alongside virtual engagement, to reflect the return to office working.

³ <https://khub.net/web/thames-lead-local-flood-authority-llfa-project-advisors-group>

⁴ The team can also be contacted on: ThamesFloodAdvisors@environment-agency.gov.uk

Thames RFCC and Environment Agency Update

Capital Investment Programme

59. The Thames RFCC has now completed quarter two of the first year of the six-year capital investment programme. This section sets out an update to financial progress and target performance so far on the 2021/22 programme.
60. The Thames RFCC are forecasting to spend 13 per cent less than their allocation and are expecting to deliver 24 per cent more households better protected from flooding than was initially set out to achieve this year.
61. **Financial Progress** – against an allocation for capital projects of just under £119m (£77.6m Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA), £19.8m Local Levy and £21.3m Partnership Funding), they are currently forecasting to spend approximately £103.6m by the end of this financial year.
62. This £10.8m forecast underspend is on Local Levy and PF contributions, both of which are more flexible than FDGiA and can be moved to future years and therefore are not lost from the programme. Some projects have adjusted their profile to spend more FDGiA this year, there are impacts of COVID and project rollovers from 2020/21.
63. **Homes Better Protected** - The Thames RFCC target is 6,344 properties at reduced risk for this financial year. The table below gives details of how the Thames RFCC 2021/22 programme is delivering against its targets for households at reduced risk. Against the target of 6,344, they are forecasting to reduce the risk of flooding to 7,881 properties. The Environment Agency is expecting to reduce the risk of flooding to 6,822 properties (against a target of 5,009), while the local authorities are forecasting 1,059 (against a target of 1,335). The increase is mostly due to projects slipping from 20/21 to 21/22.

	Households at reduced risk TARGET	Households at reduced risk FORECAST	Variance
Environment Agency	5,009	6,822	+1,813
Local authorities	1,335	1,059	-276
	6,344	7,881	+1,537

The Thames RFCC forecast over the 6-year programme is 33,121 properties at reduced risk against a target of 32,458. The National forecast over the 6 years is still on track to deliver 336k properties better protected, but uncertainty remains around assumptions made for non-residential properties.

64. **Efficiencies** - The long-term focus is on the performance across all six years of the programme. Thames RFCC has a settlement commitment to achieve 10 per cent efficiency savings during the 6-year programme. The reinvestment of these savings are vital to the delivery of the programme and were included in our original settlement bid. Work is underway to improve the process for capturing and reporting on efficiencies. It is expected that we will start to report on these from Q3 2021/22. We are also looking to more closely align the process with carbon reporting to maximise efficiencies in how both are reported.

Member's induction for the Thames RFCC

65. Thames RFCC have planned new member inductions for February 2022, new Thames RFCC Members, anyone who wants a refresher, or anyone who has not attended an induction before are invited to attend. The purpose of the induction is to introduce the role of the Thames RFCC and what is required of its members. The session may be virtual or face to face.

66. Key messages will include the importance of partnership working, that members should have a good understanding of the flood risk issues in their partnership areas and ensure local flood risk management needs are being met. It will be emphasised that members represent their partnership, not just their own authority and are encouraged to share progress of schemes, issues and good news stories from their partnerships at Committee meetings.
67. The six-year programme will be introduced, along with an overview of different funding options including levy and the levy principles of the Thames RFCC. Members will be introduced to the role of the Thames Flood Advisors and Thames Water. The members will discuss the 8 objectives of the Thames RFCC Strategy and consider which they feel most strongly represents the needs of their partnership.

Levy Vote

68. The power for the Environment Agency to set a local levy is set out in s17 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and the rules in The Environment Agency (Levies) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011. The levy is agreed by the RFCCs across the country and the resolution must be agreed by the majority of the local authority appointed members each autumn.
69. The annual Thames RFCC vote to agree the levy uplift took place on October (20th) 2021, the Thames RFCC was asked to vote on the decision to raise the levy contribution by 1.99 per cent in 2022/23, an increase of £239,642 shared across 54 lead local flood authorities. This vote was unanimously agreed and passed.
70. A new 25-year strategy was approved in the April Thames RFCC meeting, and a new set of levy principles has been aligned with the outcome of the process of developing the new 25-year strategy. Thames RFCC agreed in principle in the July Thames RFCC committee meeting to adopt a 1.99 per cent increase in levy over the full period of the new 6-year programme, however any increase must be ratified annually by the elected representatives at the October Thames RFCC meetings.

Recommendations

The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications to London Councils arising from this report. However, individual local authorities will need to budget for the increase of flood levy of 1.99 per cent.

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 & Environment Committee

Chair's Report

Item no:08

Report by:	Mayor Philip Glanville	Job title:	Chair of London Councils Transport and Environment Committee
Date:	9 December 2021		
Contact Officer:	Katharina Winbeck		
Telephone:	07769 145326	Email:	Katharina.winbeck@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary This report updates Members on transport and environment policy since the last TEC meeting on 14 October 2021 and provides a forward look until the next TEC meeting on 24 March 2022.

Recommendations Members to note this report.

Contents

Introduction	3
Transport	3
Meeting with Baroness Vere	3
Speeding Decriminalisation	3
London Lorry Control Scheme	4
EV and Car Club Co-ordination Update	4
Letter to UK Power Network (UKPN)	5
Multi-borough rental e-scooter trial update	5
Press Work	6
Environment	6
COP Events	6
Green New Deal Recovery Mission	7
Green Finance Meeting and Roundtable	7
BEIS Local Authority Carbon Dioxide Emissions Dataset	7
Green Spaces Centre for Excellence	7
Office for Environmental Protection (OEP) Roundtable	8
Press Work	8
Forward Look	10

Introduction

1. This report updates Members on London Councils' work on transport and environment policy since the last TEC meeting on 14 October 2021 and provides a forward look until 24 March 2022. As always it is very much a team effort across London Councils officers and TEC elected colleagues.

Transport

Meeting with Baroness Vere

2. The vice chairs and I met with Baroness Vere to discuss the way in which the current funding negotiations with TfL affect boroughs, particularly around the LIP and highways maintenance funding arrangements. We secured commitments to continue our dialogue and the Minister was very interested in hearing our experiences and promised to follow up on a number of issues.
3. We were able to highlight the immense difficulties the current arrangements are causing the boroughs, as well as pointing out some of the unintended consequences of some of these funding pressures, particularly on our drainage assets for example which links into our wider flooding work
4. We have agreed again to meet in the new year, where we will not only focus on funding discussions but other areas of interest, such as upcoming legislation and the future mobility agenda. Members are welcome to let me and the vice chairs or London Councils officers know of any specific items they wish to be discussed.

Speeding Decriminalisation

5. Item 10 at the TEC meeting in October outlined the continued activity on our proposals for a partial decriminalisation of speed enforcement in London and included details of plans to lobby in the House of Lords for a change to the Part 5 of the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill to facilitate further discussion on this and establish the foundations for future legislation. Our proposals were raised by a cross party representative of the Lords on 8 November and there was a good level of debate, and a clear view of Government's position was outlined. The Government's position is that the severity of speed limit non-compliance and the potential serious consequences of speeding mean that it should remain a criminal matter enforced by the police.
6. We will continue to work with stakeholders, both in London and nationally to build support for enhanced council powers and further develop the underlying evidence case that underpins the need for change. This includes re-engaging with the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) as well as giving continued support to the Lords supporting our amendments and who have been invited to attend a session with Baroness Vere on Part 5 of the Bill.
7. Item 11 at the TEC meeting in October was concerned with the proposal by LB Wandsworth to pilot civil speed enforcement in the borough and the need for TEC to set a penalty level and agree a code. Following this meeting London Councils chaired a session between LB Wandsworth and MPS about the proposals, how the legislation could allow for this and the need for the borough and MPS to work together. Discussions

are on-going and London Councils will continue to work with LB Wandsworth and MPS on this issue, but key aspects of the pilot will need to be decided by the borough and the police.

London Lorry Control Scheme

8. London Councils continue to monitor the impacts that the shortfall of drivers is having on the freight sector, and the delivery of goods and services in London. We have no current plans to suspend the scheme and pressure seems to have eased and reports of shortages has diminished as freight activity returns to almost 'normal' levels. However, the situation is volatile and dynamic and if there is an escalation of shortages, especially in the run up the Christmas, we will continue to work with the sector to discuss how best we can support the industry without damaging the integrity of the scheme.

EV and Car Club Co-ordination Update

9. Close to 5,000 on-street residential charging points, and three community charging hubs have been delivered by London boroughs, and facilitated through the Go Ultra Low Cities Scheme (GULCS) funding or procurement framework. Approximately 700 additional chargepoint are due to be delivered by the end of the calendar year.
10. Funding continues to be available to support borough delivery of slow/fast public charging infrastructure through the government's On-Street Residential Chargepoint Scheme (ORCS). The funding provides 75 per cent of the capital costs for delivery and is available for boroughs to bid for until March 2022, to deliver chargepoints by March 2023. London Councils officers have worked with operators on the TfL procurement framework to secure 25 per cent match-funding for all boroughs, ensuring a chargepoint delivery for zero capital investment.
11. 16 London boroughs have submitted funding bids to date, requesting a total of nearly £8m, of which c. £2m has been allocated and confirmed. A workshop on the funding was held in October and well attended by borough officers, who were encouraged to submit bids as soon as possible and by the end of this calendar year to provide the best chances of securing the funding they request. London Councils officers and the Energy Saving Trust team continue to offer support to all boroughs in preparing their applications.
12. In late October TfL published a draft summary of the London 2030 Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy (EVIS) with a commitment to publication of the full strategy by the end of the calendar year. The summary confirms that the final strategy will provide updated forecasts for EV infrastructure needs with proposals for how the public sector can further support the delivery of EV infrastructure and identification of how much funding/support is required to achieve this. In early November, London Councils facilitated an EVIS workshop with TfL that was attended by more than 40 borough officers. A comprehensive overview was presented, and borough officers had the opportunity to ask questions and engage in discussion groups on how the proposals aligned with local strategies, provide feedback on the proposed role of the public sector for future delivery and discuss forecasting needs to

support future delivery. Feedback will be considered as part of the final document review before publication in December.

13. London Councils continues to work with TfL on the development of a future procurement mechanism to support consistent and efficient charge point delivery across London.
14. It is proposed that this new and updated mechanism will support boroughs in the procurement and delivery of infrastructure with consistent standards and provide access to the latest technology and private sector investment. Pan-London chargepoint standards will be developed in partnership with borough officers who have joined a borough officer procurement working group recently set up by TfL and London Councils. 14 boroughs are represented on the working group.
15. London Councils officers have worked with TfL to incorporate car club data into the micromobility platform currently being trialled as part of the larger multi-borough rental e-scooter trial. Unfortunately, London Councils and TfL have concluded that incorporating car club data into the platform cannot proceed due to technical and data limitations. London Councils officers are now working with TfL to identify an alternative means of centralising car club data – either via tools internal to TfL, or via products external to TfL, such as the GLA Datastore.
16. London Councils officers have met with representatives from Zipcar to discuss a jointly organised car club event – currently planned for January 2022. Discussions on the details of the event are on-going.
17. London Councils officers continue to take forward the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group on Car Clubs, including: producing a survey to gather borough experiences of procuring car clubs (to be circulated in early December), updating the car club webpages on the London Councils website (to be made live in w/c 29 December), and supporting TfL in their on-going car club policy review.

Letter to UK Power Network (UKPN)

18. After discussion at TEC Executive with Deputy Mayor Rodrigues and some extensive officer engagement, I have written to UKPN to support their current work on the climate plan assessment framework and their engagement in London Councils renewable power programme and their engagement with the EV infrastructure co-ordination function at London Councils. We have asked for a meeting to be arranged in the new year.

Multi-borough rental e-scooter trial update

19. The rental e-scooter scheme in London continues to operate a successful service. As of November 2021, ten London boroughs have joined the trial, namely Camden, Ealing, Hammersmith & Fulham, Kensington & Chelsea, Richmond, Tower Hamlets (including Canary Wharf), City of London, Lambeth, Southwark and Westminster.
20. London Councils' officers continue to work with TfL and the participating boroughs to run the London e-scooter trial.

21. The London trial, which is the largest e-scooter trial in the UK, has been well received by Londoners. Over the first five months of the trial (7 June to 24 October) there have been 355,000 trips made on the rental e-scooters, with the average rental lasting 21 minutes over an average distance of 2.7 km.
22. The Operational Board, which is the governing body of the trial and includes representatives from London Councils, TfL and the participating boroughs, has agreed to allow all non-participating boroughs to join the trial after Trial Period 6. The original agreement was that boroughs were not allowed to join the trial after the cut of date of 25 November 2021. In case any boroughs would like to discuss this in more detail and/or receive more information, London Councils officers are available to have further engagement.
23. Safety is at the core of the trial and data shared by the operators plays a vital role in helping to shape London and the UK's future policy on e-scooters, including whether they could form part of London's sustainable recovery from the coronavirus pandemic.
24. This trial is the only legal way of riding e-scooters in public places within London. Private use of e-scooters in any public place remains illegal, and the Metropolitan Police Service are undertaking enforcement activity to deal with illegal e-scooters.
25. Our officers will continue working with TfL and the boroughs to ensure the successful delivery of this scheme and provide a full update to TEC in March 2022.

Press Work

26. London Councils in the press

- WiredGov (27.09.21) *Camden joins London's rental e-scooter trial*
- LGC (14.10.21) *Electric vehicles: the practicalities behind charging*
- Evening Standard (11.11.21) *Londoners buying electric cars soars as capital shifts to becoming green city*
- Highways News (16.11.21) *TfL commits to tougher measures to eliminate death and serious injury from London's roads by 2041*
- MyLondon (19.11.21) *More than 3,500 e-scooters seized in a year in massive police crackdown*
- Roadsafes (23.11.21) *London intensifies efforts to achieve Vision Zero*

Environment

COP Events

27. The substantive item on the agenda on climate change has the details of all the events we organised in the run up to and during COP. I participated in all and chaired some of them. These events have resulted in substantial press coverage for London Councils, which is listed in the section below. Again I thank the officer team and also the Vice Chairs and other members of TEC that attended these events, presented and also Cllrs Gould, Rodwell, Holland and Dunne who also attended COP.

Green New Deal Recovery Mission

28. As agreed at the last Recovery Board, the Green New Deal team will jointly with the Good Work mission team host a workshop with officers to help define the priority sectors for us to focus on with regards to skills and job creation. This workshop will draw on the London specific research in this field and involve the sub-regional partnerships.
29. The Green New Deal team is also working on a Retrofit Summit early in the new year, it will build on the launch of the London Action Plan just before COP, bringing together partners for all types of retrofit – domestic, business, other public sector buildings – culminating in a roadmap for the retrofit challenge for this decade, with significant partner input and buy-in. A date for the summit will soon be announced.

Green Finance Meeting and Roundtable

30. I brought together GLA and London Councils officers with Deputy Mayor Rodrigues to discuss the activities taking place on green finance in our respective organisations. This helped to clarify the individual actions we are currently undertaking in that space. We are also keen to ensure that the City of London is fully embedded in this work.
31. Deputy Mayor Rodrigues subsequently hosted a round table with a number of financial institutions to discuss what sort of financing facility would be the most helpful for the sector to engage with. I was invited to the event and am now looking to officers to work more closely together on this to ensure we are aligned and do not duplicate any work.

BEIS Local Authority Carbon Dioxide Emissions Dataset

32. On the 9th November, borough officers across London received a request from BEIS by email to fill out a survey on the Local Authority Carbon Dioxide Emissions Dataset, with a deadline of 22nd November. This caused some concern amongst officers due to the short deadline and also the implication in the email that a subset dataset regarding emissions under the control of local authorities would be discontinued. A rapid survey of the boroughs was conducted to ascertain reactions. Responses from 24 boroughs were received, which formed the basis of an officer letter to BEIS officials.
33. The letter noted that the dataset was essential and has been a key part of evidence base for the establishment of local net zero targets, and even where other datasets are used the BEIS data provides a means of assurance. Furthermore, it is in the public interest to have greater data availability for the purposes of transparency and to enable third party analyses. It was further observed that it has been acknowledged that local Climate Action Plans have been acknowledged as critical in the national Net Zero Strategy, together with the need to promote best practice and support for local authorities and increase knowledge sharing. Any moves to alter current emissions accounting needs to be in the spirit of these commitments and allow sufficient time for a proper consultation. We await a response to our letter.

Green Spaces Centre for Excellence

34. Following the early work to establish Parks for London as a Centre for Excellence for London's green spaces, stakeholder discussions through meetings and a workshop helped develop an initial health focus for the Centre for Excellence.

35. In order to support the development and long-term capacity of the Centre for Excellence there is a key need for expertise in communications and public health. A communications officer and young persons health project officer have been successfully recruited and have started work in Parks for London. A research project is currently being drafted with discussions on-going within the advisory group that includes London Councils officers. A key objective for the Centre for Excellence is to support collaboration between all council services to deliver more integrated green infrastructure within and between boroughs. This is essential to improve access to green space in areas of deficiency and deprivation and to maximise the multiple benefits of green space.
36. The Good Parks for London 2021 report was launched on 18th November attracting over 130 representatives from stakeholder groups across London. LB Lewisham was assessed as having the best parks service in London, and LB Barking & Dagenham, LB Hackney, LB Hammersmith & Fulham, LB Hounslow, and LB Redbridge were this year's biggest improvers, with over 80% of boroughs showing improvements in their park's services. Bespoke reports for individual boroughs are being prepared to provide advice and feedback.
37. This year, the report also includes invaluable case studies of landowners and managers making London's parks more climate resilient and better positioned to mitigate climate change. A series of pond restoration projects by The Royal Parks and the creation of a major wetland at Headstone Manor Park by Harrow Council were highlighted as exemplars for reducing flood risk and improve wildlife habitats.

Office for Environmental Protection (OEP) Roundtable

38. Through our national officer networks, London Councils officers were invited to take part in a workshop organised by the Interim Office for Environment Protection to discuss their strategy and upcoming 25 Year Plan monitoring report. Officers stressed the importance of net zero carbon monitoring, to which the interim OEP commented that they were currently exploring their role compared to for example the Climate Change Committee (CCC). Officers also stressed the importance of filling the gap that has been created through leaving the EU, with no further recourse to the European Court of Justice, particularly with regards to air quality. The OEP is conducting a number of these workshops across the country and will keep us informed of their next steps.

Press Work

39. London Councils in the press

- LGC (14.10.21) *London calls for support in £98bn retrofitting drive*
- Evening Standard (18.10.21) *London calls for support in £98bn retrofitting drive*
- Time Out London (18.10.21) *London calls for support in £98bn retrofitting drive*
- Inside Housing (18.10.21) *London calls for support in £98bn retrofitting drive*
- Construction Enquirer (18.10.21) *London calls for support in £98bn retrofitting drive*
- LocalGov (18.10.21) *London calls for support in £98bn retrofitting drive*
- Environment Journal (18.10.21) *London calls for support in £98bn retrofitting drive*
- Environment Journal (19.10.21) *Majority of Londoners are concerned about climate change*
- LGC (19.10.21) *Net zero strategy: hotly anticipated, but will it be coolly received?*

- The MJ (20.10.21) *Ali Griffin: Plugging the net zero funding gap*
- Trade Arabia Business News (21.10.21) *Net zero drive 'opens £500m investment window in UK'*
- Evening Standard (25.10.21) *Budget 2021: Help the capital go green in spending review, urge leaders*
- Evening Standard (29.10.21) *Boaty McBoatface: Polar ship travels up Thames*
- BBC Politics London (31.10.21) *Cllr Georgia Gould appears on panel*
- BBC Radio London (03.11.21) *Cllr Georgia Gould interview on BBC Radio London Breakfast Show*
- BBC London TV (03.11.21) *Cllr Georgia Gould is interviewed on the UKCCIC at COP26*
- Smart Cities World (03.11.21) *Cop26: research reveals £500bn net-zero investment opportunity*
- Cities Today (03.11.21) *Cop26: research reveals £500bn net-zero investment opportunity*
- Camden Citizen (03.11.21) *Cop26: research reveals £500bn net-zero investment opportunity*
- Evening Standard (10.11.21) *New eco standards for housing: 359 new 'gold standard' eco homes replace '60s estate in north London*
- OnLondon (10.11.21) *Philip Glanville: London and UK Core Cities can lead the way to net zero*
- City Matters (12.11.21) *Passivhaus eco standard for homes in London could slash energy bills*
- LGC (15.11.21) *Relief as local role recognised in COP26 text*

40. London Councils Media Work

- Press Release: [Majority of Londoners have increased level of concern about climate change – new poll shows](#) – 19th October 2021
- Press Release: [UK Core Cities and London Represent Half a Trillion-Pound Investment Opportunity](#) - 21st October 2021
- Press Release: [Urban Britain unites to call on Government to grasp green growth and jobs opportunity ahead of tomorrow's budget and spending review](#) - 26th October 2021
- Press Release: [Leader of London Councils and Mayor of London convene London Climate Summit to build powerful coalition tackling the climate crisis ahead of COP26](#) - 28th October 2021
- Comment Piece: [On London - Philip Glanville: London and UK Core Cities can lead the way to net zero](#) - 10th November 2021

Forward Look

41. Forthcoming meetings and consultations between now and the next TEC meeting on 24th March 2022:

December

- 07: London Councils Leaders Committee – climate change update report to be discussed
- 07: Transport Funding Shadow Sub-Group of TEC first meeting
- 08: TfL Board meeting
- 09: Green New Deal Workshop on skills and jobs, jointly with Good Work Mission
- 15: CELC Lead Advisor Meeting

January

- 06: DWP consultation on Climate and investment reporting: setting expectations and empowering savers closes
- 12: BEIS consultation on Market-based mechanism for low carbon heat closes
- 19: Surface Water Flooding Roundtable
- 21: Environment Agency Consultation on Draft Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs): 2021 to 2027 ends
- 26: Green jobs, Green Skills and Green Finance – CLF Breakfast Board Meeting

February

- 08: London Councils Executive
- 10: TEC Executive – Deputy Mayor Heidi Alexander in attendance
- 10: TfL consultation on step-free access closes
- 22: Defra Consultation on Commonly littered single-use plastic items: call for evidence ends

March

- 22: London Councils Leaders Committee

London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee

Transport Funding Sub Group

Item no: 09

Report by: Katharina Winbeck **Job Title:** Strategic Lead, Transport and Environment
Date: 09 December 2021
Contact Officer: Katharina Winbeck
Telephone: 07769145326 **Email:** katharina.winbeck@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report sets out arrangements for a London Councils Transport and Environment Committee Sub-Group on Transport Funding.

Recommendations: The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report
- Agree to setting up a Transport Funding Subgroup of TEC
- Approve the proposed membership of the Subgroup

Introduction

1. A stable and well-functioning transport network is critical to support London's residents and businesses to play their part in the UK's economic and green recovery. London's boroughs play a crucial role in maintaining the highways infrastructure (which covers 95 per cent of the London total) and delivering active and sustainable travel schemes.
2. However, the boroughs have suffered significant reductions in transport funding over the last several years and the network is deteriorating as outlined in the annual State of the City report jointly produced by London Technical Advisers Group (LoTAG) and London Councils.
3. The current short-term nature of the TfL funding deals has led to significant difficulties to deliver local schemes and develop long-term plans to improve London's transport network.
4. At the TEC meeting on 14 October 2021, it was agreed that a new Transport Funding Sub Group of TEC should be set up to consider a coordinated pan-London response to transport funding challenges.

Transport Funding Subgroup

5. Members of the group will aim to understand the current funding arrangements in London and identify key challenges London boroughs are facing. Building upon this, the group will identify potential solutions and coordinate a strategic, pan-London, cross-party approach.
6. The first informal meeting of the group is scheduled to take place before the TEC meeting on 9 December 2021 to discuss and agree a Terms of Reference document for the group. As at the time of writing this report the informal meeting has not taken place yet, London Councils' officers will provide a verbal progress update to TEC members.
7. In line with other, similar TEC Subgroups (such as the Electric Vehicle Rapid Charging-Point Subgroup), the group will comprise six members, three drawn from the Labour Party, two from the Conservative Party and one from the Liberal Democrat Party. The proposed composition of the group is as follows:

Cllr Claire Holland (Chair of the Sub Group)
Cllr Clyde Loakes
Cllr Pat Codd
Cllr Peter Zinkin
Cllr Johny Thalassites
Cllr Manuel Abellan

8. The Subgroup will be supported by an officer network, which may be the current LIP Working Group, or a newly formed group depending on the finalised Terms of Reference and conversations with the Subgroup and relevant officers. The Subgroup will also benefit and utilise existing relationships between TEC and partners, such as TfL, DfT and HMG, e.g. the regular Commissioner meetings.
9. It is proposed that the group will meet monthly to start with, given the pace of developments in this policy area and then move to quarterly. Where possible, the meetings will be held on the same day as TEC Executive meetings (most likely straight after TEC Executive). However, these logistics will be discussed and agreed with nominated members at the first informal meeting of the group.
10. A draft Terms of Reference has been included as Appendix A to this report. Following the first informal meeting of the group and agreement on the final Terms of Reference document, it will be shared with all TEC members.

Recommendations

The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report
- Agree to setting up a Transport Funding Subgroup of TEC
- Approve the proposed membership of the Subgroup

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.

Appendix A – Draft Terms of Reference for the Transport Funding Subgroup of TEC

Transport Funding Subgroup

The Transport Funding Subgroup is a sub-Committee of TEC, formed to consider a coordinated, pan-London response to transport funding challenges.

Aim

To consider the issues related to transport funding across the London boroughs and coordinate a joint, strategic approach.

Quorum

The quorum shall be one third of the membership.

Membership

The group will comprise six members, three drawn from the Labour Party, two from the Conservative Party and one from the Liberal Democrat Party.

Members of the Subgroup will actively engage in discussions and any relevant activities or meetings that may follow.

Terms of Reference

1. To provide a dedicated TEC member- level forum for discussion of transport funding issues and to offer advice on any pan-London response to TEC.
2. The Members' Group will report back to TEC and its Executive, having no delegated authority of its own.

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

Climate Change Strategy

Item No: 10

Report by: Kate Hand

Job title: Head of Climate Change

Date: 09 December 2021

Contact Officer: Kate Hand

Telephone: 020 7934 9898 **Email:** kate.hand@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary

This report provides an update on London Councils' climate advocacy work in the run up to COP26, work on emissions accounting and progress against the seven climate change progress; it then outlines the refreshed Government climate policy suite and key outcomes of COP, and concludes with considerations for evolving London Councils' Climate Change Programme Strategy.

Recommendations

The Committee is asked to:

1. Note and comment on the paper; and
2. Comment on the proposals for the development of London Councils' Climate Change Programme Strategy (paragraphs 31 – 38)

Climate Change Strategy

1. London Councils is delivering an ambitious 2021/22 climate change strategy, approved by London Councils' Executive and Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) in early 2021. An update report on the climate strategy was submitted to Leaders' Committee in March 2021 and Executive in September 2021.
2. This report provides an update on London Councils' climate advocacy work in the run up to and during COP26, work on emissions accounting and progress against the seven climate change programmes; it then outlines the refreshed Government climate policy suite and key outcomes of COP, and concludes with considerations for evolving London Councils' Climate Change Programme Strategy.

London Councils' climate advocacy

3. TEC received an update on climate advocacy activities at its October 2021 meeting. Since then, officers have organised a series of successful pre-COP events in London, and supported the launch of the UK Cities Climate Investment Commission (CCIC) at COP.
4. We hosted a Borough Climate Conference on 19 October attended by well over 100 councillors and officers, featuring keynote remarks from Mayor Glanville and Deputy Mayor Rodrigues, a showcase of the work of the seven climate change programmes, and breakout sessions led by boroughs who put themselves forward to share innovative approaches to climate change action¹. A key message of that event is that boroughs want to build on successes to date, with 'faster and better' action going forward.²
5. In concert with the Retrofit London programme lead boroughs, Enfield and Waltham Forest, London Councils hosted a successful programme launch event on 26 October, joined by Deputy Mayor Shirley Rodrigues, senior officials from BEIS and DLUHC, London First and the G15 group

¹ City of London, Hammersmith & Fulham, Hounslow, Islington, Sutton, Waltham Forest and Westminster

² [About Climate Change | London Councils](#)

of housing associations; the event was attended by 250 attendees, and forms an important staging post to the joint GLA-London Councils Retrofit Summit planned for early 2022.

6. At COP, we hosted a series of four events on the CCIC, together with Core Cities and the Connected Places Catapult, including an event in the official UN Blue Zone with speakers including Helen Whately MP (Exchequer Secretary), OECD Secretary General Mathias Cormann and Cllr Georgia Gould. We are confident that these events and wider outreach have secured significant private and public sector support for our proposals for accelerating private finance into place-based net zero investment.
7. We have continued to build our collaboration with the GLA under the Green New Deal mission. Our joint paper to the September London Recovery Board meeting was welcomed, including our proposals to use new green jobs and skills research to identify and focus on key green economy sectors, and to host a Summit on retrofitting in early 2022 to accelerate progress and set out a roadmap to 2030. We will also be strengthening our collaboration around green finance, as a shared priority. This joint partnership was profiled at the London Climate Summit in late October, which set out London's offer on net zero and acted as a springboard into COP26.³

Emissions accounting

8. The Emissions Accounting Task and Finish group gave its final report to TEC at the meeting in October 2021. At the meeting it was agreed that the Task and Finish group would transition into an Emissions Accounting Working Group in order to take forward the recommendations.
9. To progress this, officers have undertaken preliminary discussions with the University of Leeds regarding the consumption emissions accounting and with the GLA regarding the London Emissions and Greenhouse Gas Inventory (LEGGI). Discussions are underway regarding the development of the working group as a whole and relevant stakeholders have been contacted regarding the sub-themes in order to discuss potential approaches. The working group will have its initial meeting in the new year.

³ [The London Climate Summit - YouTube](#)

Climate change programme reports

10. The climate change lead boroughs have submitted their second set of reports to TEC, which are included at appendix 2, addressing highlights, challenges and lessons learned from the past six months, key milestones going forward and the risk management approach adopted.
11. At the June TEC meeting, it was noted that some lead boroughs had not yet secured a representative grouping of boroughs; this has now been resolved, with all programmes including boroughs from across London's sub-regions and political groups.

Programme highlights

12. All boroughs reported good progress with the set of governance structures, with a large number of meetings taking place to engage boroughs and other partners and finalise the programme action plans.
13. Lead boroughs have also secured a wide range of partners beyond the boroughs, across the public and private sectors and academic institutions. This reflects progress in understanding the stakeholder ecosystem for the programmes, which was raised as a challenge in June.
14. A number of lead boroughs have also noted good external engagement, including the launch of the Retrofit London programme (see paragraph 5), presentation at the Borough Climate Conference, to London Higher members, and at external conferences.
15. In developing their action plans, a number of lead boroughs have developed new evidence and data to guide their activity going forward; this reflects action on a concern raised in June around having data on the most effective interventions.
16. We expect that six out of the seven programmes – with the exception of Resilient and Green – will be able to meet the end of December deadline for a completed action plan. Some programmes have provided more detail on their approach in their programme reports.

Lessons learned

17. Lead boroughs continue to reflect and share on lessons learned. Two programmes have found it effective to appoint members of their Steering Group – boroughs and others – to lead on strands within the action plan; the importance of using their partners' networks to secure input and feedback on their plans has also been noted.

Challenges

18. Although there is strong engagement of boroughs going on across the programmes, lead boroughs remain concerned about maintaining strong ongoing engagement, which will be critical to success going forward.
19. Similarly, although engagement outside of boroughs is generally strong, some boroughs noted a lack of engagement from the GLA. This has been fed back will hopefully be addressed soon.
20. Capacity and resourcing continues to be raised by most programmes as a challenge, both in terms of current resourcing within lead boroughs, and the funding that will be needed to deliver capital works or projects going forward. Some lead boroughs are able to put their own resources into solving short-term capacity challenges, but there is overall a lack of collaborative resource. London Councils is looking to increase capacity through the new Programme Director role and increasingly, programmes are able to articulate their detailed resourcing requirements, as for example the One World Living programme has in their programme report below, which will support the development of funding strategies.
21. Other challenges noted were: administrative issues around meeting organisation and file sharing; the need to identify early deliverables in 2022; and the capacity to develop effective links across programmes.

Summary of key risks

22. Risks noted were similar to those outlined in June, although mitigation is developing.
23. Reflecting the challenges noted above, capacity remains a key risk – both within lead boroughs and in terms of engagement of other boroughs, including the timeline for completing action plans. Some good mitigation strategies are in place. Some lead boroughs – notably Low carbon

development and Resilient and green – felt that their programmes were struggling to achieve high priority across partner boroughs, and that collaboration was still a challenge.

24. Similar, the need to find significant funding for capital costs and projects was flagged as a risk to delivering the programmes' ambitions.

25. Other risks noted included:

- i. clarity on the roles and responsibilities across different regional partners and securing engagement from strategic partners;
- ii. securing the right technical capacity;
- iii. securing a supportive policy framework – locally and nationally;
- iv. in the long-term, securing public buy-in and behaviour change;
- v. ensuring that equalities considerations are embedded in the programmes;
- vi. avoiding duplication of effort and at the same time avoiding scope creep; and
- vii. ensuring that provision to support new green skills is aligned with focus sectors and is effectively developed and delivered.

UK government climate policy suite

26. Since our report to TEC in June, the Government has published its Net Zero Strategy, Heat and Buildings Strategy and the Net Zero Review (from Treasury). Together, these articulate the Government's approach to meeting its 2030 and 2035 carbon emissions reduction targets, building on the Prime Minister's 10 Point Plan for a Green Industrial Revolution.

27. The Net Zero Strategy in particular clearly recognises the 'essential' role of local government in delivering on net zero, the need for clarity around funding streams and greater capacity and takes steps to meet our asks for better coordination and dialogue. London Councils will actively engage with these processes going forward, seeking to develop action-orientated mechanisms to enable local government to deliver. This includes areas where our role is not yet clearly defined, for example around building the local green economy and skills. The direction on key areas such as planning, the role of hydrogen and behaviour change, are yet to be determined. We will continue to embed thinking around our seven climate change programmes, and their ability to act as exemplars for long-term, cross-cutting delivery.

28. The funding picture is less supportive, with limited new funds announced for local government net zero delivery, and less overall funding for areas like retrofitting than had been pledged. However, £300m was put forward to support the delivery of food waste services by local authorities. The Budget and Spending Review had very limited focus on net zero – for London or elsewhere – and did not meet the £30m ask from the UK Cities Climate Investment Commission (CCIC) (the partnership between Core Cities, London Councils and Connected Places Catapult on finding a financing solution for net zero), which would enable the partnership to develop a model that can ultimately draw in many times this amount in private sector investment, nor our request for support for the seven climate change programmes.

COP26 outcomes

29. COP26, hosted in Glasgow from 30th October – 13th November, produced a number of important outcomes. Most importantly, it is seen to have kept the Paris Agreement ambition not to exceed 1.5°C alive, although as COP President Alok Sharma admitted, 'the pulse is weak.' If countries meet their conditional and unconditional 'Nationally Determined Contributions' (to reducing emissions under the Climate Convention) for 2030, projected warming falls to 2.4°C; if longer-term promises are achieved – e.g. the UK's target of net zero by 2050, projected warming falls to 1.8°C.
30. The formal negotiations managed to conclude the 'Paris Rulebook' (which outlines, for example, how countries should account for emissions, the use of carbon markets and rules on transparency) and to adopt the Glasgow Climate Pact. The Pact is a political decision that aims to achieve more ambitious climate action, including urging parties to come back to COP27 with stronger carbon emissions reduction targets, calling on parties to 'at least double their collective provision of climate finance for adaptation', and highlighting 'the urgent need for multilevel and cooperative action', which includes the role of local government.

London Councils climate programme strategy

31. As outlined above, London Councils has achieved excellent outcomes in its key climate advocacy priorities in 2021; we will need to work to maintain the same momentum post-COP, and to build on these successes to secure delivery of the detailed policy framework and funding that can enable boroughs to deliver on their net zero targets. Our existing priorities will need to evolve to reflect

new government policy and opportunities, to reach new audiences and influencers (including parliamentarians) with compelling evidence of the need for change, and to reflect the breadth of our seven climate change programmes, whilst focusing resources to achieve tangible, positive outcomes.

32. In particular, green finance and work through the UK CCIC will continue to be a priority. We will use the momentum generated through COP and stakeholder engagement to accelerate identification of capacity needs within local government and funding to test our 'Net Zero Districts' demonstrators.
33. Strong partnerships have been a feature of our work in 2021, and will continue to be critical to our success, in London and on the national stage. We are already in the process of building some of these, for example with business organisations around commercial retrofit, with Sub-Regional Partnerships on green skills and employment, and with London's higher education institutions on data and practice across our net zero ambitions.
34. Equally, we should continue to make the case to Londoners for climate action, and the role of the boroughs. In 2022, we will develop and expand the reach of #BeTheSolution as a tool for boroughs, and develop narratives that support all Londoners to take action and move along a pathway to a sustainable lifestyle that responds to their needs and situation.
35. We will also seek to reach councillors with a wider suite of portfolios, to support understanding of how climate action plays into areas as diverse as education, public health and innovation.
36. In 2020 – 21, we have supported the lead boroughs to establish the seven climate change programmes, engage across their peers and draw in external partners, and we have established a governance structure that enables us to address cross-cutting issues and ensure the programmes are more than the sum of their parts. As noted above, we expect that six out of the seven programmes will have a complete action plan by the end of the year. The programmes are essential vehicles for our collective delivery, and in 2022 we need to support them to begin delivering action that can further build our collective capacity and effectiveness on net zero. To do this, we will need to support the programmes to address core capacity and funding needs, share

learning across all London' boroughs and partners, as well as highlighting the achievements to a wide audience.

37. We will transition the Emissions Accounting Task and Finish Group into a standing Working Group, which will support reporting based on the approach agreed at October TEC, address outstanding areas for which there is no agreed approach, including investments, and provide ongoing peer support between boroughs for this new area of work.

38. Finally, we will support work to ensure that London Councils is 'walking the talk' on climate, including agreeing an overarching climate change ambition for the organisation and support to staff and members to positively contribute to this agenda regardless of their position and circumstances.

Recommendations

39. The Committee is asked to:

- i. Note and comment on the paper; and
- ii. Comment on the proposals for the development of London Councils' Climate Change Programme Strategy (paragraphs 31 – 38)

Financial Implications

40. There are no specific financial implications arising from this report

Legal Implications

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

Equalities Implications

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

Appendix 1: Climate change narrative

1. We have a shared vision for a more connected city that is greener and lower carbon, more equal, healthy and resilient, and where all London's residents, business and diverse communities can thrive.
2. To deliver this vision, in 2021 we will be:
 - Working with Londoners to put their hopes, concerns and activities at the heart of London's climate action
 - Supporting our burgeoning green economy to help us build back better from Covid-19, creating markets for local businesses, good jobs for Londoners and innovation
 - Making the case that London should be a leading engine for the green recovery that supports and works alongside other cities, regions and international partners, putting a just transition at the centre of how we do this
 - Working in partnership with our diverse communities including young people, our businesses and the government

Appendix 2: Climate change programme reports

Climate change programme report: #1

Date: November 2021

Programme: Retrofit London

Lead borough(s): Enfield and Waltham Forest

Report by:

James McHugh, Head of Housing Strategy, james.mchugh@walthamforest.gov.uk

Dominic Millen, Head of Climate Action and Sustainability, dominic.millen@enfield.gov.uk

Contact officer: *As above*

Programme update: July – November 2021

Highlights

The Retrofit London Action Plan was launched at an online event on 26 October, with over 180 people attending to hear opening remarks from Mayor Glanville, as well as Matt Harrison from BEIS, before a presentation outlining the Programme and Action Plan. Joanne Drew, Director of Housing and Regeneration at Enfield, chaired a panel discussion which included the Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy and representatives from the Peabody Trust and London First.

Darren Welsh, Corporate Director of Housing at Waltham Forest, followed this up with a presentation to the Green Retrofitting and Property Decarbonisation Conference on 3 November.

In order to maintain the pace of programme delivery, the joint lead boroughs have invested a considerable level of time and resource to secure additional support to take forward:

- The preparation of the Implementation Plan; and
- Developing the appropriate delivery platform for a programme of this scale.

There is also a Practitioner's Group being established, which will build on the previous task and finish group, to bring together key stakeholders so that they can share best practice and guide the development of the next stages of the programme.

The next meeting of the Retrofit London Steering Group is due to take place on 14 December.

Challenges and lessons learned

The main challenges that have been identified in this period are the need for:

- Early deliverables which can be used to engage with a variety of stakeholders – these will be a key outcome of the Implementation Plan development.
- Additional background information to answer frequently asked questions – this was a takeaway from the Action Plan Launch and preparing responses will help identify gaps in knowledge and opportunities to enhance the Programme.

Key milestones

<i>Date</i>	<i>Milestone</i>	<i>Status</i>
Dec 2020	Project inception	Complete
Apr 2021	Draft action plan prepared and early engagement with key stakeholders	Complete
May 2021	Completion and dissemination of baseline analysis	Complete
May 2021	Engagement with Housing Director's Group	Complete
Sep 2021	Completion and wider engagement on the action plan	Complete
Oct 2021	Public launch event	Complete
Nov 2021	Initial development of implementation plan and related arrangements	Started
Nov 2021	Development of delivery approach	Started
Feb 2022	Implementation plan final drafting and engagement with stakeholders	Not started
Mar 2022	Ongoing delivery and monitoring starts	Not started

Risk management

There are two areas of ongoing risk which are being actively managed.

1. Programme support capacity, securing appropriate resources and agreeing a delivery platform. Currently they are being mitigated by:
 - Providing additional lead borough resources to increase programme support capacity. It should be noted that a longer-term solution is required – see below.
 - Requesting Government support for the programme, whilst continuing to liaise with partners about potential funding opportunities.
 - Working with stakeholders to better understand their views on the scope and reach of the programme, as well as where they see it being positioned.

2. Engagement and alignment with regional bodies and areas of work. This is currently being mitigated by involving key stakeholders, with clear articulation of roles and responsibilities part of the implementation plan development.

Climate change programme report: #2

Date: 19 November 2021

Programme: Low Carbon Development

Lead borough: Hackney

Report by: Rachel Weaver, Strategic Planning Officer, rachel.weaver@hackney.gov.uk

Contact officer: Rachel Weaver, Strategic Planning Officer, rachel.weaver@hackney.gov.uk

Programme update: July – November 2021

Highlights

- Successfully setting up the governance structure, with the establishment of a working group, bringing together sustainability specialists, planning officers, and senior management, to progress the action plan, and a steering group, involving heads of service, to oversee and provide guidance to the working group.
- Meetings held for both the working group and steering group in October and November.
- Well received presentation of the Low Carbon Development Action Plan at the Borough Climate Changes Conference on 19 October.
- Presentation to the London Higher members on 22 November.

Challenges and lessons learned

- Capacity - being able to manage the time requirements needed for this project - the actions will be shared amongst working group members going forward.
- Scheduling/availability of members of working/steering group - give a long-lead time for meetings.
- Technical issues with files and collaborative working between boroughs – ongoing.

Key milestones

- Working group to make final recommendations, and steering group to sign off action plan by end December.
- Completion of audit of existing borough Local Plans and climate change strategies of all London boroughs.
- Developing a partnership with a London Higher member to feed into the work and evidence of the action plan.

Risk management

- Capacity - single borough leadership - ongoing monitoring.
- Technical knowledge and skills - ensure we have input from those with the appropriate level of environmental/ climate change understanding.
- Building control representation - ensure that building control issues/crossover are understood and reflected in the work plan.
- Low priority - create buy-in from wider stakeholders/policy makers in the councils - build on the momentum and awareness that COP26 has created.
- Implementing low carbon policies - Covid economic impact on Councils budgets and the increase in inflation on building costs.

Climate change programme report: #3

Date: 11 November 2021

Programme: Low carbon transport

Lead borough(s): Royal Borough of Kingston and Westminster City Council

Report by:

Matthew Hill, Assistant Director, matthew.hill@kingston.gov.uk

Sarah Rye, Head of Public Realm, srye@westminster.gov.uk

Contact officers:

Hugh Brennan, Transport Programme Manager, hbrennan@westminster.gov.uk

Shadia Snelling, Strategy and Partnership Officer, shadia.snelling@kingston.gov.uk

Programme update: June – November 2021

Highlights

- A timetable of meetings are being set for the working group, Steering Group and Reference Group to prepare, consult and sign off the LCT action plan for submission end of December.
- Presentations have been given at the Borough Climate Conference (19 October 2021) setting out the draft Action Plan.
- Reviewed if the LCT Programme wished to make any material changes to the wording for the overall aim as set out in the Joint Statement on Climate Change.

Challenges and lessons learned

Challenges: Ensuring all transport sectors are involved in the consultation of the Action Plan

Lessons learned: Ensured the Steering Group actively uses their networks to share the draft Action Plan principles and ensure their feedback is integral and acknowledged in the final Action Plan.

Key milestones

Milestones	Date
Update Terms of Reference reflecting the approach to the Action Plan	November 2021
<p>Action Plan development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1st Formal LCT Programme Reference Group meeting: c6 boroughs equally spread across sub-regions and political representation defined the overarching Programme and Action Plan. 2. LCT Programme Steering Group Chair presented to Climate Oversight Group 3. Written update to TEC 4. LCT Programme Steering Group Chair present at Borough Climate Conference 5. London Higher Members meeting: Steering Group members presented 6. LCT Programme Steering Group meeting to review and update the draft Action Plan for wider stakeholder distribution. 7. Present to LEDNET Air Quality & Transport Cluster Chair - a member of the Steering Group. Note: Tuesday 2 November 2021 focus on fleet electrification and 6th December for feedback. 	<p>Meeting timetable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 16 September 2. 13 October 3. 14 October 4. 19 October 5. 22 November 6. W/c 29 November 7. 6 December

8. Present to LoTAG 9. Written update to TEC 10. 2nd Formal LCT Programme Reference Group Meeting for feedback 11. LCT Programme internal working group integrates and reflects feedback into the Action Plan. Sign off by Directors of lead boroughs 12. Submitted Final Action Plan	8. 7 December 9. 9 December 10. wk/c 13 December 11. wk/c 20 December 12. 24 December
Programme Delivery phase 1	January 2022 onwards

Risk management

Risk likelihood and impact rated from 1 (low) to 5 (high).

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Overall Risk	Mitigation
Different approaches and processes across and within councils stymie collaboration	2	2	4	Ensure that every opportunity is taken to liaise with other Council colleagues to overcome any barriers
Unable to adequately staff the programme and develop Action Plan	4	3	12	Support officers being redeployed (1 at WCC, 1 at Kingston) – interim consultant being considered and London Councils resource being considered
Unable to obtain sufficient funding to deliver identified programmes/projects	TBA	TBA	TBA	Once projects are established/scope of programme has been defined then funding can be commented on
Lack of public buy in	4	4	16	Depends on scope and scale of project / level of political differences (e.g. parking vs data)
Impact of economic context on travel behaviour	3	3	9	Depends on scope and scale of project
Difficulty securing cross-borough engagement with the action plan	3	3	9	Seek greater understanding of political and geographical differences between boroughs

Unable to secure effective collaboration across different climate programmes with shared objectives/co-dependencies	3	3	9	Greater promotion and understanding of needs and overarching goals
Unable to achieve national policy asks e.g. slower than expected technological progress	2	3	6	Public sector services and fleets are rapidly moving towards becoming zero carbon – concerns about private individuals being able to match this. Lobby Government/ TfL
Unable to persuade strategic partners to collaborate	1	2	2	Education/ incentivisation
Equalities considerations	2	2	2	Need for Councils to better understand the challenges faced by certain communities/ groups/ neighbourhoods
Unable to monitor progress against the objectives throughout the life of the Programme	3	2	6	
Willingness to push difficult policies	3	3	9	

Action plan details

- Active meetings to prepare the Action Plan with the working Group, refining the text with the Steering Group. Using online sharing of documents and active editing.
- Structure consultation with the Reference Group by theme/ objective/ principles to sense check and identify gaps and agree on areas of strength which need little or no action for preparing and finalising the Action Plan
- Consider the use of online Jam Boards with Reference Group, comments box and minutes to record discussion and feedback
- Record feedback from wider consultees from the minutes of their meetings.

Climate change programme report: #4

Date: 18 November 2021

Programme: Renewable Power for London

Lead borough(s): Islington

Report by: Ashwin Patel, Senior Energy Advice Officer, ashwin.patel@islington.gov.uk

Contact officer: Ashwin Patel, Senior Energy Advice Officer, ashwin.patel@islington.gov.uk

Programme update: July – November 2021

Highlights

- Recruited diverse mix of boroughs and external partners to Working and Steering groups for the ambition. Held inaugural kick off meetings in June and July for both groups and approved terms of references.
- Held a workshop in August with expert speakers across the three work streams and facilitated breakout sessions to help generate action plan ideas.
- Wrote a first draft of the action plan based on the outputs of the workshop.
- Recruited 'work stream sponsors' for each work stream to help further refine and draft the action plan and act as the conduit between the steering and working group.
 - Energy Advice: Sutton
 - Decentralised Energy: Hounslow
 - Accessing or Buying More Renewable Energy: Laser Energy
- Produced plan to approve the action plan by the end of the calendar year with a number of working and steering group meetings scheduled.
- Successful round of working group meetings held for each work stream w/c 1 November and a steering board meeting 12 November.

Challenges and lessons learned

Major Challenges:

- The logistics and resources required to organise the workshop.

- Ensuring high levels of participation across the three different work streams; we had few participants in the energy advice work stream at the workshop. Numbers for this have now been bolstered.
- Using the outputs of the workshop to start to formulate and draft the action plan.
- Limited staffing resources within the council to drive forward the programme.
- Gaining GLA engagement and feedback.

Lessons learnt:

- To obtain an idea of work stream preferences before the workshop to see which work stream we need to attract more participants to.

Key milestones

- w/c 1 November: Working Group meetings for each work stream to further develop action plan and produce first draft of action plan.
- 12 November: Steering board meeting with question/challenge session for each work stream.
- w/c 22 November: Working Group meetings to review feedback from Steering Group and develop key risks/issues with the action plan.
- 15 December: Steering Group meeting to approve final draft of action plan.

Risk management

Risk	Probability (out of 5)	Impact (out of 5)	Score (P x I)	Mitigation
Lack of borough engagement	3-2	4	12-8	Good amount of engagement from boroughs at the working, steering group and workshop meetings. The challenge now will be keeping those levels of engagement by listening to feedback, helping boroughs to feel empowered and demonstrating progress.
Un-balanced mix of boroughs	4-1	2	8-2	Balanced mix of boroughs have been recruited to the working and steering groups. Diverse views now need to be incorporated into plans so they are felt heard to keep boroughs engaged.
Insufficient time to develop and approve the	2	5	10	A timeline has been produced to have the action plan approved by the end of the

actions plans by the end of the year				calendar year but the timetable for this is quite tight.
Insufficient levels of resources to drive the program forward	4	5	20	Resources that will be required going forward will be asked for in the approved action plan but at the moment there is no indication of where the funding will come from and hasn't been secured.

Climate change programme report: #5

Date: 19 November 2021

Programme: One World Living – Reducing London's Consumption Emissions

Lead borough: Harrow

Report by: Matthew Adams, Head of Natural Resources & Climate, matthew.adams@harrow.gov.uk

Contact officer: As above

Programme update: July – November 2021

Highlights

- The **Programme Steering Group** was established in July and has met monthly. It includes representation from Harrow, West London Waste Authority (WLWA), Ellen MacArthur Foundation, Imperial College, Suez, ReLondon, the GLA and the four theme lead organisations.
- **Theme leads** have been appointed for Plastics (Richmond), Food (Hackney), Textiles (WLWA, supported by Wandsworth) and Electricals (Hammersmith & Fulham). The aviation theme has not been advanced as part of this first phase of work and will be considered further in 2022.
- Around 20 organisations responded to our **programme baseline survey** of existing initiatives detailing over 150 projects across the four initial thematic areas and cross-cutting projects. This data, along with the **Leeds research on London borough-based consumption emissions** was shared with theme leads to inform development and prioritisation of actions.

- Each theme lead convened **theme working groups** this autumn to develop actions in their area. The **initial programme action plan** is due to be adopted by the steering group by the end of 2021. Further details of the emerging actions / key activity types are given below.
- The programme has identified the need for **£998,000 per annum** for the first two years of the programme; if funded directly by boroughs, this would equate to a contribution of around £30,000 per annum from each borough.

Challenges and lessons learned

London-wide participation: the theme lead model has been a positive step in terms of extending the ownership of the programme more widely across London boroughs. Ten boroughs are currently involved either directly in the steering group or as part of the theme working groups. The challenge going forwards will be to ensure active and wide engagement across remaining London boroughs as part of the implementation of actions.

Programme capacity and resource: the scope and ambition of the programme is extensive, and success depends upon maintaining engagement with a wide stakeholder group. In order to ensure momentum is maintained into 2022 and beyond it is clear that dedicated coordination capacity will be required both at an overall programme level and in each of the four initial theme focus areas. In addition, as business cases are developed for specific actions and interventions there will be funding requirements to enable pilot projects to proceed. An initial core programme budget for staffing and centrally co-ordinated implementation of a select number of projects for the first two years of the programme is set out for information below.

This coordination capacity and project budget will enable the programme to be developed and its reach extended over the next two years. However, members should be aware that some of the more extensive actions potentially in scope (for example scaling up collection infrastructure, new community hubs or widespread roll out of successful pilot initiatives like the Library of Things) will have significant additional financial implications that will need to be scoped and specific funding strategies developed for discussion with boroughs.

Key milestones

December 2021	Initial Action Plan agreed by the Programme Steering Group
	Report to TEC and request for comment

January – June 2022	Programme Steering Group to continue to meet monthly
	Theme Working Groups to prioritise initial low-cost actions and identify outstanding data gaps
	Commence implementation of low-cost actions
	Recruit core co-ordination team (subject to funding agreement)
July 2022 onwards	Core team and central programme budget in place, scale up delivery of key actions

Risk management

Duplication of effort: the baseline survey has helped to establish the breadth of existing activity across London and those organisations that need to be involved as stakeholders for each of the themes. This has included alignment with current and planned ReLondon workstreams (e.g. the Material Flow Analysis projects). There remain overlaps with individual borough initiatives, but the programme will aim to minimise these through engagement with all boroughs as we commence implementation of key actions.

Systemic change: the programme has a very high level of ambition. It is clear that achieving this will involve major changes to consumption habits across London. This in turn requires significant commitment from local authorities, the public and other economic actors in order to achieve the necessary level of long-term systemic change that is required. There is a risk that the programme is perceived by the public as top down behaviour change initiative and fails. To address this, the discovery and planning phase over the last three months (informed by the emissions data and baselining survey) has helped to identify initial actions that particularly enable and scale bottom up change.

Action Plan details

Overall Programme approach

In order to achieve maximum impact through facilitating change at scale, the Programme Steering Group has agreed a set of core propositions as follows:

- The programme intent is to facilitate bottom up change by enabling the scaling up of many small individual consumption actions and together make a big change.
- The programme outcome is to identify and act on those points of intervention where local authorities can help remove barriers and enable this bottom up change. This will be both direct actions and lobbying actions to remove upstream barriers.
- The programme engagement strategy is to tell stories about, and articulate a vision for, future sustainable lifestyles that engages head, hands and hearts, around which actions can be structured.

Action Plan development and overview

The Programme Steering Group established a common approach to action development, based upon three stages as follows:

- (a) establishing a **baseline** and identifying key challenges / barriers and opportunities in each area;
- (b) developing a **vision** for the theme based upon what success would look like in 2030; and (c) identifying the **key actions** for that theme for the first two years of the programme, grouped via overarching action areas or 'pillars' for each thematic area

All theme leads have employed this agreed approach in developing the initial programme actions via the theme working groups.

Individual theme actions and pillars are currently being reviewed by the Programme Steering Group with a view to agreeing the overall action plan by the end of 2021.

Looking across the emerging individual theme actions, the Programme Steering Group has identified a range of common activity types and key points of intervention by local authorities, as follows:

1. **PLACES:** London boroughs provide / enable physical space and infrastructure across our areas where activity can happen (e.g. repair / re-use hubs, collection points, spaces for local growing initiatives).
2. **SERVICES:** London boroughs proactively use their existing waste and other services to incentivise and enable a culture of sustainable consumption (e.g. via a consistent approach to collection of food waste and flexible packaging, restricting residual waste where appropriate).

3. **CIRCULAR ECONOMY AND GREEN SKILLS:** London boroughs are supporting the growth across London of green skills and businesses working in the circular economy (e.g. training in the repair and re-use sectors).
4. **INFORMATION & ENGAGEMENT:** London boroughs use their networks and convening power to engage with their communities and provide good, consistent and clear information on how residents and organisations can contribute to reducing consumption emissions (e.g. a pan London healthy and sustainable diet campaign).
5. **OUR ORGANISATIONS:** London boroughs are 'walking the talk' as organisations and reducing our own consumption emissions (e.g. via low carbon procurement, best in class organisational policies around resource management).
6. **REGULATION & POLICY:** One voice for London - boroughs work with stakeholders to develop consistent and united lobbying and policy asks of others to influence upstream changes (e.g. engagement with local retailers to provide re-fill and no packaging options).

Implementation plans are being developed for individual actions within these categories and these will be reviewed by the Programme Steering Group in early 2022 in order to identify pilot projects across the programme that are suitable for prioritisation, where funding is available. Where possible, opportunities will also be sought to join up action of similar types across the themes.

Business cases will be developed for those actions that require more extensive funding, with options considered by the Programme Steering Group and reported to boroughs in due course.

As highlighted above, dedicated co-ordination capacity will be required both at an overall programme level and in each of the four initial theme focus areas. In addition, as implementation plans are developed for specific actions and interventions there will be funding requirements to enable pilot projects to proceed. The Programme has therefore identified the need for an initial programme budget of £998,000 per annum for 22/23 and 23/24, comprising a Programme Coordination, four Theme Lead Project Coordinators and a core budget of £150k per theme to enable to enable pilot projects.

The development of funding options to meet this need will be an early focus of the programme in 2022, including identification of existing aligned spend within boroughs, partners and the wider London community, both public and private sector.

Climate change programme report: #6

Date 22 November 2021

Programme: Green Economy

Lead borough(s): LB Hounslow

Report by: Steven Wilding (Programme Manager- Green Recovery)

Reviewed by: Victoria Lawson (Executive Director of Environment, Culture and Customer Services)

Contact officer: Steven Wilding

Programme update: Highlight Report

Highlights

Vision

LB Hounslow is working alongside GLA, London Councils and WPI Economics on a working definition of “Green Economy” applicable to London. The objective is to have an agreed definition to share with all boroughs as an output of GLA and London Councils Green Economy workshop 9 December 2021. A steering group workshop meeting 24 November 2021 will seek alignment on the four pillars for the Green Economy Action Plan as focus for doubling of the Green Economy aligned to the Green New Deal mission:

- Green Jobs and Green Skills
- Green Economic Growth
- Green Enterprise and Innovation
- Green Finance and Investment

Data and evidence

LB Hounslow is utilising the following commissioned research and strategy papers to inform the Green Economy Action Plan:

- WPI/Centre Forward London - Green Jobs and Skills in London
- LGA- Local green jobs- accelerating a sustainable economic recovery
- Eunomia- City Investment Analysis Report
- Inner Circle- Green Recovery and Skills Scoping
- Sub regional partnership reports and survey data (pending)

In addition, LB Hounslow supported by London Councils is doing primary research in the form of bi-lateral conversations and workshops to gain more qualitative data on initiatives underway or in discovery phase to support acceleration of the Green Economy.

Innovation/ engagement

LB Hounslow developed iLabs (Innovation Labs) which the programme will utilise early in 2022 together with the steering group to help shape and define new demonstrator projects and pilots aligned to the recommendations of draft action plan.

Update on action and timelines

The draft action plan will focus on a two-year period for implementation of recommendations to begin the acceleration of just, green transition working towards 2030:

- Green Skills and Green Economy Survey - deadline 26 November 2021
- GLA/London Councils Green Jobs and Skills Workshop - 9 December 2021
- Draft published Action Plan - 24 December 2021
- Sub-Regional Partnership Reports – 31 December 2021
- Review and implementation workshop - February/March 2022

Challenges and lessons learned

LB Hounslow has established a good baseline for growth sectors which can contribute to low carbon and net zero growth to 2030 alongside sectors at risk from contraction and job losses. Obvious opportunities exist to upskill and reskill persons from at risk employment to well paid, stable, and skilled jobs contributing to net zero carbon 2030 goals. The challenge for London boroughs is partnering with education and training providers who have the course delivery capability and private sector business to ensure courses meet skills gap and offer a credible pathway to employment or further training.

A collective effort is required to uplift the perception of roles in certain sectors such as transport, horticulture, manufacturing, and construction which have been devalued for decades in favour of roles typically associated as professional ones within the knowledge economy. This requires looking at remuneration but also creation of varied and attractive options for career development. Green careers not just green jobs.

Stimulating emerging businesses relevant to green enterprise and innovation requires development of relationships with academia and research institutions. These are needed to support businesses to rapidly move through discovery, testing, pilot, and proof of concept phases to understand early the likelihood of commercial viability. This allows good ideas to be scaled up and unsuitable ideas to fail

quickly. Aligned to this further collective action is required to ensure finance and investment models support businesses promoting green economic growth.

Risk management

Risk	Mitigation
Unclear definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition of Green Economy collaboratively agreed and tension between national and local context challenged.
Resource capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective galvanising resource across London to address the action plan.
Scope creep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taking time to clearly define deliverables Engaging other boroughs early in the process to ensure project is defined according to broader need. Agreement on role of local government and exclusions from programme scope.
Upskilling does not translate to immediate employment opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment of growth and at-risk sectors with skills need and course offering. Further research to assure viability of courses and involvement of private sector business to input into courses.

Climate change programme report: #7

Date: 19 November 2021

Programme: Resilient & Green London

Lead borough(s): Southwark

Report by: Tom Sharland, Climate Change Programme Lead, tom.sharland@southwark.gov.uk

Contact officer: Chris Page, Climate Change Director, chris.page@southwark.gov.uk

Programme update: Oct - Nov 2021

Highlights

London Councils have produced a draft action plan, this follows on from the convening of the 'Resilient and Green Working Group' in 2020, feedback from which has helped shape the draft. London Councils and Southwark met in April 2021 to review the plan, which has now formally been handed over to the borough.

Southwark have established a working group which met for the first time in September and again in October. The group contains representatives from London Councils, Environment Agency, GLA, TfL, London Climate Change Partnership (LCCP), LB Bromley, City of London, LB Hammersmith & Fulham and LB Hounslow.

The group have agreed a Terms of Reference, reviewed the structure of the action plan and provided comments on the 10-year work plan. The feedback is with LB Southwark to amend the action plan. A further meeting is required to review the detail of the 2021-23 priority actions, prior to finalising the document.

Challenges and lessons learned

Southwark presented a programme update to the lead officers of other work programmes at the September meeting of the Climate Officer Coordination Group. As a follow up to this, 121 meetings with other programmes will be arranged to ensure collective review of identified actions, and that cross-cutting actions are identified and referenced across programmes. This will help to reduce silo working and ensure sharing of knowledge.

Key milestones

- Steering group call for members – Jul 21
- Initial working group meeting – Sep 21
- Second working group meeting – Oct 21
- Initial steering group meeting – TBC
- Action Plan review – Sep-Dec 21
- Action Plan sign off – Dec 21*

Risk management

Lack of resource at councils to be able to join and/or contribute meaningfully to steering group and action plan review. LB Enfield have had to pull out of the steering group due to workload and a lack of available time to positively contribute. It is also unclear if LB Hounslow will be able to continue.

In order to mitigate this Southwark is promoting the group at a senior officer level, to increase awareness and buy-in. However, there have been resource implications that have also prevented the steering group from meeting.

*Resource limitations with LB Southwark have not allowed work to progress as quickly as planned. There is a risk that the action plan will not be finalised by the Dec 21 deadline.

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

Traffic Signals Maintenance Budget Item No: 11 2022/23

Report by: Mital Patel **Job title:** Transport Officer
Date: 9 December 2021
Contact Officer: Mital Patel
Telephone: 020 7934 9647 **Email:** mital.patel@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report sets out the forecasted costs to boroughs of maintaining traffic signals in London in 2022/23 and seeks agreement to the apportionment of those costs to each authority.

Recommendations: The Committee is recommended to:

- Agree the total cost to boroughs for maintaining traffic signals in London for 2022/23, which is £12,536,573.42 as shown in Appendix 1.
 - To note the correction made to the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea's (RBK&C) asset register, as shown in Appendix 3.
 - Agree that this cost is apportioned between boroughs based on the agreed formula and transition arrangements, as shown in Appendix 4.
-

Background

1. Under the terms of the Greater London Authority (GLA) Act 1999, Transport for London (TfL) recharges the London boroughs its reasonable costs for maintaining traffic signals on borough roads.
2. 29% of all traffic signals are on the TLRN (Transport for London Road Network) and 71% are on the boroughs' networks.
3. In December 2018, TEC agreed a revised approach to calculating the costs to be reimbursed to TfL to more accurately reflect actual costs incurred.
4. In October 2019, TEC agreed to a new model for apportioning traffic signal costs to each authority based on the average of costs apportioned by the number of traffic signal

controllers and population. To help smooth significant changes in apportioned amounts for some authorities, a four-year transition period from the old model of apportionment to the new was agreed. 2022/23 will be the third year of the four-year transition period.

Traffic Signals Maintenance Budget 2022/23

5. The total Traffic Signals calculations are based on actual TfL costs, some of which are directly attributed to sites (where possible), whilst others are apportioned by traffic signal controller numbers.
6. The inflation rate applied to the contract rates for 2022/23 is a CPI figure of 1.00%
7. Appendix 1 shows the total budget costs to boroughs for maintaining traffic signals in London for 2022/23, calculated to be £12,536,573.42 representing an 11.3% increase on the 2021/22 costs. *(This is an unadjusted total for comparison purposes only and does not include any reconciliations, which is explained later in this report)*
8. Appendix 2 provides a full and detailed breakdown of the 11.3% increase against the previous year's forecasted budget of £11,264,122.44.

Reconciliations against the Traffic Signals Maintenance Budget 2022/23

9. Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea (RBK&C) identified an error with their total controller sites in the 2020/21 Asset Register compiled by TfL, whereby six sites were listed to be on the borough's road network as opposed to the TLRN. These six sites had been inadvertently included as part of the budget calculations based on the Year 1 transition model (75% Old Model and 25% New Model) and charged to RBK&C in error. It was agreed that the Year 1 model would be recalculated, and an adjustment be made in the 2022/23 budget to reflect this.
10. In order to reconcile this error and put all 33 boroughs in the correct financial position, London Councils recalculated the 2020/21 budget against the corrected asset register. RBK&C were overcharged by £7,062.11 and the remaining boroughs undercharged by their apportionment percentages, totalling the same amount.
11. Appendix 3 shows the final proposed budget due for payment (borough by borough), after correcting the apportionment for the RBK&C error and the full workings are illustrated in Appendix 4, under Tab 1 "Budget + RBK&C Correction".
12. Appendix 5, which details TfL's proposed budget for 2022/23, along with the full asset register for all 33 boroughs has been shared with the borough officers but can be made available to members upon request.
13. In most years, London Councils and TfL have agreed to 'reconcile' budgeted costs against the actual outturn. This year however, due to a TfL 'asset' based calculation error in the Traffic Signals Maintenance Budget 2020/21 (which London Councils queried at the time), the reconciliations would have led to an adverse impact on all 33 boroughs if accepted. After consulting with TfL, London Councils has decided not include the reconciliation of these costs and the total budget of £11,019,852.37 will remain as is. Therefore, the boroughs' apportioned contributions for 2020/21 will be treated as the final "Actual" Traffic Signals Maintenance for 2020/21.

Financial Implications for London Councils

14. There are no financial implications for London Councils. This report concerns payments from the boroughs to TfL that are required under the GLA Act 1999 (see below).

Legal Implications for London Councils

15. Section 275 (3) of the GLA Act 1999 states that in relation to the Transfer of London Traffic Control System to Transport for London: "Any expenses reasonably incurred by or on behalf of Transport for London in the exercise, in relation to roads which are not GLA roads, of the functions transferred by this section may be recovered by Transport for London from the London borough councils and the Common Council in such proportions as may be agreed between Transport for London and those authorities or, in default of agreement, as may be determined by Transport for London."

Equalities Implications for London Councils

16. There are no equalities implications arising from this report.

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Traffic Signals Maintenance Budget for 2022/23
- Appendix 2: Traffic Signals Maintenance Budget 2022/23 comparison against 2021/22
- Appendix 3: "*** Reconciled** Borough by Borough Traffic Signals Maintenance Costs for 2022/23 (with RBK&C Correction)
- Appendix 4: Traffic Signals Maintenance Apportionment Calculations 2022/23 with RBK&C Correction
- Appendix 5: TfL's 2022/23 Proposed Budget and Asset Register (***available upon request***)

Appendix 1

Traffic Signals Maintenance Budget for 2022/23

CPI for March 1.00%

ITEM	TRAFFIC SIGNALS TOTAL COSTS	FORECAST/£
1	Lump sum forecast including BT line costs: <i>These are the actual contract costs for each piece of equipment at each site. The costs are inflated by CPI for March of the proceeding financial year. This figure will be reconciled to the actual CPI in the following year's calculation and suitable adjustments will be made.</i> Please see attached spreadsheet (Appendix 3): These are shown in a tab for each of the Boroughs, for transparency - TfL's maintained sites have also been included. (Due to commercial restrictions, a breakdown of the cost of the individual piece of equipment cannot be provided.)	£9,693,678.71
2	Lump sum performance bonus net of performance abatements forecast: <i>Written into the contract are:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capped bonuses for good performance • Abatements for poor performance. <i>These figures have been forecast for next year based on actuals from this year. This figure will be reconciled to the actual bonus/abatement made in the following year's calculation and suitable adjustments will be made.</i>	£750,000.00
3	Energy forecast: <i>This is based on current equipment with an estimated inflation rate for the following year. (Due to the way TfL are charged for the electricity, they are unable to break this down site by site and therefore apportioned).</i>	£5,621,945.76
4	Ordered maintenance costs forecast (net of recoveries): <i>All non-lump sum activities are funded from this, including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where Road Traffic Incident (RTI) damage is over the cost of £1k • Third party damage • Switch outs • Graffiti removal • Minor civils works to enable a site to be maintained • Electrical testing <i>This is netted off against the respective recoveries made from insurance claims and switch outs. Due to the nature of the work, this is apportioned.</i>	£1,870,648.41
5	Commuted sums: <i>(Due to how TfL currently account for this, they have been unable to list this by site, therefore have apportioned this figure)</i> <i>It has been deemed reasonable not to include the following costs:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff costs – no staff time for any of the operations, network performance, or asset management personnel associated with traffic signals are included, c. £6million. • SCOOT loop costs – the costs of replacing SCOOT loops have not been included in the calculation, c. £2.5million. 	-£271,663.29
6	Royal Parks recoveries	-£35,677.96
	TOTAL:	£17,628,931.63

BOROUGH COSTS	FORECAST/£
Lump sum forecast including BT line costs (1tem 1 above)	£6,879,603.78
Apportioned costs by Controller numbers (Items 2-6 above)	£5,656,969.65
TOTAL BOROUGH COSTS:	£12,536,573.43

Appendix 2

Traffic Signals Maintenance Budget 2022/23 comparison against 2021/22

ITEM	2021/22 FORECAST/£ March CPI 1.50%	2022/23 FORECAST/£ March CPI 1.00%	TRAFFIC SIGNALS 2022/23 TOTAL ITEMISED BUDGET AGAINST 2021/22
1	£10,460,938.70	£9,693,678.71	Lump sum forecast including BT line costs: Decrease of £767,259.99 <i>This is due the Scoot loop maintenance cost being included in the 2021/22 forecast (to be reconciled against the 2023/24 Budget).</i>
2	£578,686.60	£750,000.00	Lump sum performance bonus net of performance abatements forecast: Increase of £171,313.40 <i>This is due to the contractors performing better than in previous years.</i>
3	£4,517,484.93	£5,621,945.76	Energy forecast: Increase of £1,104,460.83 <i>TfL is on a fixed price across all their assets and no longer receive any cost savings from the Power company that can be forwarded on to the boroughs.</i>
4	£1,300,511.72	£1,870,648.41	Ordered maintenance costs forecast (net of recoveries): Increase of £570,136.69 <i>Due to COVID-19 lockdown restrictions, recoveries were considerably lower due to fewer people on the road networks and the Insurance companies progressing fewer cases. TfL is anticipating that the road networks will not see a full return to pre-pandemic in 2022/23, which in turn, will lead to fewer insurance recoveries for damaged assets.</i>
5	-£400,181.22	-£271,663.29	Commuted sums: Increase of £128,517.93 <i>Since 2017, TfL has requested Commuted sums from Developers for installing assets on the road network to protect the boroughs and TfL to reduce maintenance costs. There has been a marked downturn in acceptance from developers for the commuted maintenance.</i>
6	-£29,854.04	-£35,677.96	Royal Parks recoveries: Decrease of £5,823.92 <i>This is due to TfL claiming for the communication lines for sites not previously recovered.</i>
	£16,427,586.69	£17,628,931.63	TOTAL OVERALL INCREASE: £1,201,344.94

2021/22 FORECAST/£	2022/23 FORECAST/£	BOROUGH COSTS
£6,982,748.46	£6,879,603.78	Lump sum forecast including BT line costs (Item 1 above): Decrease of £103,144.68 <i>Due to a calculation error made by TfL in the 2021/22 lump sum forecast for the boroughs, 66% of the maintenance and comms was charged back to the boroughs as opposed to 70.90% and therefore, 2021/22 forecast borough costs were calculated incorrectly. The costs for 2021/22 should have been c.£7.41m and not c.£6.98m</i>
£4,281,373.98	£5,656,969.65	Apportioned costs by Controller numbers (Items 2-6 above): Increase of £1,375,595.67

		<i>This increase is due to Items 2 – 5 above, being £1.2m greater than 2021/22 for the reasons provided above.</i>
£11,264,122.44	£12,536,573.42	TOTAL BOROUGH INCREASE: £1,272,450.98 (11.3%)

Appendix 3

**** Reconciled** Borough by Borough Traffic Signals Maintenance Costs for 2022/23**
(with RBK&C Correction)

Borough	2022/23 **RECONCILED** Budget
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham	£327,866.37
London Borough of Barnet	£503,415.28
London Borough of Bexley	£300,198.26
London Borough of Brent	£477,665.97
London Borough of Bromley	£419,406.14
London Borough of Camden	£422,700.57
City of London	£99,212.14
London Borough of Croydon	£499,261.29
London Borough of Ealing	£502,658.15
London Borough of Enfield	£400,910.41
Royal Borough of Greenwich	£435,465.57
London Borough of Hackney	£346,865.26
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham	£287,889.90
London Borough of Haringey	£394,085.58
London Borough of Harrow	£325,137.71
London Borough of Havering	£389,015.72
London Borough of Hillingdon	£434,479.33
London Borough of Hounslow	£346,929.96
London Borough of Islington	£289,680.55
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea	£238,064.99
Royal Borough of Kingston	£281,876.26
London Borough of Lambeth	£391,640.20
London Borough of Lewisham	£331,521.60
London Borough of Merton	£339,063.66
London Borough of Newham	£500,812.75
London Borough of Redbridge	£437,292.94
London Borough of Richmond	£345,689.80
London Borough of Southwark	£427,542.37
London Borough of Sutton	£295,407.86
London Borough of Tower Hamlets	£346,200.37
London Borough of Waltham Forest	£403,028.31
London Borough of Wandsworth	£388,188.24
Westminster City Council	£607,399.87
TOTAL:	£12,536,573.42

Year 3 of the Transition Period 2022/23 (25% Old Model + 75% New Model) with Refund to Kensington & Chelsea for the Controller Error

	Old Model		2022-23 Year 3 Transitional Apportionment				2022/23 Budget based on 50/50 Controllers and Population %s (Column C + ColumnE)	2022/23 (Year 3) Budget Costs of a 4 Year Transition (25% Old Model + 75% New Model)	Adjusted difference for K&C Controller Error	FINAL 2022/23 Traffic Signals Budget to be Paid
Borough	2019/20 % against Old Model	2019/20 Costs (against Old Model %s)	2022/23 % of Controllers	2022/23 Costs based on % of Controllers	2022/23 % of Mid-20 ONS Population	2022/23 Costs based on % Mid-20 ONS Population				
Barking & Dagenham	2.46%	£308,832.07	2.95%	£370,263.80	2.38%	£298,158.48	£334,211.14	£327,866.37	£188.27	£328,054.64
Barnet	3.94%	£493,809.50	3.65%	£457,590.17	4.43%	£555,644.23	£506,617.20	£503,415.28	£289.07	£503,704.35
Bexley	2.75%	£344,707.04	1.78%	£223,555.50	2.77%	£347,168.50	£285,362.00	£300,198.26	£172.38	£300,370.64
Brent	3.59%	£450,578.42	4.12%	£516,972.10	3.64%	£456,418.22	£486,695.16	£477,665.97	£274.29	£477,940.26
Bromley	3.91%	£490,034.36	2.62%	£328,347.14	3.70%	£463,379.67	£395,863.41	£419,406.14	£240.83	£419,646.98
Camden	3.02%	£378,632.97	3.87%	£485,534.61	3.10%	£389,244.93	£437,389.77	£422,700.57	£242.73	£422,943.30
City Of London	0.64%	£80,584.09	1.56%	£195,611.06	0.12%	£15,231.90	£105,421.48	£99,212.14	£56.97	£99,269.11
Croydon	4.36%	£546,165.75	3.40%	£426,152.68	4.32%	£541,100.26	£483,626.47	£499,261.29	£286.69	£499,547.98
Ealing	3.97%	£498,054.74	4.26%	£534,437.37	3.78%	£473,947.86	£504,192.62	£502,658.15	£288.64	£502,946.79
Enfield	3.47%	£435,265.58	2.51%	£314,374.93	3.71%	£464,542.46	£389,458.69	£400,910.41	£230.21	£401,140.63
Greenwich	3.19%	£399,332.13	3.93%	£492,520.72	3.21%	£402,499.39	£447,510.06	£435,465.57	£250.06	£435,715.63
Hackney	3.08%	£386,690.06	2.20%	£275,951.32	3.12%	£391,229.34	£333,590.33	£346,865.26	£199.18	£347,064.44
Hammersmith & Fulham	2.24%	£280,882.32	2.59%	£324,854.09	2.04%	£255,597.43	£290,225.76	£287,889.90	£165.31	£288,055.21
Haringey	2.91%	£365,014.36	3.48%	£436,631.84	2.96%	£370,920.14	£403,775.99	£394,085.58	£226.29	£394,311.88
Harrow	2.70%	£338,568.94	2.31%	£289,923.54	2.80%	£351,397.73	£320,660.64	£325,137.71	£186.70	£325,324.41
Havering	3.22%	£403,810.16	3.23%	£405,194.35	2.90%	£362,974.15	£384,084.25	£389,015.72	£223.38	£389,239.11
Hillingdon	3.36%	£421,766.48	3.57%	£447,111.01	3.43%	£430,322.90	£438,716.95	£434,479.33	£249.49	£434,728.82
Hounslow	2.70%	£337,997.39	2.56%	£321,361.04	3.02%	£378,453.93	£349,907.48	£346,929.96	£199.22	£347,129.17
Islington	2.43%	£305,113.58	1.78%	£223,555.50	2.76%	£345,516.92	£284,536.21	£289,680.55	£166.34	£289,846.89
Kensington & Chelsea	2.18%	£273,542.36	1.87%	£234,034.67	1.74%	£218,443.73	£226,239.20	£238,064.99	£7,062.11	£231,002.88
Kingston	1.95%	£245,064.56	2.70%	£338,826.31	1.99%	£249,467.35	£294,146.83	£281,876.26	£161.86	£282,038.12
Lambeth	3.50%	£438,497.61	2.42%	£303,895.76	3.57%	£448,146.37	£376,021.06	£391,640.20	£224.89	£391,865.09
Lewisham	3.15%	£394,924.67	1.56%	£195,611.06	3.39%	£425,163.43	£310,387.25	£331,521.60	£190.37	£331,711.97
Merton	2.57%	£322,453.04	3.20%	£401,701.29	2.29%	£287,499.77	£344,600.53	£339,063.66	£194.70	£339,258.36
Newham	3.62%	£454,257.48	4.29%	£537,930.43	3.95%	£494,731.93	£516,331.18	£500,812.75	£287.58	£501,100.33
Redbridge	3.47%	£434,791.50	3.59%	£450,604.06	3.40%	£425,649.44	£438,126.75	£437,292.94	£251.10	£437,544.04
Richmond	2.59%	£324,403.50	3.43%	£429,645.73	2.20%	£275,924.74	£352,785.24	£345,689.80	£198.50	£345,888.31
Southwark	3.46%	£433,909.98	3.23%	£405,194.35	3.55%	£445,645.32	£425,419.83	£427,542.37	£245.51	£427,787.87
Sutton	2.33%	£291,918.75	2.42%	£303,895.76	2.31%	£289,246.05	£296,570.90	£295,407.86	£169.63	£295,577.50
Tower Hamlets	2.63%	£329,836.38	1.92%	£241,020.78	3.69%	£462,289.29	£351,655.03	£346,200.37	£198.80	£346,399.16
Waltham Forest	3.19%	£399,637.30	3.37%	£422,659.62	3.08%	£385,657.68	£404,158.65	£403,028.31	£231.43	£403,259.74
Wandsworth	3.42%	£429,100.22	2.31%	£289,923.54	3.66%	£459,178.29	£374,550.92	£388,188.24	£222.91	£388,411.15
Westminster	3.98%	£498,396.17	7.27%	£911,687.28	3.00%	£375,781.59	£643,734.44	£607,399.87	£348.78	£607,748.65
TOTAL:	100%	£12,536,573.42	100%	£12,536,573.42	100%	£12,536,573.42	£12,536,573.42	£12,536,573.42	£0.00	£12,536,573.42

Refund to Kensington & Chelsea for the Controller Error in Year 1 of the Transition Period 2020/21 (75% Old Model + 25% New Model)

2020/21 Controller Asset Register %				K&C Correction 2020/21 Controller Assets Register %			2020/21 (Mid-2018) ONS Population %			2020/21 Budget (Before and After Controller Error)	
Borough	Borough Controller Sites	% of Borough Controller Sites	Total Controller Costs by %	Revised Borough Controller Sites	Revised % of Borough Controller Sites	Revised ACTUAL Total Controller Costs by %	Mid-2018 ONS Population Figures	% of ONS Population	Total ONS Population Costs by %	**Incorrect** 2020/21 Budget Paid	**Corrected** 2020-21 Budget
Barking & Dagenham	125	3.29%	£362,495.14	125	3.34%	£368,606.25	211,998	2.38%	£262,254.76	£312,374.95	£315,430.50
Barnet	141	3.71%	£408,894.52	141	3.77%	£415,787.85	392,140	4.40%	£485,101.66	£446,998.09	£450,444.76
Bexley	80	2.11%	£231,996.89	80	2.14%	£235,908.00	247,258	2.78%	£305,873.58	£268,935.24	£270,890.79
Brent	158	4.16%	£458,193.86	158	4.23%	£465,918.30	330,795	3.71%	£409,214.07	£433,703.96	£437,566.18
Bromley	94	2.47%	£272,596.35	94	2.52%	£277,191.90	331,096	3.72%	£409,586.42	£341,091.39	£343,389.16
Camden	145	3.82%	£420,494.37	145	3.88%	£427,583.25	262,226	2.94%	£324,389.93	£372,442.15	£375,986.59
City Of London	114	3.00%	£330,595.57	57	1.53%	£168,084.45	8,706	0.10%	£10,769.87	£170,682.72	£89,427.16
Croydon	134	3.53%	£388,594.79	134	3.59%	£395,145.90	385,346	4.33%	£476,697.06	£432,645.93	£435,921.48
Ealing	157	4.13%	£455,293.90	157	4.20%	£462,969.45	341,982	3.84%	£423,053.09	£439,173.49	£443,011.27
Enfield	96	2.53%	£278,396.27	96	2.57%	£283,089.60	333,869	3.75%	£413,016.80	£345,706.53	£348,053.20
Greenwich	157	4.13%	£455,293.90	157	4.20%	£462,969.45	286,186	3.21%	£354,029.95	£404,661.93	£408,499.70
Hackney	81	2.13%	£234,896.85	81	2.17%	£238,856.85	279,665	3.14%	£345,963.07	£290,429.96	£292,409.96
Hammersmith & Fulham	90	2.37%	£260,996.50	90	2.41%	£265,396.50	185,426	2.08%	£229,383.54	£245,190.02	£247,390.02
Haringey	132	3.47%	£382,794.87	132	3.53%	£389,248.20	270,624	3.04%	£334,778.78	£358,786.83	£362,013.49
Harrow	92	2.42%	£266,796.43	92	2.46%	£271,294.20	250,149	2.81%	£309,449.93	£288,123.18	£290,372.06
Havering	120	3.16%	£347,995.34	120	3.21%	£353,862.00	257,810	2.89%	£318,927.07	£333,461.20	£336,394.53
Hillingdon	145	3.82%	£420,494.37	145	3.88%	£427,583.25	304,824	3.42%	£377,086.32	£398,790.34	£402,334.78
Hounslow	90	2.37%	£260,996.50	90	2.41%	£265,396.50	270,782	3.04%	£334,974.24	£297,985.37	£300,185.37
Islington	63	1.66%	£182,697.55	63	1.69%	£185,777.55	239,142	2.68%	£295,833.58	£239,265.57	£240,805.57
Kensington & Chelsea	73	1.92%	£211,697.16	67	1.79%	£197,572.95	156,197	1.75%	£193,225.44	£202,461.30	£195,399.19
Kingston	99	2.61%	£287,096.15	99	2.65%	£291,936.15	175,470	1.97%	£217,067.35	£252,081.75	£254,501.75
Lambeth	87	2.29%	£252,296.62	87	2.33%	£256,549.95	325,917	3.66%	£403,179.68	£327,738.15	£329,864.81
Lewisham	57	1.50%	£165,297.79	57	1.53%	£168,084.45	303,536	3.41%	£375,492.98	£270,395.38	£271,788.72
Merton	118	3.11%	£342,195.42	118	3.16%	£347,964.30	206,186	2.31%	£255,064.96	£298,630.19	£301,514.63
Newham	155	4.08%	£449,493.98	155	4.15%	£457,071.75	352,005	3.95%	£435,452.16	£442,473.07	£446,261.95
Redbridge	131	3.45%	£379,894.91	131	3.51%	£386,299.35	303,858	3.41%	£375,891.32	£377,893.11	£381,095.33
Richmond	125	3.29%	£362,495.14	125	3.34%	£368,606.25	196,904	2.21%	£243,582.54	£303,038.84	£306,094.39
Southwark	115	3.03%	£333,495.53	115	3.08%	£339,117.75	317,256	3.56%	£392,465.48	£362,980.51	£365,791.61
Sutton	86	2.26%	£249,396.66	86	2.30%	£253,601.10	204,525	2.30%	£253,010.19	£251,203.43	£253,305.65
Tower Hamlets	73	1.92%	£211,697.16	73	1.95%	£215,266.05	317,705	3.57%	£393,020.92	£302,359.04	£304,143.48
Waltham Forest	117	3.08%	£339,295.45	117	3.13%	£345,015.45	276,700	3.11%	£342,295.18	£340,795.32	£343,655.31
Wandsworth	86	2.26%	£249,396.66	86	2.30%	£253,601.10	326,474	3.66%	£403,868.72	£326,632.69	£328,734.91
Westminster	264	6.95%	£765,589.74	264	7.06%	£778,496.39	255,324	2.87%	£315,851.73	£540,720.74	£547,174.06
TOTAL:	3800	100%	£11,019,852.37	3737	100%	£11,019,852.37	8,908,081	100.00%	£11,019,852.37	£11,019,852.37	£11,019,852.37

Costs Apportioned by Controller 2022/23

Borough	Borough Sites	%age of Borough Controller	Apportioned by Controller
Barking & Dagenham	106	2.95%	£370,263.80
Barnet	131	3.65%	£457,590.17
Bexley	64	1.78%	£223,555.50
Brent	148	4.12%	£516,972.10
Bromley	94	2.62%	£328,347.14
Camden	139	3.87%	£485,534.61
City Of London	56	1.56%	£195,611.06
Croydon	122	3.40%	£426,152.68
Ealing	153	4.26%	£534,437.37
Enfield	90	2.51%	£314,374.93
Greenwich	141	3.93%	£492,520.72
Hackney	79	2.20%	£275,951.32
Hammersmith & Fulham	93	2.59%	£324,854.09
Haringey	125	3.48%	£436,631.84
Harrow	83	2.31%	£289,923.54
Havering	116	3.23%	£405,194.35
Hillingdon	128	3.57%	£447,111.01
Hounslow	92	2.56%	£321,361.04
Islington	64	1.78%	£223,555.50
Kensington & Chelsea	67	1.87%	£234,034.67
Kingston	97	2.70%	£338,826.31
Lambeth	87	2.42%	£303,895.76
Lewisham	56	1.56%	£195,611.06
Merton	115	3.20%	£401,701.29
Newham	154	4.29%	£537,930.43
Redbridge	129	3.59%	£450,604.06
Richmond	123	3.43%	£429,645.73
Southwark	116	3.23%	£405,194.35
Sutton	87	2.42%	£303,895.76
Tower Hamlets	69	1.92%	£241,020.78
Waltham Forest	121	3.37%	£422,659.62
Wandsworth	83	2.31%	£289,923.54
Westminster	261	7.27%	£911,687.28
TOTAL:	3,589	100%	£12,536,573.42

Costs Apportioned by projected mid-20 ONS Population 2022/23

Borough	Mid-2020 ONS Population	Mid-2020 ONS %age Population	Apportioned by Population
Barking & Dagenham	214,107	2.38%	£298,158.48
Barnet	399,007	4.43%	£555,644.23
Bexley	249,301	2.77%	£347,168.50
Brent	327,753	3.64%	£456,418.22
Bromley	332,752	3.70%	£463,379.67
Camden	279,516	3.10%	£389,244.93
City Of London	10,938	0.12%	£15,231.90
Croydon	388,563	4.32%	£541,100.26
Ealing	340,341	3.78%	£473,947.86
Enfield	333,587	3.71%	£464,542.46
Greenwich	289,034	3.21%	£402,499.39
Hackney	280,941	3.12%	£391,229.34
Hammersmith & Fulham	183,544	2.04%	£255,597.43
Haringey	266,357	2.96%	£370,920.14
Harrow	252,338	2.80%	£351,397.73
Havering	260,651	2.90%	£362,974.15
Hillingdon	309,014	3.43%	£430,322.90
Hounslow	271,767	3.02%	£378,453.93
Islington	248,115	2.76%	£345,516.92
Kensington & Chelsea	156,864	1.74%	£218,443.73
Kingston	179,142	1.99%	£249,467.35
Lambeth	321,813	3.57%	£448,146.37
Lewisham	305,309	3.39%	£425,163.43
Merton	206,453	2.29%	£287,499.77
Newham	355,266	3.95%	£494,731.93
Redbridge	305,658	3.40%	£425,649.44
Richmond	198,141	2.20%	£275,924.74
Southwark	320,017	3.55%	£445,645.32
Sutton	207,707	2.31%	£289,246.05
Tower Hamlets	331,969	3.69%	£462,289.29
Waltham Forest	276,940	3.08%	£385,657.68
Wandsworth	329,735	3.66%	£459,178.29
Westminster	269,848	3.00%	£375,781.59
TOTAL:	9,002,488	100.00%	£12,536,573.42

INFORMAL MEETING OF THE LONDON COUNCILS' TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT EXECUTIVE SUB COMMITTEE (VIRTUAL)

Minutes of an informal virtual meeting of the London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on 17 November 2021 at 14:00pm

Present:

Mayor Phil Glanville	LB Hackney (Chair)
Councillor Peter Zinkin	LB Barnet
Councillor Krupa Sheth	LB Brent
Councillor Huntington-Thresher	LB Bromley
Councillor Johnny Thalassites	RB Kensington & Chelsea
Councillor Martin Whelton	LB Merton
Councillor Manuel Abellan	LB Sutton
Councillor Julian Bell	Transport for London Board (LB Ealing)

1. Apologies for Absence & Announcement & Deputies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Muhammad Ali (LB Croydon), Claire Holland (LB Lambeth), Councillor Sophie McGeevor (LB Lewisham), and Alastair Moss (City of London Corporation).

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no other declarations of interest other than those listed at agenda item 2.

The Chair reminded Members that this was an informal meeting of the TEC Executive Sub Committee, and any decisions would be agreed by the TEC Elected Officers, through the TEC Urgency Procedure following the meetings. He confirmed that the meeting was not being livestreamed. The Chair said that it was important to mention the incredible amount of work that had been carried out on Climate Change leading up to COP26. He informed Members that the Mayor of London was now the Chair of the C40 Network.

3. Talk by Shirley Rodrigues, Deputy Mayor for Environment & Energy

Shirley Rodrigues, Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy, GLA, introduced the item and made the following comments.

- C40 was a global network that had a membership of over 100 cities and was put in place to ramp-up the work of Climate Change in these cities.
- Although the COP Agreement was not without some disappointments, it had also agreed to cap temperature increases to 1.5 degrees, instead of 2 degrees.
- Reducing the use of fossil fuels had also been discussed and had received collective support.
- It had agreed to cut global emissions by half by 2030, which was great news. There was less than 70 to 80 months left to achieve this, which presented big challenges.
- The Mayor was currently looking at a number of areas around emissions, including "Breathe London". One of the focuses was on global southern cities.

- The ULEZ extension had been in operation for one month now and had resulted in a doubling of compliance. A more detailed report on ULEZ compliance would be released in due course.
- Fewer vehicles were being charged the ULEZ fine, with 110,000 less vehicles exceeding the air pollution limit. Air pollution was being driven down in London and the Mayor was continuing with this work. The Mayor was also putting planning guidance in with regards to air quality.
- Launch of EV plan (2030 Strategy) – feedback was now out with stakeholders. London is leading the way and has more than 30 per cent of all public EV charging points in the UK. The Government plan is to phase out combustion engines by 2030, and London is well on course to achieve this.
- Details of the EV Infrastructure Delivery programme included the identification of public land to deliver EV charge points. GLA and local authority land would help to support this as well.
- Boroughs will be invited to work with TfL to deliver EV charging points with public and private investment. A good spread of these was needed throughout London, especially in outer London.
- A Retrofit Summit was taking place in spring 2022, before the London local elections and would showcase retrofitting activities by the partners. Targets out of the summit would be to inspire Londoners and to accelerate retrofitting in London. This was being pulled together to make this issue more visible and used to lobby Government.
- A bad winter for Londoners was forecast, with fuel poverty on the increase, The GLA was looking at ways to reduce fuel bills for Londoners.
- A great deal of discussion had taken place on surface water flooding (including with Mayor Glanville and Councillor Zinkin) and an interim review would be published on this.
- Consultation was taking place with Thames Water, along with mapping being carried out at a borough level. There was a fear that the recent flooding events that had taken place in New York could happen here in London. An interim report would be taken to the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting on 10 February 2022. Fiona Twycross, Deputy Mayor for Fire and Resilience, GLA, would be working with boroughs on this.
- There was a lack of funding for the strategic plan, which had been raised with the Thames RFCC and the Environment Agency. A response to this had not yet been received.

Q and As

The Chair thanked Shirley Rodrigues for the succinct overview of the environmental work currently being undertaken by the GLA. He said that surface water flooding was an issue and the mapping by local flood authorities and strategies was on track. The Chair said that his borough of Hackney was part of the mapping and accelerating retrofitting. He said that live data information was now needed in order to progress with this. The Chair said that the borough of Hackney might be a good case study to start looking at this.

Councillor Zinkin said that the Thames Water Committee would be a good place to start with regards to local flooding. He informed Members that there was money available for this. Councillor Zinkin said a more serious issue was the way by which the partnership operated. He felt that there needed to be more focus on housing as well as infrastructure. Councillor Zinkin said that he had asked Robert Van de Noort to raise this issue, as real change was required. He informed Members that the Thames RFCC had around £1 billion to spend over the next 6 years, and there was a need to use these funds to the best effect. Shirley Rodrigues said that the issue of

infrastructure was being looked at in the group and a letter would be sent to George Eustice MP and others regarding these matters. This letter would be shared with TEC. The Chair said that TEC had met with Baroness Vere and Michael Gove MP, where the issue of flooding had been raised. He said that pressure needed to be put on Thames Water when it came to dealing with flooding.

Councillor Abellan voiced concern about the ULEZ boundary being “tweaked” in the borough of Brent. He felt that clarification was needed as to whether the boundary was being altered due to traffic management reasons and not for the Ikea store. Councillor Abellan also asked whether the scrappage scheme for low-income households was still taking place. Shirley Rodrigues said that the scrappage scheme was still open to low-income households until the money ran out. She advised people to get their scrappage applications in as soon as possible. Shirley Rodrigues said that she would look into any boundary tweaks with regards to the ULEZ and the Ikea store in Brent.

The Chair said that EVs were a success story for London and would be discussed later in the agenda. He said that the use of public and adjacent land for EVs/charging points was now getting down to a borough level. The Chair said that there were already models out there (eg making borough fleets electric etc). He said that he was proud of the work that had taken place so far and was keen for this work to continue. Shirley Rodrigues said that it was important for funding to continue and to also obtain private sector funding. She said that there was not a great deal of public land that could be used for EVs, and boroughs should make the best use of what was available. Shirley Rodrigues said that shared access to EV charging points was required and TfL would speak to local authorities about this.

Councillor Zinkin felt that there seemed to be an important piece of the debate that was missing. He said that the success of EVs was dependent on electricity infrastructure. Councillor Zinkin said that conversations had taken place with UK Power Network, who had said that there were not enough sub-stations to make it all work. He said that there were also issues over electricity supply constraints and whether EV charging points were being put in the right places. Shirley Rodrigues said that these were valid points. She said that discussions had taken place with the UK Power Network Chief Executive regarding possible supply issues. The business plan was out for consultation, and there was a need to reflect the Mayor’s aspirations and to increase EV deployment.

Shirley Rodrigues said that there was a need to see more investment in electrification, and she could ask GLA officers to discuss this with Katharina Winbeck and her team, if required. Councillor Zinkin said that he was struggling to see where all the pieces fitted together when it came to EVs. The Chair said that retrofitting, the Recovery Board and NHS were moving forward with this. Shirley Rodrigues said that funding from C40 to support developing cities was available, but there was a need to press our own UK Government with regards to EVs. She said that “Template 100”, from Denmark could be rolled out, along with the sharing of best practice. Shirley Rodrigues said that she would follow-up any outstanding issues with Katharina Winbeck.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that letter being written to George Eustice MP would be shared with TEC Members;
- Noted that the GLA would find out the details of the boundary “tweak” with regards to the IKEA site;

- Noted that TfL would speak to local authorities, via GULCS, about shared access to EV charging points;
- Noted that Shirley Rodrigues would share details of best practice and Template 100 (Denmark) and would follow-up this and any other issues with Katharina Winbeck.

4. TfL Board Update

Councillor Julian Bell gave a TfL Board update and presentation to the TEC Executive Sub Committee. He made the following comments:

- Demand for public transport continued to rise as confidence in using public transport was growing. Bus ridership now averaged around 77% and higher at the weekend (88%). Many people were still working from home on Mondays and Fridays. Tube ridership was 70% at the weekend.
- Football was higher last weekend than before the pandemic, although this had not been reflected in tube ridership.
- The use of face masks was not required on National Rail services, but they were on the Tube. Uniformity was needed otherwise there would be a lack of compliance, especially if people could not be fined if they did not wear face masks. This issue had been raised at TfL Board level. 40% of passengers were not wearing masks on the Tube, and a national change of view was needed.
- More people were now cycling (Santander cycle hire), perhaps assisted by a milder November than usual. Road traffic levels on the TRLN were up by 94% and were almost back to the pre-pandemic level (this needed to be monitored owing to the detrimental effect this had on air quality).
- The TfL Finance Committee was due to meet shortly. The implications of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) would be circulated to borough finance officers.
- TfL Government funding expired on 11 December 2021. In January 2021, a TfL financial sustainability plan up to 2023/24 was put forward that had a number of different scenarios in it. One was on a Green Recovery that was in line with Government policy. This was part of the Mayor's CSR and there was disappointment that this had not been taken forward in the CSR.
- TfL still required a £1billion per annum and there was no let-up in pressure for TfL to raise this from 2023 onwards. This was a challenge and TfL received little out of the CSR. Discussions were continuing with the Department for Transport. The Board was due to get an update, although nothing had been heard about this from the Government yet.
- 87 per cent of vehicles complied with the ULEZ scheme on the day the expansion went live. Reports on the key data would be published after 1, 6 and 12 months, and a cloud-based software system had been deployed, along with 900 new cameras.
- There would be a 4 per cent reduction in bus network services (frequency), as a result of funding challenges for TfL and a change in demand for bus services in central London. There would, however, also be changes to some bus routes.
- A "Bus Action Plan" had been launched with five key priorities, including safety and security, customer satisfaction and connections. TfL was looking to present the action plan by the end of November 2021, although this might be pushed back because of the 11 December deadline in Government funding to TfL.

Q and As

Councillor Bell said that a meeting had taken place with Heidi Alexander (at Party Conference), with regards to buses and the need to work with the boroughs on this. The Chair felt that no real steer had been given with regards to the changes and reduction in bus services, and there was no real level of agreement around these changes. He said that there was acceptance with regards to the issues around bus services in central London.

The Chair asked whether anything was being done to manage the effects of weekend and mid-week peaks in bus service usage, especially around overcrowding on Saturday afternoons. He felt that some provisions might need to be shifted as well. Councillor Zinkin felt disappointed that there was a lack of recognition on how bus users felt regarding the services. He said that more discussions had taken place around the people that worked on buses, like ensuring there were toilet facilities and food etc, rather than the passengers. Consultations were taking place with bus users, but their views were not being listened to.

Katharina Winbeck thanked TEC for the feedback. She said that TfL did want to publish the Bus Action Plan, and people needed to be consulted on this and kept engaged. She said that TEC needed to be part of these conversations and the points that had been made would be referred to TfL colleagues.

Councillor Thalassites felt that the boroughs had not been consulted on the reduction and frequency of bus services. He voiced concern that buses were low down on the list of TfL priorities. Councillor Thalassites said that the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea had already had eight bus routes cut, and the messages were simply not getting through. Councillor Bell said that there appeared to be a deep rooted culture in TfL when it came to altering bus services. He said that it was important for TfL to consult with the boroughs on changes to bus routes as well as bus frequency reductions. Councillor Bell said that the boroughs needed to be consulted on all changes that were taking place with bus services and would take these issues back to TfL for further discussion.

Councillor Bell said that he had not seen anything to reflect an alignment of resources with regards to the new busy peak times. He said that TfL was still waiting to see what the new “normal” was with regards to service take-up. Councillor Bell informed Members that the Government had wanted to do a review on this in July 2021, but TfL had said that this was not the right time and that September 2021, at the earliest, would be more appropriate. He said that this would also be fed back into discussions with TfL.

Councillor Bell informed Members that, with regards to the new Elizabeth Line, the final complex stages of the trial running were taking place, with 12 trains running every hour. Seven new stations had been handed over from Crossrail to TfL and preparations for Trial Operations would be taking place by the end of November 2021 to the end of Christmas. The trials/ops would be ramped-up in the new year. Councillor Bell said that the window for completion had slipped from February 2022 to June 2022.

Councillor Bell said that TfL wanted to continue with the funding of Taxicard, although this was in limbo at the moment owing to the uncertainty around Government funding to TfL post 11 December 2021. He informed Members that there was also no current information with regards to re-instating the 60+ Oyster card before 9am.

The Chair thanked Councillor Bell for the presentation, which Alan Edwards would circulate after the meeting. He said that a constructive meeting had taken place with the Minister on TfL funding points. Councillor Zinkin felt that a cultural change was needed when it came to the people that dealt with bus services. The Chair said that he would let TEC have all the feedback again from the meetings that had taken place. Councillor Abellan said that support was needed from the Board for boroughs like Sutton with regards to LIP funding. He felt that the delivery of the Mayor's Transport Strategy was currently being hindered. Councillor Bell said that he would be happy to take this and the other issues discussed back to the Board, and would update TEC on TfL's position after the CSR.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that details of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) would be circulated to borough finance officers;
- Noted that Councillor Bell would take back to the TfL Board the issue on LIP funding commitment to the boroughs; and
- Noted that the presentation would be circulated by email to TEC Executive Members by Alan Edwards.

5. Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordination

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that gave details of the coordination function that was created to facilitate and oversee charge point installation at a pan-London level, which provided support to London boroughs to maintain the delivery momentum of the Go Ultra Low Cities Scheme (GULCS) and accelerated the transition to zero emission vehicles. The paper also provided a progress overview of the coordination activity.

Claudia Corrigan, Senior Lead, EV Infrastructure Coordination, London Councils, introduced the report, which was an overview to EV coordination across the boroughs, and made the following comments.

- Progress was key, with an increased number of charge points - more than 5,000 EV charge points had now been delivered across the Capital, and EV uptake had also increased. One in eight vehicles were electric in 2020 and this would increase in 2021/22.
- Analysis conducted over a twelve-month period (to September 2021) showed a marked increase in EV uptake and utilisation of charge points.
- Public funding was available through the On-Street Residential Charge Point Scheme (ORCS) and more than £6m had been secured by 14 London boroughs to deliver An additional 1,500 charge points by March 2023.
- 75% of capital costs for delivery are available to boroughs. London Councils had worked with operators to secure 25% in match funding for all boroughs. The funding had a time limit and had to be allocated by March 2022. Funds were allocated on a "first come, first served" basis, and boroughs were encouraged to submit their bids by the end of the current calendar year.
- TfL had published a draft summary of the London 2030 Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy (EVIS), which was a joint consultation. A draft survey was available online on the TfL website and provided a useful overview of updated forecasting (up to 40 to 60% extra charge points were forecasted by 2030).

- There was a commitment to have forecasting on a more granular level, from 2022, to help boroughs understand what was needed. TfL would set up a working group and all boroughs were welcome to join this group (borough officers to let TfL know who was interested in joining).
- London Councils facilitated an EVIS workshop with TfL in early November 2021 that was attended by more than 40 borough officers. Work stream on rapid charging on GLA land, and then at a borough level, was also taking place, although no timescales were available yet (there was a need to identify where this land was).
- TfL was also committed to a new procurement mechanism to deliver more longer-term procurement solutions, including access to private investment .
- Office for Zero Emissions Vehicles (OZEV) had launched a draft consultation on 29 September 2021 (one of five), where they asked views on whether to deliver four new powers, (a response was drafted by London Councils and needed submitting by Monday 22 November).
- The first proposal including a *statutory obligation to plan for and provide charging infrastructure on local authorities* or District Notice Operators (DNOs). The response recognised the benefit to the delivery of charge points and made recommendations to deliver by a collaborative approach, which was proactively supported by central government, and referenced progress in London. A more flexible approach was suggested (similar to Active Travel), and to develop a plan to promote support.
- The second proposal was a *requirement to install charge points in non-residential car parks*. The response was clear that any provision would be coordinated with other plans rather than standard recommendations.
- The third consultation response was to the *new powers to support the delivery of the Rapid Charging Fund*. Government would be asked to consider extending the fund to support local authority delivery of rapid charge points in London, particularly if the non-residential car parks provision was mandated.
- The fourth consultation response was *requirements to improve the experience for electric vehicle consumers*, where proposals identified to improve the consumer chargepoint experience were supported and their importance recognised in sustaining and accelerating the switch to EVs. User experience would be looked at along with customer service.

The Chair thanked Claudia Corrigan for all the hard work that had taken place on EV infrastructure. He voiced concern, however, that pavements could become cluttered with cables being put across them. The Chair also asked whether there was anything in the consultation regarding data points and whether the debate on data points would be taken forward. Councillor Zinkin said that the UK Power Network (UK PN) did not have enough power to deal with these issues and were less clear on supplying streets. He felt that officers needed to start thinking about these issues, which needed to be more nuanced. The diversity of boroughs also needed to be reflected (the London Borough of Bromley was so large that it had car parks that were spaced miles apart). Officers needed to contact Councillor Huntington-Thresher to discuss the issues that Bromley had and the need to be proportionate (eg where the rules were inappropriate).

Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that parts of the Borough of Bromley were very rural, with some lanes being miles long and with no street-lighting or electricity connections. He said that installing EV charge points in these car parks would be a burden on the borough. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that some strong caveats would be required and the Government would need to ensure that any burdens imposed would need to come with some funding to help with this. Claudia Corrigan thanked Members for the very useful feedback. She said that officers were

trying to get these points across. There was currently no standard provision for EV points across car parks and a holistic view was needed from place to place.

Claudia Corrigan said that, regarding the issue of energy capacity and UKPN, there were challenges at a local level and this would need to be picked-up on. She said that a great deal of information had been provided with regards to data sharing, although this needed to be shared in a consistent way. Claudia Corrigan informed Members that details on a national data sharing would be published in 2022 and would likely focus on location and availability. Claudia Corrigan said that there were issues of public data sharing in London due to commercial sensitivity, and the publication of the less commercially sensitive data is being investigated with LOTI.

Claudia Corrigan said that the charge points would not add to street clutter, although the issue of minimum widths and access would be looked at again. She said that there was a recommendation about free-standing charge points and minimum requirements on pavements.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that the final response to the OZEV zero emissions vehicle consultation was required by Monday 22 November 2021, incorporating comments from Members;
- Noted that officers needed to start to consider the diversity of boroughs when it came to supplying charge points in streets etc (eg some of LB Bromley's car parks were rural, had no electricity supply and it was not practical to have charge points); and
- Noted that the issue of energy capacity would be picked-up.

6. Transport Funding Sub Group

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that set out arrangements for a London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee Sub-Group on Transport Funding.

The Chair informed Members that a steer had been received from Leaders' Committee to explain in more detail how transport funding worked. Katharina Winbeck said that Members wanted to have an oversight on transport funding in the future and how they could influence some of those discussions. She said that the subgroup would need to be signed-off by the full TEC meeting on 9 December 2021, and membership of the group would need to be in place by then. The Transport Funding Subgroup would discuss infrastructure and would feedback into transport priorities. The Chair said that there was a need to know where funding with regards to LIPs was going. Also, a four-year strategic direction (long-term) came through from Leaders.

The Chair said that a mixture of boroughs needed to be represented on the subgroup in order to get a real balance of views. Councillor Zinkin said that quarterly meetings of the subgroup would probably be appropriate, although he felt that discussions needed to take place regarding what this group was for and what it was going to achieve. Discussions needed to take place once the group was formed, especially about the group's terms of reference. Councillor Zinkin said that a great deal was currently going on with regards to TfL funding. He said that there was £100million in

Active Travel funding which was initially split 60 per cent for boroughs and 40 per cent for TfL, but now appeared to be the other way around.

The Chair suggested that the TEC Executive Sub Committee be the main voice on behalf of the Transport Funding Subgroup. Councillor Zinkin said that the terms of reference would be quite broad and the subgroup would need to fit in with the existing framework. The Chair asked whether there was any value in writing to TfL to recognise the role of the boroughs in this. Katharina Winbeck said that a shadow meeting of this subgroup could be convened, along with a follow-up letter to Baroness Vere in order to make borough voices heard again. Stephen Boon, Acting Director of Transport & Mobility, London Councils, said that this shadow board could also come up with several workstreams that the subgroup could focus on. The Chair said that the levelling-up of London funding pots could also be mentioned. Stephen Boon said work should take place with TfL and the GLA to look at strategic funding for London.

The Chair said that the TEC Party Groups should look at nominating a shadow list to look at the terms of reference for the subgroup. He said that TEC Vice Chair representation was needed on this.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that the Transport Funding Subgroup would be signed-off by full TEC at the meeting on 9 December 2021;
- Noted that a mixture of boroughs should be represented on the new subgroup to get a real balance; and
- Noted that a shadow meeting of this sub-group should be convened and party groups to nominate a shadow list to look at the Terms of Reference for this group, before it went for sign-off by full TEC in December. A follow-up letter would also be sent to Baroness Vere to ensure that the boroughs are heard again with respect to transport funding. Shadow Board would come up with workstreams for TEC to focus on. Vice chair representation should be included on this group.

7. Transport & Mobility Performance Information

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the London Councils' Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Q2 2021/22 and full year 2020/21.

Stephen Boon introduced this report. He informed Members that an Improvement Performance Plan had been put in place for the Freedom Pass contact centre. Service Level Agreements were still not being met (causing the "red" ratings), but improvements were being made. Stephen Boon said that there had been a slight drop in performance for ASAP bookings which was due to earlier fuel shortage problems leading to an "amber" rating and taxi supply. He said that the team was working with ComCab to increase provision in private hire vehicles (PHVs) with a plan for approximately 10% of jobs to be carried out by PHVs by the end of 2021.

Stephen Boon said that the number of cases reported on the London Lorry Control Scheme (LLCS) was down owing to enforcement officer shortages causing an "amber" rating. Also, participation in the London European Partnership for Transport had dropped by two boroughs, also leading to an "amber" rating.

The Chair asked whether the question regarding Taxicard performance challenges had been followed-up after the previous TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting. Stephen Boon confirmed that Andy Rollock, Mobility Services Manager, London Councils, had followed up on this issue immediately after the previous meeting. The Chair thanked Stephen Boon for all the hard work on producing the mobility and services performance data.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted the Transport and Mobility Services Performance information report,

8. Draft Revenue Budget & Borough Charges 2022/23

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2022/23.

David Sanni, Acting Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, introduced the report which would be going to the TEC Main meeting for final approval. He said that the use of TEC Reserves amounted to £1.2million. An estimated 2% increase in staff salary costs had also been reflected, along with a 1.25% increase in NI contributions for employees. David Sanni said that other costs included the new Director post for Climate Change. There had also been a reduction to Freedom Pass contributions. The final figures would be presented to the full TEC meeting on 9 December 2021. David Sanni informed Members that the Committee's reserves were in a healthy and stable position.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the levies and charges below that would be presented to the full TEC meeting on 9 December 2021 and agreed by TEC Elected Officers via the TEC Urgency Procedure following that meeting in December:

- The proposed individual levies and charges for 2022/23 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 £0.3751 per PCN which will be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2020/21 (2021/22 - £0.3596 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 (2021/22 – nil charge; paragraph 15);
 - The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,000 in total (2021/22 - £338,000; paragraphs 17-18).
 - No charge to boroughs in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which is fully covered by estimated PCN income (2021/22 – nil charge; paragraphs 19-20);

- Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) - charge of £29.36 per appeal or £25.55 per appeal where electronic evidence is provided by the enforcing authority (2021/22 - £27.84/£24.06 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £23.64 for hard copy submissions and £22.88 for electronic submissions (2021/22 - £22.15/£21.40 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 (2021/22 - £12; paragraph 10);
- The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2021/22 - £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 (2021/22 - £15.23; paragraphs 29-35);
- The TEC¹ Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2021/22 - £0.175; paragraphs 29-35).
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £238.371 million for 2022/23, as detailed in Appendix A;
- On the basis of the agreement of all the above proposed charges as outlined in this report, the provisional gross revenue income budget of £237.215 million for 2022/23, with a recommended transfer of £275,000 from specific reserves for previously agreed priorities, £160,000 from uncommitted reserves to fund a new programme director to support boroughs on climate change and £721,000 from uncommitted Committee reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B; and
- To consider the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 52-56 and Table 8 of this report.

The Executive-Sub Committee was also asked to note:

- the indicative total charges to individual boroughs for 2022/23, dependent upon volumes generated through the various parking systems, as set out in Appendix C.1.

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

9. Month 6 TEC Revenue Forecast 2021/22

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that outlined actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of September 2021 for TEC and provided a forecast of the outturn position for 2021/22. At this stage, a surplus of £717,000 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 £1.756 million, due in part to the impact of the Covid-19 on the scheme. The net borough proportion of this underspend was projected to be £1.588 million, with £168,000 accruing to TfL.

David Sanni introduced the second quarter TEC revenue forecast report. He informed Members that one of the key variances was the underspend on the Taxicard Scheme of £1.756 million on projected trip data. This would however be offset by a reduction in borough and TfL contributions. There were additional variances including an underspend on payments to non-TfL bus operators and a surplus from the replacement of Freedom passes. David Sanni said that the next revenue forecast report would be presented to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 10 February 2022.

The Chair said that he noted all the good work in managing the new Climate Change post. He asked Members whether they were content with the methodology used to pay the private bus operators. Stephen Boon said that London Councils was still in the same position when it came to paying the non-TfL bus operators. DfT offered guidance to phase this out on 1 April 2022 by 10% each month. Stephen Boon said that this would be covered in the concessionary fares report that was going to the TEC Main meeting on 9 December 2021. The Chair said that 10% per month sounded reasonable, although the political groups should flag this up to ensure that value for money was being achieved. Stephen Boon confirmed that the payments were made on a quarterly basis, by area, so payments on a month-by-month basis would not be an issue.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Note the projected surplus of £717,000 for the year, plus the forecast net underspend of £1.756 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.

10. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 September 2021

The minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 September 2021 were noted to be an accurate record and would be agreed by the TEC Elected Officers via the TEC Urgency Procedure following the meeting.

The Chair asked if the TEC finance reports and concessionary fares settlement and apportionment reports could be placed at the beginning of the agenda for the Main TEC meeting, especially if they were of a critical nature. He said that this would not keep guests/speakers waiting and would provide a fair and balanced agenda.

The Chair agreed to remove the press and public in that the following items would be exempt from the Access to Information Regulations, and via Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (Section 3) in that the items related to the financial or business affairs of a particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The meeting finished at 11:29am

Consultation with Elected Officers under the Urgency Procedure

Decisions to be taken following the Meeting of TEC Executive Members on 17 November 2021

Contact officer: Alan Edwards **Date:** 18 November 2021
Telephone: 020 7934 9911 **Email:** alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

London Councils' Elected Officers are requested to deal with the details set out below under the Urgency Procedure.

- 19.1 Paragraph 19 of London Councils' Standing Orders deals with urgency: If at any time the Acting Director of Transport and Mobility of London Councils considers that any matter is urgent and should be decided on prior to the next meeting of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee (TEC), then he/she shall consult the Elected Officers of the Transport and Environment Committee. If at least two of the Elected Officers of the Transport and Environment Committee, of whom one will be the Chair, if available, and the other will be from another political party or no party, agree that the matter is urgent and agree on the Acting Director of Transport and Mobility's recommendation(s), then the decision shall be taken by the Acting Director of Transport and Mobility in accordance with such recommendation(s), subject to the decision being recorded in writing and signed by the Elected Officers of the Transport and Environment Committee agreeing the recommendation(s) of the Acting Director of Transport & Mobility.

Item under Urgency Procedure*

Items listed below

Reason for Urgency

Part 5A of the Local Government Act 1972 governs public access to meetings, agendas and reports and applies to London Councils' joint committee meetings. Now that the modifications introduced by the emergency Regulations (SI 2020/392), made under section 78 of the Coronavirus Act 2020, 2020 Regulations have expired on 6 May 2021 formal meetings may not take place virtually. This means that in order to participate in discussions and vote on decisions or recommendation(s), Members must again be present physically at the meeting at which business is considered.

In considering the implication of this in the current circumstances , London Councils' Executive Members have agreed on 11 May 2021 that until the legislation is changed formal committee business is to be dealt with by holding an informal virtual meeting in the first instance to ascertain the general view of a committee or sub-committee with a formal decision to be then taken under delegated authority by way of London Councils' Urgency Procedure.

Items to be agreed following the TEC Executive Members Meeting on 17 November 2021:

Item 5: Electric Vehicle (EV) Infrastructure Coordination

TEC Chair and Vice Chairs to agree the final response to the OZEV zero emissions vehicle consultation by Monday 22 November 2021, incorporating comments from members.

Item 6: Transport Funding Sub-Group

To agree that a shadow meeting of this sub-group should be convened and party groups would nominate a shadow list of representatives to look at the Terms of Reference for this group, before it went for sign-off by full TEC on 9 December 2021. A follow-up letter would also be sent to Baroness Vere to ensure that the boroughs were heard again with respect to transport funding. Shadow Board would come up with workstreams for TEC to focus on. Vice chair representation should be included on this group.

Item 10: Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 September 2021

To agree the minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 September 2021.

Item E1: Exempt Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 September 2021

To agree the exempt minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 September 2021.

If you are content, please could you email your agreement to Alan Edwards: alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk by **midday on Thursday 25 November 2021**.

I hereby agree that resolution of the above matter to be approved under the Urgency Procedure and I agree to the Acting Director of Transport and Mobility recommendation(s) as set out above.

Name_____

Signature_____

Date_____

INFORMAL MEETING OF THE LONDON COUNCILS' TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT EXECUTIVE SUB COMMITTEE (VIRTUAL)

Minutes of an informal virtual meeting of the London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on 17 November 2021 at 14:00pm

Present:

Mayor Phil Glanville	LB Hackney (Chair)
Councillor Peter Zinkin	LB Barnet
Councillor Krupa Sheth	LB Brent
Councillor Huntington-Thresher	LB Bromley
Councillor Johnny Thalassites	RB Kensington & Chelsea
Councillor Martin Whelton	LB Merton
Councillor Manuel Abellan	LB Sutton
Councillor Julian Bell	Transport for London Board (LB Ealing)

1. Apologies for Absence & Announcement & Deputies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Muhammad Ali (LB Croydon), Claire Holland (LB Lambeth), Councillor Sophie McGeevor (LB Lewisham), and Alastair Moss (City of London Corporation).

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no other declarations of interest other than those listed at agenda item 2.

The Chair reminded Members that this was an informal meeting of the TEC Executive Sub Committee, and any decisions would be agreed by the TEC Elected Officers, through the TEC Urgency Procedure following the meetings. He confirmed that the meeting was not being livestreamed. The Chair said that it was important to mention the incredible amount of work that had been carried out on Climate Change leading up to COP26. He informed Members that the Mayor of London was now the Chair of the C40 Network.

3. Talk by Shirley Rodrigues, Deputy Mayor for Environment & Energy

Shirley Rodrigues, Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy, GLA, introduced the item and made the following comments.

- C40 was a global network that had a membership of over 100 cities and was put in place to ramp-up the work of Climate Change in these cities.
- Although the COP Agreement was not without some disappointments, it had also agreed to cap temperature increases to 1.5 degrees, instead of 2 degrees.
- Reducing the use of fossil fuels had also been discussed and had received collective support.
- It had agreed to cut global emissions by half by 2030, which was great news. There was less than 70 to 80 months left to achieve this, which presented big challenges.
- The Mayor was currently looking at a number of areas around emissions, including "Breathe London". One of the focuses was on global southern cities.

- The ULEZ extension had been in operation for one month now and had resulted in a doubling of compliance. A more detailed report on ULEZ compliance would be released in due course.
- Fewer vehicles were being charged the ULEZ fine, with 110,000 less vehicles exceeding the air pollution limit. Air pollution was being driven down in London and the Mayor was continuing with this work. The Mayor was also putting planning guidance in with regards to air quality.
- Launch of EV plan (2030 Strategy) – feedback was now out with stakeholders. London is leading the way and has more than 30 per cent of all public EV charging points in the UK. The Government plan is to phase out combustion engines by 2030, and London is well on course to achieve this.
- Details of the EV Infrastructure Delivery programme included the identification of public land to deliver EV charge points. GLA and local authority land would help to support this as well.
- Boroughs will be invited to work with TfL to deliver EV charging points with public and private investment. A good spread of these was needed throughout London, especially in outer London.
- A Retrofit Summit was taking place in spring 2022, before the London local elections and would showcase retrofitting activities by the partners. Targets out of the summit would be to inspire Londoners and to accelerate retrofitting in London. This was being pulled together to make this issue more visible and used to lobby Government.
- A bad winter for Londoners was forecast, with fuel poverty on the increase, The GLA was looking at ways to reduce fuel bills for Londoners.
- A great deal of discussion had taken place on surface water flooding (including with Mayor Glanville and Councillor Zinkin) and an interim review would be published on this.
- Consultation was taking place with Thames Water, along with mapping being carried out at a borough level. There was a fear that the recent flooding events that had taken place in New York could happen here in London. An interim report would be taken to the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting on 10 February 2022. Fiona Twycross, Deputy Mayor for Fire and Resilience, GLA, would be working with boroughs on this.
- There was a lack of funding for the strategic plan, which had been raised with the Thames RFCC and the Environment Agency. A response to this had not yet been received.

Q and As

The Chair thanked Shirley Rodrigues for the succinct overview of the environmental work currently being undertaken by the GLA. He said that surface water flooding was an issue and the mapping by local flood authorities and strategies was on track. The Chair said that his borough of Hackney was part of the mapping and accelerating retrofitting. He said that live data information was now needed in order to progress with this. The Chair said that the borough of Hackney might be a good case study to start looking at this.

Councillor Zinkin said that the Thames Water Committee would be a good place to start with regards to local flooding. He informed Members that there was money available for this. Councillor Zinkin said a more serious issue was the way by which the partnership operated. He felt that there needed to be more focus on housing as well as infrastructure. Councillor Zinkin said that he had asked Robert Van de Noort to raise this issue, as real change was required. He informed Members that the Thames RFCC had around £1 billion to spend over the next 6 years, and there was a need to use these funds to the best effect. Shirley Rodrigues said that the issue of

infrastructure was being looked at in the group and a letter would be sent to George Eustice MP and others regarding these matters. This letter would be shared with TEC. The Chair said that TEC had met with Baroness Vere and Michael Gove MP, where the issue of flooding had been raised. He said that pressure needed to be put on Thames Water when it came to dealing with flooding.

Councillor Abellan voiced concern about the ULEZ boundary being “tweaked” in the borough of Brent. He felt that clarification was needed as to whether the boundary was being altered due to traffic management reasons and not for the Ikea store. Councillor Abellan also asked whether the scrappage scheme for low-income households was still taking place. Shirley Rodrigues said that the scrappage scheme was still open to low-income households until the money ran out. She advised people to get their scrappage applications in as soon as possible. Shirley Rodrigues said that she would look into any boundary tweaks with regards to the ULEZ and the Ikea store in Brent.

The Chair said that EVs were a success story for London and would be discussed later in the agenda. He said that the use of public and adjacent land for EVs/charging points was now getting down to a borough level. The Chair said that there were already models out there (eg making borough fleets electric etc). He said that he was proud of the work that had taken place so far and was keen for this work to continue. Shirley Rodrigues said that it was important for funding to continue and to also obtain private sector funding. She said that there was not a great deal of public land that could be used for EVs, and boroughs should make the best use of what was available. Shirley Rodrigues said that shared access to EV charging points was required and TfL would speak to local authorities about this.

Councillor Zinkin felt that there seemed to be an important piece of the debate that was missing. He said that the success of EVs was dependent on electricity infrastructure. Councillor Zinkin said that conversations had taken place with UK Power Network, who had said that there were not enough sub-stations to make it all work. He said that there were also issues over electricity supply constraints and whether EV charging points were being put in the right places. Shirley Rodrigues said that these were valid points. She said that discussions had taken place with the UK Power Network Chief Executive regarding possible supply issues. The business plan was out for consultation, and there was a need to reflect the Mayor’s aspirations and to increase EV deployment.

Shirley Rodrigues said that there was a need to see more investment in electrification, and she could ask GLA officers to discuss this with Katharina Winbeck and her team, if required. Councillor Zinkin said that he was struggling to see where all the pieces fitted together when it came to EVs. The Chair said that retrofitting, the Recovery Board and NHS were moving forward with this. Shirley Rodrigues said that funding from C40 to support developing cities was available, but there was a need to press our own UK Government with regards to EVs. She said that “Template 100”, from Denmark could be rolled out, along with the sharing of best practice. Shirley Rodrigues said that she would follow-up any outstanding issues with Katharina Winbeck.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that letter being written to George Eustice MP would be shared with TEC Members;
- Noted that the GLA would find out the details of the boundary “tweak” with regards to the IKEA site;

- Noted that TfL would speak to local authorities, via GULCS, about shared access to EV charging points;
- Noted that Shirley Rodrigues would share details of best practice and Template 100 (Denmark) and would follow-up this and any other issues with Katharina Winbeck.

4. TfL Board Update

Councillor Julian Bell gave a TfL Board update and presentation to the TEC Executive Sub Committee. He made the following comments:

- Demand for public transport continued to rise as confidence in using public transport was growing. Bus ridership now averaged around 77% and higher at the weekend (88%). Many people were still working from home on Mondays and Fridays. Tube ridership was 70% at the weekend.
- Football was higher last weekend than before the pandemic, although this had not been reflected in tube ridership.
- The use of face masks was not required on National Rail services, but they were on the Tube. Uniformity was needed otherwise there would be a lack of compliance, especially if people could not be fined if they did not wear face masks. This issue had been raised at TfL Board level. 40% of passengers were not wearing masks on the Tube, and a national change of view was needed.
- More people were now cycling (Santander cycle hire), perhaps assisted by a milder November than usual. Road traffic levels on the TRLN were up by 94% and were almost back to the pre-pandemic level (this needed to be monitored owing to the detrimental effect this had on air quality).
- The TfL Finance Committee was due to meet shortly. The implications of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) would be circulated to borough finance officers.
- TfL Government funding expired on 11 December 2021. In January 2021, a TfL financial sustainability plan up to 2023/24 was put forward that had a number of different scenarios in it. One was on a Green Recovery that was in line with Government policy. This was part of the Mayor's CSR and there was disappointment that this had not been taken forward in the CSR.
- TfL still required a £1billion per annum and there was no let-up in pressure for TfL to raise this from 2023 onwards. This was a challenge and TfL received little out of the CSR. Discussions were continuing with the Department for Transport. The Board was due to get an update, although nothing had been heard about this from the Government yet.
- 87 per cent of vehicles complied with the ULEZ scheme on the day the expansion went live. Reports on the key data would be published after 1, 6 and 12 months, and a cloud-based software system had been deployed, along with 900 new cameras.
- There would be a 4 per cent reduction in bus network services (frequency), as a result of funding challenges for TfL and a change in demand for bus services in central London. There would, however, also be changes to some bus routes.
- A "Bus Action Plan" had been launched with five key priorities, including safety and security, customer satisfaction and connections. TfL was looking to present the action plan by the end of November 2021, although this might be pushed back because of the 11 December deadline in Government funding to TfL.

Q and As

Councillor Bell said that a meeting had taken place with Heidi Alexander (at Party Conference), with regards to buses and the need to work with the boroughs on this. The Chair felt that no real steer had been given with regards to the changes and reduction in bus services, and there was no real level of agreement around these changes. He said that there was acceptance with regards to the issues around bus services in central London.

The Chair asked whether anything was being done to manage the effects of weekend and mid-week peaks in bus service usage, especially around overcrowding on Saturday afternoons. He felt that some provisions might need to be shifted as well. Councillor Zinkin felt disappointed that there was a lack of recognition on how bus users felt regarding the services. He said that more discussions had taken place around the people that worked on buses, like ensuring there were toilet facilities and food etc, rather than the passengers. Consultations were taking place with bus users, but their views were not being listened to.

Katharina Winbeck thanked TEC for the feedback. She said that TfL did want to publish the Bus Action Plan, and people needed to be consulted on this and kept engaged. She said that TEC needed to be part of these conversations and the points that had been made would be referred to TfL colleagues.

Councillor Thalassites felt that the boroughs had not been consulted on the reduction and frequency of bus services. He voiced concern that buses were low down on the list of TfL priorities. Councillor Thalassites said that the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea had already had eight bus routes cut, and the messages were simply not getting through. Councillor Bell said that there appeared to be a deep rooted culture in TfL when it came to altering bus services. He said that it was important for TfL to consult with the boroughs on changes to bus routes as well as bus frequency reductions. Councillor Bell said that the boroughs needed to be consulted on all changes that were taking place with bus services and would take these issues back to TfL for further discussion.

Councillor Bell said that he had not seen anything to reflect an alignment of resources with regards to the new busy peak times. He said that TfL was still waiting to see what the new “normal” was with regards to service take-up. Councillor Bell informed Members that the Government had wanted to do a review on this in July 2021, but TfL had said that this was not the right time and that September 2021, at the earliest, would be more appropriate. He said that this would also be fed back into discussions with TfL.

Councillor Bell informed Members that, with regards to the new Elizabeth Line, the final complex stages of the trial running were taking place, with 12 trains running every hour. Seven new stations had been handed over from Crossrail to TfL and preparations for Trial Operations would be taking place by the end of November 2021 to the end of Christmas. The trials/ops would be ramped-up in the new year. Councillor Bell said that the window for completion had slipped from February 2022 to June 2022.

Councillor Bell said that TfL wanted to continue with the funding of Taxicard, although this was in limbo at the moment owing to the uncertainty around Government funding to TfL post 11 December 2021. He informed Members that there was also no current information with regards to re-instating the 60+ Oyster card before 9am.

The Chair thanked Councillor Bell for the presentation, which Alan Edwards would circulate after the meeting. He said that a constructive meeting had taken place with the Minister on TfL funding points. Councillor Zinkin felt that a cultural change was needed when it came to the people that dealt with bus services. The Chair said that he would let TEC have all the feedback again from the meetings that had taken place. Councillor Abellan said that support was needed from the Board for boroughs like Sutton with regards to LIP funding. He felt that the delivery of the Mayor's Transport Strategy was currently being hindered. Councillor Bell said that he would be happy to take this and the other issues discussed back to the Board, and would update TEC on TfL's position after the CSR.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that details of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) would be circulated to borough finance officers;
- Noted that Councillor Bell would take back to the TfL Board the issue on LIP funding commitment to the boroughs; and
- Noted that the presentation would be circulated by email to TEC Executive Members by Alan Edwards.

5. Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordination

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that gave details of the coordination function that was created to facilitate and oversee charge point installation at a pan-London level, which provided support to London boroughs to maintain the delivery momentum of the Go Ultra Low Cities Scheme (GULCS) and accelerated the transition to zero emission vehicles. The paper also provided a progress overview of the coordination activity.

Claudia Corrigan, Senior Lead, EV Infrastructure Coordination, London Councils, introduced the report, which was an overview to EV coordination across the boroughs, and made the following comments.

- Progress was key, with an increased number of charge points - more than 5,000 EV charge points had now been delivered across the Capital, and EV uptake had also increased. One in eight vehicles were electric in 2020 and this would increase in 2021/22.
- Analysis conducted over a twelve-month period (to September 2021) showed a marked increase in EV uptake and utilisation of charge points.
- Public funding was available through the On-Street Residential Charge Point Scheme (ORCS) and more than £6m had been secured by 14 London boroughs to deliver An additional 1,500 charge points by March 2023.
- 75% of capital costs for delivery are available to boroughs. London Councils had worked with operators to secure 25% in match funding for all boroughs. The funding had a time limit and had to be allocated by March 2022. Funds were allocated on a "first come, first served" basis, and boroughs were encouraged to submit their bids by the end of the current calendar year.
- TfL had published a draft summary of the London 2030 Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy (EVIS), which was a joint consultation. A draft survey was available online on the TfL website and provided a useful overview of updated forecasting (up to 40 to 60% extra charge points were forecasted by 2030).

- There was a commitment to have forecasting on a more granular level, from 2022, to help boroughs understand what was needed. TfL would set up a working group and all boroughs were welcome to join this group (borough officers to let TfL know who was interested in joining).
- London Councils facilitated an EVIS workshop with TfL in early November 2021 that was attended by more than 40 borough officers. Work stream on rapid charging on GLA land, and then at a borough level, was also taking place, although no timescales were available yet (there was a need to identify where this land was).
- TfL was also committed to a new procurement mechanism to deliver more longer-term procurement solutions, including access to private investment .
- Office for Zero Emissions Vehicles (OZEV) had launched a draft consultation on 29 September 2021 (one of five), where they asked views on whether to deliver four new powers, (a response was drafted by London Councils and needed submitting by Monday 22 November).
- The first proposal including a *statutory obligation to plan for and provide charging infrastructure on local authorities* or District Notice Operators (DNOs). The response recognised the benefit to the delivery of charge points and made recommendations to deliver by a collaborative approach, which was proactively supported by central government, and referenced progress in London. A more flexible approach was suggested (similar to Active Travel), and to develop a plan to promote support.
- The second proposal was a *requirement to install charge points in non-residential car parks*. The response was clear that any provision would be coordinated with other plans rather than standard recommendations.
- The third consultation response was to the *new powers to support the delivery of the Rapid Charging Fund*. Government would be asked to consider extending the fund to support local authority delivery of rapid charge points in London, particularly if the non-residential car parks provision was mandated.
- The fourth consultation response was *requirements to improve the experience for electric vehicle consumers*, where proposals identified to improve the consumer chargepoint experience were supported and their importance recognised in sustaining and accelerating the switch to EVs. User experience would be looked at along with customer service.

The Chair thanked Claudia Corrigan for all the hard work that had taken place on EV infrastructure. He voiced concern, however, that pavements could become cluttered with cables being put across them. The Chair also asked whether there was anything in the consultation regarding data points and whether the debate on data points would be taken forward. Councillor Zinkin said that the UK Power Network (UK PN) did not have enough power to deal with these issues and were less clear on supplying streets. He felt that officers needed to start thinking about these issues, which needed to be more nuanced. The diversity of boroughs also needed to be reflected (the London Borough of Bromley was so large that it had car parks that were spaced miles apart). Officers needed to contact Councillor Huntington-Thresher to discuss the issues that Bromley had and the need to be proportionate (eg where the rules were inappropriate).

Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that parts of the Borough of Bromley were very rural, with some lanes being miles long and with no street-lighting or electricity connections. He said that installing EV charge points in these car parks would be a burden on the borough. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that some strong caveats would be required and the Government would need to ensure that any burdens imposed would need to come with some funding to help with this. Claudia Corrigan thanked Members for the very useful feedback. She said that officers were

trying to get these points across. There was currently no standard provision for EV points across car parks and a holistic view was needed from place to place.

Claudia Corrigan said that, regarding the issue of energy capacity and UKPN, there were challenges at a local level and this would need to be picked-up on. She said that a great deal of information had been provided with regards to data sharing, although this needed to be shared in a consistent way. Claudia Corrigan informed Members that details on a national data sharing would be published in 2022 and would likely focus on location and availability. Claudia Corrigan said that there were issues of public data sharing in London due to commercial sensitivity, and the publication of the less commercially sensitive data is being investigated with LOTI.

Claudia Corrigan said that the charge points would not add to street clutter, although the issue of minimum widths and access would be looked at again. She said that there was a recommendation about free-standing charge points and minimum requirements on pavements.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that the final response to the OZEV zero emissions vehicle consultation was required by Monday 22 November 2021, incorporating comments from Members;
- Noted that officers needed to start to consider the diversity of boroughs when it came to supplying charge points in streets etc (eg some of LB Bromley's car parks were rural, had no electricity supply and it was not practical to have charge points); and
- Noted that the issue of energy capacity would be picked-up.

6. Transport Funding Sub Group

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that set out arrangements for a London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee Sub-Group on Transport Funding.

The Chair informed Members that a steer had been received from Leaders' Committee to explain in more detail how transport funding worked. Katharina Winbeck said that Members wanted to have an oversight on transport funding in the future and how they could influence some of those discussions. She said that the subgroup would need to be signed-off by the full TEC meeting on 9 December 2021, and membership of the group would need to be in place by then. The Transport Funding Subgroup would discuss infrastructure and would feedback into transport priorities. The Chair said that there was a need to know where funding with regards to LIPs was going. Also, a four-year strategic direction (long-term) came through from Leaders.

The Chair said that a mixture of boroughs needed to be represented on the subgroup in order to get a real balance of views. Councillor Zinkin said that quarterly meetings of the subgroup would probably be appropriate, although he felt that discussions needed to take place regarding what this group was for and what it was going to achieve. Discussions needed to take place once the group was formed, especially about the group's terms of reference. Councillor Zinkin said that a great deal was currently going on with regards to TfL funding. He said that there was £100million in

Active Travel funding which was initially split 60 per cent for boroughs and 40 per cent for TfL, but now appeared to be the other way around.

The Chair suggested that the TEC Executive Sub Committee be the main voice on behalf of the Transport Funding Subgroup. Councillor Zinkin said that the terms of reference would be quite broad and the subgroup would need to fit in with the existing framework. The Chair asked whether there was any value in writing to TfL to recognise the role of the boroughs in this. Katharina Winbeck said that a shadow meeting of this subgroup could be convened, along with a follow-up letter to Baroness Vere in order to make borough voices heard again. Stephen Boon, Acting Director of Transport & Mobility, London Councils, said that this shadow board could also come up with several workstreams that the subgroup could focus on. The Chair said that the levelling-up of London funding pots could also be mentioned. Stephen Boon said work should take place with TfL and the GLA to look at strategic funding for London.

The Chair said that the TEC Party Groups should look at nominating a shadow list to look at the terms of reference for the subgroup. He said that TEC Vice Chair representation was needed on this.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that the Transport Funding Subgroup would be signed-off by full TEC at the meeting on 9 December 2021;
- Noted that a mixture of boroughs should be represented on the new subgroup to get a real balance; and
- Noted that a shadow meeting of this sub-group should be convened and party groups to nominate a shadow list to look at the Terms of Reference for this group, before it went for sign-off by full TEC in December. A follow-up letter would also be sent to Baroness Vere to ensure that the boroughs are heard again with respect to transport funding. Shadow Board would come up with workstreams for TEC to focus on. Vice chair representation should be included on this group.

7. Transport & Mobility Performance Information

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the London Councils' Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Q2 2021/22 and full year 2020/21.

Stephen Boon introduced this report. He informed Members that an Improvement Performance Plan had been put in place for the Freedom Pass contact centre. Service Level Agreements were still not being met (causing the "red" ratings), but improvements were being made. Stephen Boon said that there had been a slight drop in performance for ASAP bookings which was due to earlier fuel shortage problems leading to an "amber" rating and taxi supply. He said that the team was working with ComCab to increase provision in private hire vehicles (PHVs) with a plan for approximately 10% of jobs to be carried out by PHVs by the end of 2021.

Stephen Boon said that the number of cases reported on the London Lorry Control Scheme (LLCS) was down owing to enforcement officer shortages causing an "amber" rating. Also, participation in the London European Partnership for Transport had dropped by two boroughs, also leading to an "amber" rating.

The Chair asked whether the question regarding Taxicard performance challenges had been followed-up after the previous TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting. Stephen Boon confirmed that Andy Rollock, Mobility Services Manager, London Councils, had followed up on this issue immediately after the previous meeting. The Chair thanked Stephen Boon for all the hard work on producing the mobility and services performance data.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted the Transport and Mobility Services Performance information report,

8. Draft Revenue Budget & Borough Charges 2022/23

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2022/23.

David Sanni, Acting Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, introduced the report which would be going to the TEC Main meeting for final approval. He said that the use of TEC Reserves amounted to £1.2million. An estimated 2% increase in staff salary costs had also been reflected, along with a 1.25% increase in NI contributions for employees. David Sanni said that other costs included the new Director post for Climate Change. There had also been a reduction to Freedom Pass contributions. The final figures would be presented to the full TEC meeting on 9 December 2021. David Sanni informed Members that the Committee's reserves were in a healthy and stable position.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the levies and charges below that would be presented to the full TEC meeting on 9 December 2021 and agreed by TEC Elected Officers via the TEC Urgency Procedure following that meeting in December:

- The proposed individual levies and charges for 2022/23 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 £0.3751 per PCN which will be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with PCNs issued in 2020/21 (2021/22 - £0.3596 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 (2021/22 – nil charge; paragraph 15);
 - The Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,000 in total (2021/22 - £338,000; paragraphs 17-18).
 - No charge to boroughs in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which is fully covered by estimated PCN income (2021/22 – nil charge; paragraphs 19-20);

- Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) - charge of £29.36 per appeal or £25.55 per appeal where electronic evidence is provided by the enforcing authority (2021/22 - £27.84/£24.06 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £23.64 for hard copy submissions and £22.88 for electronic submissions (2021/22 - £22.15/£21.40 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 (2021/22 - £12; paragraph 10);
- The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2021/22 - £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 (2021/22 - £15.23; paragraphs 29-35);
- The TEC¹ Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2021/22 - £0.175; paragraphs 29-35).
- The provisional gross revenue expenditure of £238.371 million for 2022/23, as detailed in Appendix A;
- On the basis of the agreement of all the above proposed charges as outlined in this report, the provisional gross revenue income budget of £237.215 million for 2022/23, with a recommended transfer of £275,000 from specific reserves for previously agreed priorities, £160,000 from uncommitted reserves to fund a new programme director to support boroughs on climate change and £721,000 from uncommitted Committee reserves to produce a balanced budget, as shown in Appendix B; and
- To consider the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 52-56 and Table 8 of this report.

The Executive-Sub Committee was also asked to note:

- the indicative total charges to individual boroughs for 2022/23, dependent upon volumes generated through the various parking systems, as set out in Appendix C.1.

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

9. Month 6 TEC Revenue Forecast 2021/22

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that outlined actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of September 2021 for TEC and provided a forecast of the outturn position for 2021/22. At this stage, a surplus of £717,000 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 £1.756 million, due in part to the impact of the Covid-19 on the scheme. The net borough proportion of this underspend was projected to be £1.588 million, with £168,000 accruing to TfL.

David Sanni introduced the second quarter TEC revenue forecast report. He informed Members that one of the key variances was the underspend on the Taxicard Scheme of £1.756 million on projected trip data. This would however be offset by a reduction in borough and TfL contributions. There were additional variances including an underspend on payments to non-TfL bus operators and a surplus from the replacement of Freedom passes. David Sanni said that the next revenue forecast report would be presented to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 10 February 2022.

The Chair said that he noted all the good work in managing the new Climate Change post. He asked Members whether they were content with the methodology used to pay the private bus operators. Stephen Boon said that London Councils was still in the same position when it came to paying the non-TfL bus operators. DfT offered guidance to phase this out on 1 April 2022 by 10% each month. Stephen Boon said that this would be covered in the concessionary fares report that was going to the TEC Main meeting on 9 December 2021. The Chair said that 10% per month sounded reasonable, although the political groups should flag this up to ensure that value for money was being achieved. Stephen Boon confirmed that the payments were made on a quarterly basis, by area, so payments on a month-by-month basis would not be an issue.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Note the projected surplus of £717,000 for the year, plus the forecast net underspend of £1.756 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.

10. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 September 2021

The minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 September 2021 were noted to be an accurate record and would be agreed by the TEC Elected Officers via the TEC Urgency Procedure following the meeting.

The Chair asked if the TEC finance reports and concessionary fares settlement and apportionment reports could be placed at the beginning of the agenda for the Main TEC meeting, especially if they were of a critical nature. He said that this would not keep guests/speakers waiting and would provide a fair and balanced agenda.

The Chair agreed to remove the press and public in that the following items would be exempt from the Access to Information Regulations, and via Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (Section 3) in that the items related to the financial or business affairs of a particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The meeting finished at 11:29am

Informal London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee (Virtual) – 14 October 2021

Minutes of a virtual informal meeting of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee held on Thursday 14 October 2021 at 2:30pm

Present:

Council	Councillor
Barking and Dagenham	Apologies
Barnet	Cllr Peter Zinkin
Bexley	
Brent	Cllr Krupa Sheth
Bromley	Cllr William Huntington-Thresher
Camden	Cllr Adam Harrison
Croydon	Apologies
Ealing	Cllr Deidre Costigan
Enfield	Apologies
Greenwich	
Hackney	Mayor Phil Glanville (Chair)
Hammersmith and Fulham	Cllr Wesley Harcourt
Haringey	Cllr Mike Hakata
Harrow	Cllr Varsha Parmar
Havering	
Hillingdon	
Hounslow	
Islington	Cllr Phil Graham (Deputy)
Kensington and Chelsea	Cllr Johnny Thalassites
Kingston Upon Thames	Cllr John Sweeney
Lambeth	Apologies
Lewisham	Cllr Patrick Codd (Deputy)
Merton	Cllr Martin Whelton
Newham	Cllr James Asser
Redbridge	Cllr Jo Blackman
Richmond Upon Thames	Cllr Julia Neden-Watts (Deputy)
Southwark	
Sutton	Cllr Jill Whitehead (Deputy)
Tower Hamlets	Cllr Asma Islam (Deputy)
Waltham Forest	Cllr Clyde Loakes
Wandsworth	Cllr Sarah McDermott
City of Westminster	Cllr James Spencer
City of London Corporation	Oliver Sells QC (Deputy)
Transport for London	Alex Williams

1. Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies

Apologies:

Cllr Syed Ghani (LB Barking & Dagenham)
Cllr Muhammad Ali (LB Croydon)
Cllr Ian Barnes (LB Enfield)
Cllr Rowena Champion (LB Islington)
Cllr Claire Holland (LB Lambeth)
Cllr Sophie McGeevor (LB Lewisham)
Cllr Alex Ehmann (LB Richmond)
Cllr Manuel Abellan (LB Sutton)
Cllr Dan Tomlinson (LB Tower Hamlets)
Alastair Moss (City of London Corporation)

Deputies:

Cllr Phil Graham (LB Islington)
Cllr Patrick Codd (LB Lewisham)
Cllr Julia Neden-Watts (LB Richmond)
Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton)
Cllr Asma Islam (LB Tower Hamlets)
Oliver Sells QC (City of London Corporation)

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

West London Waste Authority

Cllr Julia Neden-Watts (LB Richmond)

South West London Waste Partnership

Cllr John Sweeney (RB Kingston-upon-Thames)

Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee

Cllr Julia Neden-Watts (LB Richmond)

Freedom Pass

Cllr Jill Whitehead

CCIC Board

Mayor Phil Glanville (LB Hackney – Chair)

3. Vision Zero – Presentation by Lilli Matson, Transport for London (TfL)

The Chair informed members that the issue of speeding was already on the agenda a number of times today, and there would be further opportunities to discuss this very important issue.

Lilli Matson, Chief Safety Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London, said that discussions had taken place to revisit the Vision Zero Action Plan, and a great deal of work had been carried out across London on this. She said that, at the post pandemic stage, a move was taking place to a safe and green recovery. Lilli Matson said that TfL was working with London Councils and the Met Police and that she would discuss what was in the Plan,

with a view to TEC endorsing the Plan. She said that targets were set in Vision Zero in 2018 in order to reduce the dangers involving buses from TfL's point of view in particular. The aim was to eliminate all deaths and serious injuries due to road collisions by 2041, which was audacious and would require a great deal of effort.

Lilli Matson made the following comments regarding Vision Zero.

- London made good progress against the 2005 to 2009 baseline for deaths and serious injuries, although there had been an increase in the number of injuries for pedal cyclists.
- The Vision Zero Action Plan had generated focus and energy to make London safer like implementing the TfL Bus Safety Programme.
- There were five key action areas that boroughs were being asked to consider championing, including the focus on reducing speeds to 20mph (which would significantly reduce deaths and injuries), Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and encouraging ways of travel (eg active travel, walking and street design to make people feel safer).
- TfL was leading by example and signing-up their fleets and supply chains to FORS, CLOCS and NCAP 5-star ratings to embed the best standards. TfL would be happy to support the boroughs in this.
- One of the key elements was to accelerate the roll-out of the Lower Speed Limits programme and to use the power of marketing campaigns and enhance police enforcements, which would need compliance.
- More work needed to be done on making streets safer, and 43 schemes had been delivered, along with identifying high-risk junctions and expanding the London Cycle Network and improving motorcycle safety.
- Direct Vision Standard - London had carried out a great deal of work to improve vehicle safety (HGVs and buses).
- Future policies to be built-in and National Government to be lobbied. Boroughs could add FORS and CLOCs to their supplier contracts.
- "Safe Behaviour" was a longer-term win, and a new campaign was taking place this autumn. Increased training numbers of motorcyclists by 10% by 2022/23. Also working with delivery cyclists. Boroughs had a key role to play in encouraging ways to travel which pose less risk.
- Post collision learning and support given to victims of accidents is also an important activity.
- Engagement and next steps are taking place with stakeholder groups over the coming months. Chair of TEC and TfL (Lili Matson) to write to boroughs to promote this and to take forward this final plan.

Q & As

The Chair thanked Lili Matson for the presentation and welcomed the joint approach being taken. He said that there were a number of challenges that currently centered around deliveries and the gig economy. There was also interest in how boroughs worked with drivers and the companies themselves. People wanted this carried out quickly, which presented risks.

Councillor Zinkin said that he had a number of issues/difficulties with this presentation. He said that while he fully supported the aims and endorsed the motorcyclists and delivery drivers, there was a paradox taking place by which the Vision Standard was being promoted and yet funds were being removed for borough safety schemes. Councillor Zinkin felt that this was not a good backdrop by which to sign-up to. He said that the introduction of 20mph speed restrictions was not a priority on all residential streets, and speeds should be lowered in sensitive areas like around schools. Councillor Zinkin said that the boroughs of Barnet and Newham had the most number of electric cars.

Councillor Zinkin said that it was also assumed that Low Traffic Neighbourhoods were good, which was not always the case. He said that the work on making junctions safer was all carried out by TfL and borough funding was being taken away. Councillor Zinkin asked where the consultation was on this. Bus routes had also been reduced. He felt that there was a lot of disquiet at the moment, especially around the TfL budget settlement.

Lilli Matson thanked Councillor Zinkin for his comments. She said that these issues made achieving Vision Zero difficult. The importance of reducing the death rates on London roads sat higher than any TfL funding issues. Lili Matson said that it was entirely appropriate to look at where 20mph speeding restrictions would make a difference. She said that the document presented a structured approach, along with five key parts for boroughs to consider. She said that electric cars still caused accidents and this needed to be considered.

Lilli Matson said that one of the main issues was resources and there was a need to re-focus efforts as a City (London). Stuart Reid, Head of Insights and Direction, TfL, informed Members that bi-lateral conversations had taken place with the gig economy over the past couple of months, and all recognised the importance of protecting motorcyclists. He said that a charter-based approach was being developed. The Chair said he was glad that these debates were taking place.

Alex Williams said that he understood the frustrations Councillor Zinkin had regarding money and the LIP funding regime. He said that TfL wanted to reinstate the LIP funding as soon as possible. Alex Williams said that TfL was also seeking a long-term funding deal post 11 December 2021. He said that it was now more difficult to get money to the boroughs and further help was needed with this. The Chair said that these messages and concerns would be raised with Baroness Vere at the meeting taking place with her shortly. He said that it was important to recognise the issue of borough funding.

Councillor Neden-Watts said that she welcomed the great deal of the work that was taking place here, including the identification of high-risk junctions, which needed to be flagged-up. She said that it was important not to lose sight of keeping pedestrians safe. Councillor Neden-Watts said that her borough of Richmond already had 20mph speed restrictions, although the issue of speed restrictions on residential streets was more complex. She questioned whether certain age groups were suffering more as a result of living in less safer streets.

Councillor Whitehead felt that more clarification was needed that all boroughs would be treated fairly when it came to the distribution of funds. She said that the borough of Sutton needed more money, especially as it had a very ambitious sustainable transport strategy. Councillor Whitehead said that Sutton also had a problem with HGVs, especially when they travelled down side roads. There were also problems on red routes that had an effect on some roads in the borough. Councillor Whitehead said that there had already been a number of accidents involving e-scooters in the borough of Sutton and that these were seen as a danger by residents.

The Chair said that an e-scooter pilot update would soon be taken to a full TEC meeting. Lili Matson said that it was important to address the issue of motorcyclists in order to protect pedestrian journeys, which was having a disproportionate impact. She said that TfL was not specifically using residential roads for 20mph speeding zones, and this could be on any stretch of the TLRN. Lili Matson said that she was unaware of any particular roads in the borough of Richmond that had 20mph speeding restrictions, and TfL was looking at roads where 20mph zones were most appropriate and effective. She said that in Wales the 20mph roads were the default limit.

With regards to Black, Asian and Ethnic Minority groups, Lilli Matson said that there was a correlation to accidents and the type of roads they lived on. She said that TfL would be looking at using a similar funding formula that was used before. There was a need to get

this money to the boroughs and this needed to be made clear to central Government. Lilli Matson said that larger HGVs were now being used, as larger vehicles could carry bigger loads and would require less drivers.

Lilli Matson informed TEC that she would be happy to offer members information regarding freight movements. She confirmed that e-scooters would be mentioned in the document and that it would be useful to have an update on how the pilots were progressing at a future TEC meeting. Councillor Graham said that it was very important to get funding to the boroughs. He said that his borough of Islington did have problems with delivery drivers because of their employers. Drivers were putting themselves at risk, and a license to McDonalds had already been revoked. Councillor Graham said that drivers should be made to take a proper test to ensure that they had sufficient road skills.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that he had problems with the ways the issues were presented. He said that the boroughs were responsible for 95 per cent of the road network, but the document did not seem to recognise everyone in the partnership to make London safer. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that the document did also not recognise the LIPs that was agreed by the boroughs and the Mayor.

Lilli Matson said that the gig economy had presented new risks lately. She said that TfL was working with delivery companies and putting safety measures in place. Taking away driving notices (eg McDonalds) was making companies take notice. Lilli Matson said that the document represented a collaborative effort. The draft of the document represented what the boroughs had achieved, although the issue of LIPs did not come across well enough, and this needed to be taken back and looked into.

Councillor Asser said that he did not share the pessimistic views mentioned about this document. He said that collaborative working was a “two-way street” and he welcomed the safety elements in the document. He felt that speed limits needed to be lowered to 20mph, and further joint work needed to be carried out on certain bus routes, as this would solve a range of problems. Councillor Asser said that he was optimistic about this as there was a great deal of areas TfL and the boroughs could work on together.

In response to Islington’s query, Councillor Zinkin said that he would be happy to lobby Government for more money. He said that if there was an “action plan”, the boroughs would need actions that they could all sign-up to. This needed to be more nuanced than the current actions reflected. Lilli Matson said that TfL could come back to TEC on a regular basis on this. She said that part of the reason for coming to the meeting today was so that TfL could listen and reflect on the conversations that had taken place. The Chair said that he appreciated all the conversations that had taken place today and thanked TfL for attending the TEC Executive and giving the update.

The Committee:

- Noted that the next steps would be for TfL and Chair of TEC to write to the boroughs in order to go forward with this final plan;
- Noted concern voiced by Cllr Zinkin with regards to funds being removed for borough safety schemes; and
- Noted that the issue of LIP funding did not come through well enough in the document, and TfL would this away to look at.

4. ReLondon Update

The Committee received a report that provided a summary update on ReLondon’s activities and noted that in March this year that the London Waste and Recycling Board (LWARB) was rebranded and was renamed ReLondon.

Liz Goodwin, Chair of ReLondon, said that there was a great deal of value to be had in ReLondon attending the TEC meetings as it was important to keep the dialogue going between the organisations. She also thanked the TEC Board Members of ReLondon. Wayne Hubbard, Chief Executive Officer, ReLondon, informed members that Liz Goodwin had been elected for another term as Chair for ReLondon. He said that LWARB was still its strategic name, although it had now been rebranded to ReLondon.

Wayne Hubbard made the following comments.

- Key areas of work: we're trying to integrate Climate Change and trying to mitigate waste in order to help London and businesses fight Climate Change (200 businesses were currently listed in a directory).
- ReLondon would be participating in COP26. Food waste and loss contributed to emissions.
- TEC has a series of "asks". ReLondon was already addressing consumption issues and would be discussing the work it did with businesses and the circular economy, and recycling with residents.
- ReLondon had got to the first round of funding and would like to work with boroughs interested in low waste neighbourhoods (boroughs to let ReLondon know).
- ReLondon was also part of the Mayor's Green New Deal funding.

The Chair thanked ReLondon for their engagement and congratulated Liz Goodwin on her re-appointment as Chair of ReLondon.

Q and As

Councillor Neden-Watts said that she understood the charges for the services provided, but queried how much it would raise and how the funding would pan-out. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that funding would be provided on a third public, a third private and a third commercial basis which amounted to small amounts of money spread among many clients. He said that this was all demand-led and needed to be a bit more structured. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that this was an interesting report. He voiced concern though that residents were not engaged enough when it came to recycling in flats and getting a return for recycling. Councillor Huntington-Thresher felt that more receptacles for dry recycling and food waste were needed, especially for smaller homes like flats (which was a challenge).

Antony Buchan, ReLondon, said that a Deposit Return Scheme (DRS) was in preparation for implementation in the UK in 2023, and sat alongside Mayoral changes and a shake-up in collections. He said that the Government consultation on this ended in May 2021, and Government will feed back on these in spring 2022. Antony Buchan said that the DRS could affect local authority collections and ReLondon was part of the national debate on this and would be feeding back to the Government. The full net cost for recycling and packaging was key.

Antony Buchan said that a great deal of work was being carried out already in flats in the boroughs of Lambeth and Tower Hamlets in particular. He said that there was a need to consider flats supplementary guidance planning when it came to waste and services and especially capacity. Workshops had taken place with the boroughs, and a Supplementary Planning Guidance template had been devised from the work carried out with Tower Hamlets. Antony Buchan said that it was critical that ReLondon achieved a lot more from flats with regards to recycling.

Councillor Whitehead said that not a great deal had been taken forward from the recycling habits of 16 to 34 year olds. She asked whether any changes in habits had been noticed as

a result of the pandemic and climate emergency. Councillor Whitehead asked whether ReLondon was looking at good practice that could be used elsewhere, including elderly people in flats. She said that the borough of Sutton was very interested in recycling in flats and asked for the borough to be added to the ReLondon's list.

Councillor Islam said that she was very pleased with the report. She said that the borough of Tower Hamlets was made up of 80 per cent of flats. Councillor Islam felt that it was important that ReLondon focused on communities and needed to get the recycling message through to all residents. She said that local authorities were also struggling with resources for recycling. The Chair said that there was concern about boroughs getting extra resources to help with this. Councillor Zinkin said that London Councils and waste authorities had made submissions, especially around waste collections. He said that he welcomed the work that was taking place on flats. Councillor Zinkin said that there was a great deal of work that needed implementing that the London boroughs would struggle to carry out. He questioned whether these discussions were reflective of the work that was possible.

The Chair thanked ReLondon for the comprehensive report. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that the next recycling campaign would specifically target the 16 to 34 year old age group. He said that the campaign would be very digitally targeted, and this would assist local authorities to maintain their recycling rates. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that he was passionate about the circular economy and felt that it was important to pick-up on these local points. He said that the waste authorities tried to give independent advice on how to best help local authorities.

With reference to the comments made by Councillor Whitehead, Antony Buchan said that he would ask the project lead, Gemma Scott, to make contact with her about joining the flats recycling project and to offer information regarding new projects on flats recycling. He said that consultation was taking place with London Councils, but if TEC wanted a more detailed presentation on flats recycling it should let ReLondon know. Councillor Zinkin said that this information should be distributed to TEC via Alan Edwards.

The Committee noted the ReLondon report and update.

(Post meeting note: Further details on flats recycling was emailed to TEC Members, by Alan Edwards, following the meeting).

5. Environment & Adjudicators Annual Report 2020/21

The Committee received the Annual Report from the Environment and Traffic Adjudicators for the reporting year 2020-2021, presented to Members on behalf of the Environment and Traffic Adjudicators by the Chief Adjudicator, Caroline Hamilton.

Caroline Hamilton presented the Annual Report, which was produced as a statutory requirement on behalf of the independent adjudicators. She informed Members that the adjudicators continued to hear appeals by telephone. The Appeals Centre would also be opening soon for in-person appeals.

Councillor Zinkin thanked the adjudicators for their Annual Report and for their hard work keeping the tribunal running, which was much appreciated, and noted the judicial review outcomes. Caroline Hamilton said that she was happy to hear that and would relay this message back to the adjudicators. The Chair said that none of these issues had been easy and thanked Caroline Hamilton for this work.

The Chair asked Members if they had any thoughts on the volume of work, opening up the

centre and the challenges in maintaining the appeals service. Councillor Neden-Watts said that the report was very clear and thanked the adjudicators for their continued efforts. Caroline Hamilton said that it was relatively straightforward to make the transfer to telephone appeals, using the tribunal's case management system, as most appeals were assessed by evidence, with no issues of credibility arising, and could be addressed by telephone. She said that it was hoped the Appeals Centre would be opening soon, once all the screens were put in to make the center Covid-safe.

Caroline Hamilton said that it would be good to return to sharing the evidence with the appellants on screen, as this would make it easier for all parties concerned. This would also enable the appellants to have a better understanding of the reasons behind any outcome. Caroline Hamilton said that she was pleased that the centre continued to be able to provide access to justice. The Chair thanked Caroline Hamilton and the adjudicators and said that TEC very much valued the important work they carried out.

The Committee noted the Traffic and Environment Adjudicators' Annual Report for 202/21.

6. Chair's Report

The Committee received a report that updated Members on transport and environment policy since the last TEC meeting on 10 June 2021 and provided a forward look until the next TEC meeting on 9 December 2021.

The Chair said that an incredible amount of work had been undertaken by TEC officers, especially in advocating the role of climate change. He thanked the TEC vice chairs for their work on flooding and the evidence given by Councillor Holland. The Chair said that this was not just a straightforward Chair's Report, and a great deal of work had been carried out in the build-up to COP26 over the summer. He said that the item on flooding had been discussed at the Labour Group meeting, and a roundtable was taking place with the Mayor. A more detailed item on flooding would be going to the TEC meeting on 9 December 2021, and work was continuing to take place with Chief Executives.

Councillor Zinkin said that a critical element of doing something about flooding was having the funds to do this. He said that most of this money was with the Thames RFCC. Councillor Zinkin informed members that an RFCC meeting was taking place next week, and he urged members to email him with any specific points they wanted to raise. The Chair thanked Councillor Zinkin for this helpful offer of engagement. Councillor Neden-Watts said that she was the South-West member on the Thames RFCC. She said that one of the other key partners, when it came to local surface water flooding, was Thames Water. The Chair said that it was important to ensure that there were no information gaps when it came to flooding.

The Committee:

- Noted that a more detailed report on flooding would be presented to Members at the TEC meeting on 9 December 2021;
- Noted that Cllr Zinkin urged Members to email him with any points they want raised at the Thames RFCC meeting next week; and
- Noted that the issue of TfL finances would be raised with Baroness Vere at the meeting with her next week.

7. Climate Change Update Report

The Committee received a report that provided members with an update on the key upcoming moments before COP26, and London Councils' focus for the COP itself.

Katharina Winbeck said that she would like to draw Members' attention to a couple of resources, namely, the toolkit used and the graphics on the webpage. She said that the Cities Climate Investment Commission report would be soft launched on 22 October 2021 and formally launched at COP26 on 3 and 11 November 2021. Joint work was also taking place with housing directors with regards to retrofitting in London.

Katharina Winbeck said that London Councils and the GLA were lining-up a joint Climate Change conference prior to the start of COP26, with the Mayor, London Councils Chair and vice chairs, business and community groups speaking. The Chair thanked Kate Hand and Katharina Winbeck for all their work on Climate Change. He encouraged Members to look at these resources and join any Member events.

The Committee noted the Climate Change update report.

88. Emissions Accounting Proposal

The Committee received a report that provided Members with a summary of the work of the Emissions Accounting Task and Finish Group and presented a set of recommendations for the implementation of a shared approach to emissions accounting for London boroughs and the City of London. The report considered both borough-wide and council operations emissions.

Simon Gilby, Principal Projects and Policy Officer, London Councils, introduced the report and made the following comments.

- The Task and Finish Group was set-up in February 2021 and its first area of work was to look at borough-wide emissions. This included direct emissions (known as territorial or Scope 1 and 2 emissions) and consumption emissions.
- For direct emissions, officers recommended the use of the London Emissions and Greenhouse Gas Inventory (LEGGI) produced by the GLA as the inventory is London focused and boroughs wish to support the GLA in this area.
- Other areas included the borough-level consumption-based emissions datasets, available for 2001 – 2018, which ReLondon and London Councils jointly commissioned from the University of Leeds in 2021. This work built on the pan-London consumption-based emissions datasets, available for 2001 – 2016, previously commissioned by the GLA.
- Due to the overlap between the work commissioned by London Councils and ReLondon and that by the GLA, discussions had taken place to integrate the two separate reports into one report and jointly recommission it from the University of Leeds in the next fiscal year.
- A second area of focus was council emissions. A tool has been developed by Local Partnerships in partnership with the Local Government Association to measure council emissions. Whilst it is a work in progress, it is fit for purpose and officers felt they should support the nationwide work of the LGA, and both Local Partnerships and the LGA have signaled their willingness to work with London Councils to further expand the tool. Officers therefore recommended the use of this tool by London local authorities.
- The twin roles of the working group would be to act as a hub for Greenhouse Gas Emissions Accounting and to oversee the future development of this local partnership tool.

- In order to be able to commission the consumption-based emissions accounting on an annual basis, £10,000 from the TEC reserves was requested.

The Chair thanked Simon Gilby for the update on the emissions accounting proposal. He said that he was pleased that there would not be a league table that would measure boroughs against each other. The Chair said that the progress of the group would need to be followed carefully and would need to come back to TEC.

Councillor Zinkin said that he supported the suggested recommendations with a caveat. He said that the first recommendation (6.1) – “boroughs should calculate their scope 1,2 and 3 council emissions” using the Local Partnerships calculator should be altered to state that boroughs are encouraged to use the calculator, as some boroughs have already well established emissions measurements mechanisms using other tools. He said that he also shared Councillor Huntington-Thresher’s concerns over what scope 3 was and was worried about what could be construed as intrusive to borough residents. Councillor Whitehead said that she was a member of the London CIV pensions group, and the definition was based on the UN definition. She said that the report made reference to investment and this needed to be cross-referenced. Councillor Whitehead said that the borough of Sutton took on waste from four other boroughs and said that all the boroughs in that partnership were represented. She said that most emissions related to housing and transport, and there had, therefore, been lots of requests for retrofitting. Councillor Whitehead said that the borough of Sutton had poor transportation links and was dependent on car usage.

Simon Gilby said that he had taken on board Councillor Zinkin’s comments about boroughs calculating their scopes. He said that this was intended to be an evolutionary process. He said that discussions had taken place with the Society of London Treasurers regarding pensions (Councillor Whitehead’s comments). He said that this was a new topic and was mindful that this would need careful consideration. Simon Gilby said that the issue of energy and waste plants and how to divide this up where there were joint waste authorities was very much on the agenda and was being dealt with.

Simon Gilby said that housing and transport did make up the lion’s share of emissions, and in London, retrofitting was an important piece of work. He said that he was also mindful of the LEGGI reports, as boroughs wish to see a greater explanation of the data. Thought was needed on this and developing LEGGI. Katharina Winbeck, Strategic Lead Transport and Environment, London Councils, said that the best way to keep members updated on this issue was to bring this back to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on a regular basis.

Oliver Sells QC said that this was a very significant item. He said that the City of London Corporation viewed scopes 1 and 2 as a good start, although scope 3 required more ambition. Oliver Sells QC said that he very much supported the proposed recommendations in paragraph 6.1 and hoped that the City was leading the way on this. Councillor Neden-Watts said that she supported the initiative although she felt that boroughs risked becoming competitive on this issue. She said that a collegiate approach was needed. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that boroughs needed to avoid comparing their own figures to that of the United Nations. He felt that scope 3 could be intrusive to residents and emphasised the need to ensure that local authorities would not be measured on a borough-wide basis.

Simon Gilby said that the City of London Corporation was a member of the Task and Finish Group and contributed a great deal to this group. With reference to the comments made by Councillor Neden-Watts, Simon Gilby said that the working group should be seen as a forum by which to discuss the issue of measurement of GHG emissions (eg technical issues). He said that he took on board the potential privacy concerns regarding consumption emissions. However, the University of Leeds methodology is based on national statistics that are anonymized and there are no current plans to conduct surveys of

the public through which private data would be gathered. He said that currently emissions numbers are primarily raw data and further analytical work is needed in order to advise London Councils' members on potential policy solutions that might be in addition to work already on going. The Chair said that recommendation 6.1 should be revisited in light of Councillor Zinkin's comments. He reminded Members that any recommendations in this report would need to be agreed by TEC Elected Officers under the Urgency Procedure following the meeting.

The Committee:

- Noted that the first recommendation in paragraph 6.1 should be reworded to say that "Boroughs were encouraged to calculate their scope 1, 2 and 3 council emissions using the Local Partnerships tool considering the emissions under operational control." The recommendations would be agreed by TEC Elected Officers by the TEC Urgency Procedure following the meeting;
- Noted to agree that up to £10,000 could be used from TEC's Special Project Reserves annually to commission the Borough Consumption Emission Profile together with GLA and ReLondon;
- Noted that the best way to continue to engage members on this was to bring this back to TEC Executive meetings on a regular basis, and to circulate details via email; and
- Noted that the working group would replace the Task and Finish Group, and would be the forum to discuss issues of measurement of GHG emissions (ie technical issues)

9. Taxicard Update

The Committee received a report that provided Members with a progress update on the Taxicard scheme, including analyses of current performance levels. The report also provided information on how the pandemic had impacted Taxicard scheme and its financial situation.

Andy Rollock, Mobility Services Manager, London Councils, introduced the report, which gave an update on the Taxicard scheme. He confirmed that Addison Lee had now acquired CityFleet. Due diligence had been carried out with TfL on this matter. Andy Rollock informed Members that there had been a slight impact on performance owing to the recent fuel supply issues, although he was confident that performance would pick-up especially now the Addison Lee fleet were on board.

Councillor Harcourt voiced concern that the figures presented were not what was perceived by customers. He said that customers had voiced concern that there were not enough taxis around and that there were problems with taxi drivers being located. Andy Rollock said that he would discuss any issues about this with Councillor Harcourt after the meeting.

The Committee noted the Taxicard update report.

10. Safer Speeds Review

The Committee received a report that provided an update to members on London Councils' activity and planned future actions in lobbying for a change in legislation to radically improve the way that speed is enforced in London. An amendment to Part 5 of the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill had been tabled to include future provisions on enhanced borough speed enforcement powers.

Andy Luck, Transport Manager, London Councils, introduced the report, which provided

members with an update of the safer speeds review. The report included London Councils' response to central government's roads policing review: "call for evidence". He informed Members that the report also provided an update from Transport for London on the enhancement work they had been undertaking with MPS and boroughs under the existing regulations.

Andy Luck said that London Councils had proposed an amendment to Part 5 of the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill in order to give legislation to the boroughs. This would be tabled by the House of Lords in the next few weeks. He said that communications work would be continuing with the GLA, along with the lobbying. London Councils would be looking for more information from local authorities with regards to speeding in boroughs. The Chair said that engagement was continuing to take place with TfL and the lobbying and work carried out had been really good. He said that there was a need to deliver different things for different boroughs.

Councillor Zinkin said that he welcomed the paper. He felt, however, that a view needed to be taken with regards to the borough of Wandsworth item, as the two things could not be taken separately (ie LB Wandsworth used to assist operations with Safer Neighbourhood Teams for Operation Cubo - using ANPR to locate uninsured vehicles - as there was a direct correlation between those that did not pay their penalty notices and those that did not insure, tax or MOT their vehicles).

Councillor Codd said that this was a good report and relevant to the borough of Lewisham. He said that the report was also very helpful at a local level. Councillor Codd said that a nasty accident had taken place in Lewisham, but not a great deal of notice had been taken because speeding levels were going down. Councillor Codd also asked whether looking at standard speeds was appropriate. Councillor Whitehead said that she also welcomed the report and the reintroduction of speed cameras. She asked whether TfL had specific camera sites in mind. Andy Luck said that the issue of camera sites was currently being looked into (ie where boroughs needed more enforcement to take place). He said that better engagement between the boroughs and TfL would lead to more cameras. Andy Luck said that he did not have an answer to Councillor Codd's question about standard (average) speeds, but would look at this in more detail if he emailed London Councils. The Chair said that average speeds varied at different times of the day.

The Committee:

- Noted that Cllr Codd would email Andy Luck regarding the issue of average speeds and that contact had been made.

11. Health Emergency Badge Scheme Review - Update

Members received a report on the Health Emergency Badge (HEB) review recommendations and presented options for delivering these recommendations. The report also asked for Member views on going to the market to supply a new case management system (CMS) and badge supply and using the TEC special project reserve to fund the upfront CMS development costs, and to raise the cost of a badge from £27 to £95, in order for the initial investment to be repaid over a four-year period.

Stephen Boon introduced the report which was a continuing review of the HEB Scheme. He said that London Councils was looking to go to the market and to seek funding from TEC reserves to help go towards this. The Chair asked for a definition of what constituted as a "health emergency". Stephen Boon said that this covered all health care operators that dealt with health emergencies. Councillor Huntington-Thresher asked whether vehicles that had HEBs had serial numbers so that they could not be used illegally. Stephen Boon said that London Councils was trying to address this issue. He informed Members that the current system did not allow for badges to be taken out of circulation. Stephen Boon said that new

badges were being looked at that were more difficult to replicate (eg that had holograms etc).

The Committee noted and commented on the report.

12. London Borough of Wandsworth Speeding Enforcement Pilot – Contravention Code & Penalty Level

Members considered a report that sought member approval for the creation of a new contravention code and to agree a penalty charge level for Wandsworth Borough Council to progress a planned new 20mph speed enforcement pilot.

Councillor McDermott said that something needed to be done now to impose fines in 20mph speed limit zones. Andy Luck said that this could present an opportunity to do this, but it was not without risks or possible legal challenge. He said that it was important for the borough of Wandsworth to be able to move into the next stage of 20mph speeding enforcement. Andy Luck informed Members that Wandsworth now had a plan in place, which was a novel approach that was supported by providing the tools to allow LB Wandsworth to pilot the proposal. Nick O'Donnell, Assistant Director of Traffic and Engineering, TfL, said that there were powers that existed on a temporary basis (up to 18 months) for the experimental trial of speed cameras. He said that live data would be available which would help to re-energise this.

The Chair said that he welcomed this pilot. He asked whether this was being explored with any other boroughs than Wandsworth. Nick O'Donnell said that although the borough of Richmond was keen to follow this up, and it was important to use Wandsworth as a "test case". The Chair said that one of the recommendations was the creation of a new contravention code. Councillor McDermott said that she was keen to go ahead with this and then to share the data. Andy Luck said that the new contravention code (97) would need to be created which TEC would need to approve, along with a penalty charge level of £130 (reduced to £65 for prompt payment).

As this was an informal TEC meeting, any decisions outlined below would be agreed by TEC Elected Officers under the TEC Urgency Procedure after the meeting.

The Committee:

- Noted that the revision of the contravention code list to include the new speeding contravention code and description (code 97) would need to be approved; and
- Noted the penalty levels for a newly created speeding contravention code to be set at the existing tariff for moving traffic contraventions would need to be approved by TEC (£130 with a discount of 50% for prompt payment)

NOTE: that London Councils was not asking the Committee to approve to LB Wandsworth undertaking the pilot (as this is a matter for Wandsworth) but to approve the above which would allow the next phase to continue.

13. Items Considered under the TEC Urgency Procedure

The Committee received a report that gave Members details of the TEC Urgency Procedures that were sent to TEC Elected Officers following the TEC meetings listed below:

- TEC AGM Meeting held on 10 June 2021; and
- TEC Executive Sub Committee Meeting held on 15 July 2021

The Committee noted the TEC Urgency Procedures that were sent to TEC Elected Officers for approval following those meetings.

14. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 September 2021

The Committee noted the minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 September 2021.

15. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 10 June 2021

The Committee noted the minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 10 June 2021. The minutes of this meeting would be agreed via the TEC Urgency Procedure following the meeting.

The Chair agreed to remove the press and public in that the following items would be exempt from the Access to Information Regulations, and via Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (Section 3) in that the items related to the financial or business affairs of a particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The meeting finished at 17:14pm