

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Thursday 9 February 2023

10:00am in Meeting Room 5, London Councils, 1st Floor,
59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL

Contact Officer: Alan Edwards **Tel:** 020 7934 9911
Email: Alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Agenda item (Part One)	Pages
1 Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies	-
2 Declarations of Interests*	
3 TfL Board Oral Update by Cllr Kieron Williams	-
4 Micromobility Update	
5 Climate Change Update: Programme Funding, Advocacy, 3Ci	
6 Transport & Mobility Performance Information	
7 Transport Funding Sub Group Update	
8 TEC Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2022/23	
9 Proposed Dates for TEC & TEC Executive Sub Committee 2023/24	
10 Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 17 November 2022 (for agreeing)	
11 Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 8 December 2022 (for noting)	

<p>Part Two: Exclusion of the Press & Public (Exempt)</p> <p>TEC will be invited by the Chair to agree to the removal of the press and public since the following items of business are closed to the public pursuant to Part 5 and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended):</p> <p>Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial and business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information), it being considered that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.</p>	
<p>E1 Exempt Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 8 December 2022 (for noting)</p>	

***Declarations of Interests**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Declarations of Interest – TEC Executive Sub Committee
9 February 2022**

Freedom Pass & 60+ Oyster Card

Cllr Nicholas Bennett (LB Bromley)

North London Waste Authority

Cllr Mike Hakata (LB Haringey)

Western Riverside Waste Management

Councillor Rezina Choudhury (LB Lambeth)

West London Waste Authority

Cllr Krupa Sheth (LB Brent)

Cllr Deidre Costigan (LB Ealing)

ReLondon

Cllr Krupa Sheth (LB Brent)

Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee

Cllr Mike Hakata (LB Haringey)

London Road Safety Council (LRSC)

Cllr Krupa Sheth (LB Brent)

Cllr Mike Hakata (LB Haringey)

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

Mayor Philip Glanville (LB Hackney)

British Cycling

Mayor Philip Glanville (LB Hackney)

Member of SERA

Mayor Philip Glanville (LB Hackney)

Councillor Deidre Costigan (LB Ealing)

Councillor Rezina Choudhury (LB Lambeth)

Councillor James Asser (LB Newham)

Labour Cycles & UK Cities Climate & Investment Commission (CCIC) Advisory Board

Mayor Philip Glanville (LB Hackney)

Friends of London Transport Museum

Cllr Nicholas Bennett (LB Bromley)

London Underground Transport Museum

Cllr Nicholas Bennett (LB Bromley)

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Micromobility Update

Item
No: 04

Report by: Agathe de Canson **Job Title:** Principal Policy and Project Officer,
London Councils

Date: 9 February 2023

Contact Officer: Agathe de Canson

Telephone: 0207 934 9829 **Email:** agathe.decanson@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report is to update TEC's executive on London Councils' activity in relation to the micromobility agenda, including the e-scooter trial, dockless bikes, the Transport Bill and longer term plans for micromobility.

Recommendations: The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report

Introduction

1. London Councils and TfL continue to work together to deliver London's e-scooter trial which will run until at least May 2024.
2. The micromobility rental market continues to be unregulated in the UK (outside of the e-scooter trials). Legislation to regulate it has been delayed and it is expected legislation will not be brought forward until Autumn 2023 at the earliest.
3. London Councils and TfL are in the early stages of working together to create a longer term plan on micromobility rental in London in anticipation of regulation in this space.

Rental e-scooter trial

4. London's e-scooter trial is one of several trials across the UK authorised by DfT.
5. London Councils and TfL are currently undertaking a procurement process to select operators for a new contract to be launched around September 2023. In the meantime, the current contract with Dott, Lime and TIER has been extended.
6. DfT has set learning objectives for e-scooter trials nationwide, towards which we have been working in London's e-scooter trial:
 - Maintaining high standards
 - Contributing to Net Zero
 - Maintaining a safe & attractive environment
 - Improving user and non-user perceptions
 - Commercial viability & accessibility
7. In January 2023, London Councils, borough officers, TfL, and London e-scooter operators identified a set of priority actions for this phase of the trial that will help deliver to the above objectives. These include:
 - Unlocking more parking spaces
 - Expanding the trial to new boroughs
 - Improving the user experience, in particular with regards to the first ride
 - Publishing an interim report with key data points and lessons learnt
 - Working with women's active travel groups
 - Running more safety events
 - Reviewing geofenced zones
8. These actions will be taken forward by London Councils, borough officers, TfL, and London e-scooter operators, with progress reviewed against the priorities and targets identified.
9. The use of private e-scooters on public land remains illegal.

Rental e-bikes

10. In December 2022, London Councils held a meeting with London rental e-bike operators and members of the TEC Executive Sub-Committee.
11. Following this meeting, London Councils has taken the following steps:
 - Collecting boroughs' current MoUs and contracts
 - Drafting a template MoU to be shared with boroughs (*in progress*)
 - Advising boroughs that are considering setting up a contract or MoU
 - Sharing information with borough officers through the "micromobility working group"
 - Circulating a briefing regarding parking with TEC members
 - Circulating a briefing to London MPs regarding the need for legislation in this space
 - Facilitating discussions with operators and helping to resolve any issues, particularly if a borough is experiencing issues around parking

Building a longer term strategy

12. London Councils and individual boroughs increasingly see the need for more coordinated action and a clearer strategy when it comes to the micromobility rental market.
13. London Councils and TfL have been exploring solutions for the longer term that would streamline approaches across London.
14. As part of this London Councils held a meeting with TEC members in January 2023 exploring a proposal to join up the governance and delivery of rental e-scooter and e-bike services.

London Councils' proposed activity

15. We will work with TfL, borough officers, TEC members and e-scooter operators to deliver on the priorities identified for the current phase of the e-scooter trial.
16. We will continue to support boroughs to manage rental e-bikes in the ways set out above.
17. We will continue to work with TfL, borough officers, TEC members and e-scooter operators to develop a longer term plan for managing the micromobility rental market in London in the ways set out above.
18. We will circulate a briefing to TEC members and borough officers responding to the questions raised in the meeting as well as putting together a timeline for engagement with borough and other stakeholders.
19. We will work with London MPs and other UK local authorities to make the case for legislation to enable and regulate rental e-scooter and e-bike schemes in the UK.

Recommendations

The Committee is asked to:

- Note and comment on the report

Financial Implications

None

Legal Implications

None

Equalities Implications

20. Rental e-bikes and e-scooters have the potential to cause obstructions on the footway when parked.
21. In developing any longer term approach to micromobility rental, it is essential to consider impacts on the public realm and the implications this may have for pedestrians. In particular, steps must be taken to ensure footways are accessible to people who are blind or partially sighted and people who require more space, including those with wheelchairs, mobility aids or buggies. This is necessary to ensure disabled people, older people, parents and carers are not adversely affected.

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Climate Change Update: Programme Funding, Advocacy, 3Ci

Item No: 05

Report by: Hannah Jameson **Job Title:** Programme Director, Climate Change
Kate Hand Head of Climate Change

Date: 7 Feb 2023

Contact Officer: Kate Hand **Email:** Kate.hand@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report provides updates on three key areas of climate change work: Climate Programmes Funding, Climate Advocacy, and 3Ci. Members are asked to note and comment on progress to date.

Recommendations: The Committee is asked to:

1. Note the update on funding for the programmes.
2. Note the climate advocacy strategy for 2023-24.
3. Note the update on 3Ci work.

Introduction/Overview

1. This report provides updates on three key areas of climate change work: Climate Programmes Funding, Climate Advocacy, and 3Ci.
2. London boroughs work on the climate programmes has demonstrated that they allow boroughs to act as an effective strategic partner for climate change delivery, but in order to accelerate into delivery they will need a new resourcing model. London Councils is proposing a mixed resourcing model that collectively delivers total resourcing of £2,040,000 for Financial Years 2023-24 and 2024-25.
3. Following the paper to TEC in October 2022, London Councils has prepared a climate advocacy strategy for 2023-24, following extensive consultation with boroughs and reflecting on our unique role in supporting boroughs. The strategy outlines a focus on:
 - a. Securing progress against our current key policy asks, which have been identified within the Shared Ambitions priorities (retrofit, skills and the green economy)
 - b. Completing further policy development work to fully articulate the framework, engaging closely with London Councils' groups and drawing on boroughs' expert technical leads and the climate programmes, and complementing the development of a narrative and vision for a net zero London
 - c. Significantly strengthen our credibility and reach amongst key stakeholders to underpin future influencing activities
 - d. Continuing to address the links with cross-cutting issues, such as the cost-of-living crisis.
4. 3Ci has attracted additional partner organisations from both the public and private sector organisations, it has developed an Outline Business Case together with BEIS and has started a national net zero project pipeline, to which the London boroughs have made a great contribution.

Climate Programmes Funding Update

5. The London Councils climate programmes were launched in 2019, following LEDNet and TEC's joint statement on the climate emergency. The programmes are led by London's boroughs, and each brings together a range of partners to collaborate on some of our city's biggest climate challenges.
6. Over the course of 2020 and 2021, the lead boroughs for each programme established governance arrangements, engaged partners and undertook work to scope the programmes. This culminated in the publication of action plans for each programme, which were shared with TEC in March 2022 and which are available on the [London Councils website](#).
7. Work to date has demonstrated that the programmes allow London's boroughs to act as an effective strategic partner for climate change delivery. The programmes have established a valuable new tier of climate governance in London, bringing together partners from across London government, central government and associated bodies, private and third sector. Working at this scale allows local government to start to address

policy, partnerships, investment, procurement, supply-chain, skills and other strategic issues that will allow effective climate change delivery. It also enables us to approach a range of partners collectively, to help provide a joined-up way for other sectors, investors and national partners to do business with London's boroughs on net zero. This has been recognised nationally by two awards received by the Retrofit London programme.

8. Since publication of the action plans, the programmes have started to deliver key priority actions that will add clear value for boroughs and help coalesce our collaboration on these key climate goals. Alongside this, programme teams have been further developing and refining two-year implementation plans, and identifying the resources required to deliver these plans. Alongside achievements to date, the tables in Appendix 1 therefore set out the specific vision each programme is offering London for the next two years, as well as key planned deliverables for 2023-24.
9. Overall, this presents a picture across the seven programmes, that the next two years will be about capacity building and early delivery. The programmes are working towards 2030 and they will mature and grow over time. The focus of the next two years is to learn by doing; develop delivery models; attract partnerships and funding; and strengthen climate governance for London.

Funding required

10. This next phase of work and the deliverables associated with it are subject to resourcing. The programmes are therefore at a tipping point. Each of the programmes has priority actions for the next two years that have the potential to significantly accelerate or strengthen London's climate action. To date the programmes have run on minimal resources, but to move to implementation, a new resourcing model will need to be established.
11. In order to unlock the next phase of work, develop full costed delivery plans, accelerate project delivery and unlock other funding sources, each of the programmes will require initial, dedicated project management capacity with a strong level of experience and expertise, as well as some additional funding for the project managers to have additional team members and/or consultancy in the first two years.
12. The Retrofit London programme already has funding for this core capacity, provided by contributions from the London Housing Directors' Group; but the other six programmes are lacking this dedicated resource and continue to be undertaken with only existing staff capacity at the lead boroughs, plus some support from London Councils and other partners.
13. Current modelling suggests that to take forward the ambitions and deliverables set out in the implementation plans, each of the remaining six programmes would require £170,000 for the first year, and the same for the following year – a total resourcing requirement of **£2,040,000 for Financial Years 2023-24 and 2024-25**. To achieve this would require contributions of approximately £40,000 per borough per year for the next two years.

Emerging resource model

14. If the programmes are to be taken forwards over the next two years and set up for success looking out to 2030, we are likely to need a mixed resourcing model to support core delivery capacity for each programme as well as specific deliverables. Key sources of funding currently being explored are:
- a. **External funding.** The programmes are already seeking, and will continue to seek, external funding for a range of deliverables including key projects, research partnerships, and pilot initiatives. Feedback from the programmes is that there is a significant amount of external funding available for climate change work, however, at present the programmes do not have the capacity to apply for funding or develop the partnerships necessary to attract larger grants. Therefore, securing funding for the programmes' core capacity will be critical to unlocking further investment.
 - b. **London Councils resourcing.** London Councils is funding an overall programme director, as well as secretariat for the cross-programme governance, to help drive the programmes forward and support effective cross-working and collaboration on programme synergies. London Councils officers from core policy teams are also supporting each of the seven programmes with additional advice and occasional project support (e.g. with contributions from NGDP or fast stream placements). At a minimum, London Councils expects to maintain current levels of resourcing for coordinating the programmes and is examining options for increasing support, (whilst cognizant of the expectations of the Leaders Committee for the whole organisation to reduce its reliance on using reserves). London Councils itself would not be in a position to fund dedicated resources for each individual programme at the scale required, which is why contributions from other sources are also being sought.
 - c. **GLA / strategic partners.** We will be seeking contributions from the GLA and other strategic partners in London to support across the programmes or in specific areas of interest as key strategic delivery initiatives for London. We will also be looking at approaches to central government (DfT, DLUHC, BEIS) on a similar basis.
 - d. **Borough contributions.** To help unlock these other sources of funding and provide core capacity to drive forward the programmes, we are highly likely to need contributions from London boroughs. This would demonstrate borough leadership and commitment to collectively delivering our net zero goals and provide a core resource fully controlled by boroughs to steer and drive work and leverage other funding. Contributions could be a combination of cash and in-kind (e.g. dedicated staff time, NGDP placements, etc) and could be made across the next two years. As the list of deliverables is firmed up, there is also potential for these to come from effectively pooling budgets that were otherwise earmarked for creating similar deliverables or capacity on a borough-by-borough basis, delivering greater efficiency and enabling us to do more together.

Next steps

15. The London Environment Directors Network has been leading engagement with boroughs on resourcing the programmes, alongside London Councils. Initial feedback has been positive, and a formal letter will be issued to boroughs in February.
16. The amount of resources available to the programmes over the next two years will influence the implementation plan for 2022/23-24/25. Once the resources are confirmed the London Councils programme implementation plan will be published in March.

Climate Change Advocacy Strategy

Overview

17. Officers have developed an updated climate advocacy strategy for the 2023-24 period, building on the October 2022 paper to TEC and given the priority placed on this issue within the Shared Ambitions. The draft strategy is attached to this document.
18. The strategy development process has drawn extensively on borough expertise, and has sought to identify London Councils' unique role, and where we can most effectively deliver for the London boroughs. We also continuously seek to ensure that the action we are taking is effective and has a clear theory of change to ensure delivery and realise goals.
19. We will update TEC on our progress against the strategy at the March 2023 meeting.

What we aim to deliver

20. The October 2022 TEC paper set out our current priorities for climate influencing, including the headline need for 'a clear framework for regional and local climate delivery and a just transition that creates good jobs, supported by the right powers, resources and incentives'.
21. To deliver against this ambition over 2023 – 24, London Councils will:
 - a. Secure progress against our current key policy asks, which have been identified within the Shared Ambitions (retrofit, skills and the green economy)
 - b. Complete further policy development work to fully articulate the framework, engaging closely with London Councils' groups and drawing on boroughs' expert technical leads and the climate programmes, and complementing the development of narrative and vision for a net zero London
 - c. Significantly strengthen our credibility and reach amongst key stakeholders to underpin future influencing activities
 - d. Continue to address the links with cross-cutting issues, such as the cost-of-living crisis.
22. Key opportunities to influence around on retrofit, skills and the green economy will include the publication in March 2023 of the revised Net Zero Strategy, parties' manifesto development process, including party conferences, and forthcoming fiscal events. Alongside these major national moments, we will progressively seek to 'make the weather' where we need to create opportunities for influence.

23. Our detailed delivery plans will be set out in a separate, living document, which will include more detailed stakeholder analysis and a theory of change for each priority ask.

Strategy Document Contents

24. The strategy covers the strategy development process, including both how officers looked at our policy positions and thought creatively about our advocacy activities.
25. It outlines where we need to undertake further policy development to ensure we have key shared positions.
26. It also outlines key barriers to action, and our overarching approach to tackling these.
27. It provides an assessment of the opportunities and strengths, the resources we are dedicating to this work, and a section on how we will report on and evaluate this work, including regular reporting back to TEC.

3Ci Update

Overview

28. The Cities Commission for Climate Investment (3Ci) is a collaboration of local authorities across the country, private financial institutions, and Government to create a market for net zero finance.
29. London Councils, Core Cities and Connected Places Catapult were the founding members in 2021 with the key aim of enabling private finance to assist in our individual and collective net zero ambitions. It now includes the devolved administrations, key Cities and the LGA, therefore representing all local authorities across the UK.
30. The Commission created a place-based, multi-intervention, blended finance model for delivering net zero, which delivers a financial return as well as social and environmental outcomes.
31. This means that dividends from the most financially attractive assets, such as renewable energy generation, but also EV infrastructure for example, help fund some of the more challenging interventions, like decarbonising waste management and making our places greener and more resilient.
32. An Outline Business Case has been developed in partnership with BEIS to Treasury green book standards and rules, which has a positive return on investment. It demonstrates economic, as well as environmental and social benefits.
33. In order to further refine and test viability of the outline business case, 3Ci is looking to run a programme of demonstrators across the country. The approach to developing these is currently being looked at.

Net Zero Pipeline

34. 3Ci, in partnership with local authorities, is creating a national pipeline for local and regionally led bankable projects, delivering net zero outcomes.
35. For London, 28 boroughs submitted responses with 671 distinct projects. Table 1 below provides an overview of the total funding need that was identified by strategic sub-region. Altogether, £52 billion of funding was sought from the projects proposed by boroughs in their pipelines. This is not the full sum required for boroughs to reach net

zero, but rather the investment required for specific projects currently identified for development and/or delivery.

36. There was substantial variation across individual boroughs in the number and value of projects for which a funding need was identified. These differences do not necessarily reflect genuine differences in feasible projects being developed on the ground, but rather reflects differences in the way the project information was gathered, costed and selected for submission to the pipeline.

Table 1. Summary of submissions by strategic sub-regional partnership groups

Sub-region	Number of Projects	Total Finance Required (£)¹	Public Funding (£)²
Central	276	14,029.7m	3,144.2m
South	65	584.2m	21.9m
West	203	30,516.8m	18,945.8m
Local	127	6,893.7m	2,748.7m
Grand Total	671	52,024.5m	24,860.5m

¹'Total finance requirement' is the finance being sought from public and private sources

²'Public funding' refers to the grants or own resource contributions from the public sector

Next Steps

37. 3Ci have appointed consultants Jacobs to help them further develop the pipeline through the following work:
- a) adopt a typology of sub-sectors for categorising assets drawing from the types of net zero project local authorities have identified,
 - b) enhance the terminology around the maturity or readiness for investment,
 - c) provide cost and carbon benchmarks to help boroughs judge whether their unit costs are reasonable, and
 - d) produce factsheets about asset sub-classes and measures to decarbonise them.
38. 3Ci is also developing approaches to disseminate and share innovations usefully and rapidly across the country, to facilitate learning, as well as the creation of a development fund that invests in the necessary capacity and skills to bring net zero, place based projects forward for investment.
39. 3Ci is also organising a number of investor events, including one for London in the summer, which will be a great opportunity to showcase some of the projects in the pipeline.

Recommendations

The Committee is asked to:

1. Note the update on funding for the programmes.
2. Note the climate advocacy strategy for 2023-24.
3. Note the update on 3Ci work.

Financial Implications

There are no immediate 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 direct equalities implications arising from the recommendations made in this report.
- However, there are significant equalities impacts arising from climate change, and potential equalities impacts associated with the development and implementation of climate change policy. We know that those with the least resources to adapt to a changing climate are most likely to be negatively impacted. These resources can include financial, emotional and social factors.

London Councils Climate Advocacy Strategy 2023-24

Introduction

This document outlines the strategy development process, the overall climate advocacy strategy, and plans to monitor and evaluate that strategy. A delivery plan will be created to operationalise this document, taking into account our limited resources and alignment with other work underway at London Councils. In that document, the detailed approach and sequencing for activities will be decided.

Throughout this process, we have sought to identify our unique role, and where we can most effectively deliver for the London boroughs; some issues are better tackled via national networks. So, we must be clear that what we are doing is effective and have a clear theory of change behind the action that we are taking.

The policy focus of this work was signed off by London Councils Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) in October 2022, and is informed by work on retrofit, skills and the green economy which the Shared Ambitions highlight as key areas for London Councils.

Strategy Development

Policy review process

Over the summer we reviewed our policy positions on climate issues, to ensure that we are responding to the latest policy developments and calling for things that best help the boroughs achieve key climate and environment goals.

To begin this process officers undertook a desk-based review of London Councils and LEDNet's existing policy positions on climate change and environment including decisions from Leaders Committee and TEC, LEDNet published positions, and other positions from signed off statements, positions papers, and consultation responses.

A session was held with LEDNet to understand the key priorities for directors in this space and to inform detailed work of officer workshops. Following this, seven deeper dive workshops were held with specialist officers from across London:

- Two workshops on the overarching policy framework: 1. governance and powers and 2. finance and funding
- Five deep-dive workshops on environmental themes: 3. built environment & energy; 4. transport and air quality; 5. waste, resources and consumption; 6. green economy and skills; and 7. climate resilience and adaptation.

These workshops were attended by around 130 borough and London Councils officers, including specialists in other related policy areas such as finance, skills or built environment, as well as those from environment and climate roles and the climate programmes. They focused on outlining our key climate and environment goals, the barriers to delivering them, and how national or regional policy could change to achieve a more enabling environment for local government action.

Appendix 1

We took a paper to TEC in October 2022 to update them on this process, and secured support for continued climate policy influencing.

Advocacy workshop

In November we held an internal climate advocacy workshop to ensure we're aligned on our climate advocacy work across teams and secure their creative input into this advocacy strategy. At the workshop we outlined the work that had been carried out as part of the policy review process, discussed the political situation, and worked through four workshop activities:

- Barriers analysis to understand the barriers to change that we need to overcome
- Opportunities mapping to understand upcoming and ongoing advocacy opportunities
- Stakeholder mapping to understand our key stakeholders
- Tactics ideation to come up with interesting ideas for influencing activities

The written output of these workshop sessions, a [miro board](#), has informed the rest of this document.

Strategy – overview

The October 2022 TEC paper set out our current priorities for climate influencing, including the headline need for 'a clear framework for regional and local climate delivery and a just transition that creates good jobs, supported by the right powers, resources and incentives'.

To deliver against this ambition over 2023 – 24, London Councils will:

- secure progress against our current key policy asks, which been identified within the Shared Ambitions (retrofit, skills and the green economy (* in Table A));
- complete further policy development work to fully articulate the framework, engaging closely with London Councils' groups and drawing on boroughs' expert technical leads and the climate programmes, and complementing the development of narrative and vision for a net zero London (see Table B);
- significantly strengthen our credibility and reach amongst key stakeholders to underpin future influencing activities (see Table B); and
- continue to address the links with cross-cutting issues, such as the cost of living crisis.

Key opportunities to influence around on retrofit, skills and the green economy are set out in Appendix 1, but will include the publication in March 2023 of the revised Net Zero Strategy, parties' manifesto development process, including party conferences, and forthcoming fiscal events. Alongside these major national moments, we will progressively seek to 'make the weather' where we need to create opportunities for influence.

Our detailed delivery plans will be set out in a separate, living document, which will include more detailed stakeholder analysis and a theory of change for each priority ask.

Policy asks

Table A, below, sets out our key existing asks, and areas where further policy development work is needed.

Appendix 1

Policy area	Key existing asks	Policy development needed
Governance	Recognition of local government's key role and unique position to deliver A clear set of council powers and freedoms to deliver net zero, including a statutory duty for public bodies to reach net zero Clear engagement between central and local government through the Local Net Zero Forum	
Funding and financing	More central government funding to support local government climate action, in particular for decarbonising buildings, transport networks and waste services, with simplified, longer-term funding commitments Increased funding and financing from the wider financial system, both to local government directly, e.g. from UKIB and to our partners in decarbonisation in the private and wider public sector	Greater flexibility for local government to resource climate action locally, e.g. through charges raised from environmental enforcement Articulation of how much funding and financing boroughs need to get to net zero Set out effective funding models, including the costs of competitive funding pots to boroughs
Sectoral policy and powers	Support for a robust retrofit supply chain and skills training Planning policy and building regulations aligned to decarbonisation and led by local places Legislation to manage e-bikes and e-scooters A modern transport hierarchy in the Road Transport Act and changes to TMOs Waste reform aligned to decarbonisation	New national standards for energy efficiency in all housing sectors Strategic energy planning and delivery Strategic infrastructure development Changes to energy pricing and investment to incentivise retrofit and renewables Support for locally-led climate adaptation Increasing electric vehicle infrastructure delivery and making it simpler, cheaper and more accessible to all Reducing the carbon and air quality impacts of vehicles on London's roads Skills policy that supports local green skills and green economic development
Delivery support	Provision of tools and evidence that enable places to make the right decisions for local net zero delivery, including standardised approaches for carbon accounting and emissions, strategic planning, and use of carbon offsets	Supporting sustainable lifestyles

Table A: climate policy framework

Appendix 1

Approaches to cross-cutting barriers

The following table outlines the barriers that are common across our climate advocacy work, which we will seek to address across our influencing.

Barriers	Activities	Outcomes	Impact
Lack of vision and narrative on what a net zero London looks like	Develop a collective vision and narrative for a net zero London	Clearly articulated and used vision for a net zero London	Boroughs, the GLA, other stakeholders and government share our vision for a net zero London, including the associated policy, funding and incentive framework
Lack of clarity on boroughs' roles	Thought leadership work on what a net zero London looks like		
	Clarify what boroughs can do towards net zero	What boroughs can do is made clear and areas of ambiguity are raised with govt	Boroughs are enabled to act as far as their powers and funds allow and Government and other stakeholders are clear on what boroughs can deliver
Relationships with government and parliament not deep enough	Thought leadership work on the role of the boroughs		
	Build stronger relationships with key ministers and special advisors, via meetings and site visits to success stories		
	Senior civil service engagement	We have strong relationships with all key stakeholders	London Councils is a trusted partner on climate policy
	Influence select committee inquiries and build relationships with Select Committee clerks		
	Build relationships with MPs in London and interested in climate policy		
Our impact isn't demonstrated	Present analysis into the benefits of boroughs taking action and the co-benefits and return on investment of local that action	Impact of borough climate action clearly demonstrated to government, wider local government and	Stakeholders clearly understand the impact we can and do have
	Present our work at effective public forums		

Appendix 1

Not everyone is making the case for local authorities	Create effective London Councils climate action online presence to showcase	other key stakeholders	
	Empower borough comms teams to advocate via comms network	Boroughs and representatives make a coordinated case	Our asks land more effectively, coming from a diverse and respected set of stakeholders across all the public, private and third sectors
	Empower representatives (borough cllrs and senior officers) to advocate	NGOs and others understand the role of boroughs and make a complimentary case	
	Work in coalition to empower our allies to advocate		
	Build relationships with allies and provide them with evidence to make our case		

Table B: Approaches to cross-cutting barriers

Opportunities and strengths

Local Net Zero Forum

BEIS have set up a local net zero forum to enhance collaboration between local and central government on net zero, which London Councils strongly lobbied for. London Councils has representation on this via the chair of LEDNet. The cross-departmental group brings together senior officials from national and local government on a regular basis to discuss net zero policy and delivery. The LGA are still pushing for a political level forum above this too.

Central government target & carbon budgets

Under the Climate Change Act, the UK Government has a legally binding target of reaching net zero by 2050.

The Climate Change Act also requires the government to set legally-binding 'carbon budgets' to act as stepping stones towards the 2050 target. A carbon budget is a cap on the amount of greenhouse gases emitted in the UK over a five-year period. Budgets must be set at least 12 years in advance.

The government has agreed with the Committee on Climate Change and set the fifth budgetary period covering 2028 to 2032 at 1,725 MtCO₂e, and the six for 2033-37 at 965 MtCO₂e, in line with the level advised by the Committee on Climate Change. The process for setting seventh carbon budget will shortly be beginning.

National Adaptation Programme

The Climate Change Act also requires the UK government to produce a National Adaptation Programme (NAP), covering just England. [local govt role feeding into NAP, engagement via N

The seven London Councils climate programmes

Our seven programmes are a great source of information about issues that boroughs are facing, and the policy solutions they need. They also give us a strong legitimacy to advocate in this space, as we

Appendix 1

are demonstrably taking action and not just talking. They also help us to build our evidence base and keep it up to date.

London Councils' cross-party nature

We work on cross-party consensus and are a nexus for strong cross-party collaboration.

Relationship with the GLA

The corporate management teams of the GLA and London Councils are now meeting quarterly and have identified three priority areas for deepening joint working. Building on the positive work that was achieved to agree a borough allocation for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund and economic framework for London, the goal is to agree a common vision and clarify roles and responsibilities so that we each work to our strengths in striving to achieve better outcomes for London. Climate change and housing are two of these priority areas.

Cost-of-living

The cost-of-living crisis has raised public consciousness about the importance of warm, green and cheap to run housing. Research by ECIU has demonstrated that if investment to energy efficiency was not cut in 2010 the average household would be £1,750 better off.

Extreme weather events

Climate change is already causing extreme weather events in London, including flooding and heat waves.

Blueprint coalition

We are supporters of the blueprint coalition, which is made up of local government and NGO members, and which has good links with key stakeholders at BEIS and DLUCH.

3Ci

We are a core member of 3Ci, which is looking to unlock private capital to invest in the public sector's work on net zero. This gives us strong legitimacy in the net zero finance space.

Expert partners in London

London is home to a wide range of organisations with expertise and experience around climate action, including higher education institutions, NGOs and community organisations. London Councils and London boroughs can develop partnerships with these organisations to accelerate progress towards net zero.

Barriers to change

Lack of clarity on roles

Tackling climate change is, comparatively, a new policy area. There are no clearly delineated statutory duties around tackling carbon emissions. Councils have a wide range of duties, including statutory roles around things like adult social care, where it is clear what their role is.

Boroughs have no statutory duty to undertake carbon emissions reduction, and only some duties in the adaptation space.

Impact not demonstrated

We often speak about how local government is, in many spheres of policy, the most efficient level of government to deliver action on net zero, as we have a holistic understanding of our areas and can

Appendix 1

work across departments in a place-based way that central government finds difficult. However, we do not have a strong enough evidence base to make this argument.

We also have not clearly quantified the co-benefits of action towards net zero, and to adapt the city to the changing climate. Without a strong evidence base here, for example in how active travel helps public health, or how adaptation work makes more equitable communities, climate work can be seen as an add on, not a key part of how we make a more equal, liveable healthy city. This also creates apparent conflict with other policy areas, such as helping people in the cost-of-living crisis.

Funding based around bids and not strategic need, and there isn't enough

Highly limited pots of money accessed via competitive funding process incur costs on local authorities, using a large amount of limited staff time to craft bids which can often be unsuccessful. Further, narrow windows for applications, or unreasonable timescales for the delivery of funded work, do not allow local authorities to strategically plan how to most effectively decarbonise their areas. All areas must reach net zero, so providing funds to limited local authorities is not only inefficient, but also hinders the national net zero effort.

Lack of vision and narrative for a net zero London

In London we have a variety of targets for council and borough-wide emissions, alongside the GLA 2030 target and national 2050 target. However, we do not have an articulated vision for what a net zero London would look like.

Not everyone is making the case for local authorities

There are many stakeholders who care deeply about action on net zero, but they are not all making the case for the role of local authorities. We also don't have deep enough relationships with many key allies.

Relationships with government not deep enough

We have some relationships with key government departments but need to build on this as part of our mission to be a trusted partner to central government.

Stakeholders

We have some good relationships with stakeholders but have work to do to deepen them and form new relationships. In relation to the key opportunities outlined above, these will include politicians across the political spectrum, where we know that climate change is a significant shared concern, as well as those – for example, think tanks and other local government organisations – who are also influential on the political and policy development process. In the context of our position on devolution, local government allies and critical friends across the country will be key, including through our 3Ci work.

Drawing from the exercise at the advocacy workshop we will produce a stakeholder map which will inform the delivery of activities. We will identify and agree leads for these relationships from across the organisation as appropriate.

Resources

London Councils has committed to action on climate change and has invested in dedicated capacity to deliver climate advocacy, together with making it an organisation-wide priority through the Shared Ambitions. This staff time and expertise is the principal resource needed to successfully deliver this strategy, and it comprises:

Appendix 1

- Dedicated policy staff time: Head of Climate Change; Principal Policy Officer – Climate
- Communications staff time: support from the parliamentary officers, a media and public affairs officer, and a climate communications officer
- Drawing on policy and practice expertise from staff across London Councils on an ad hoc basis
- Drawing on senior staff time, particularly to ensure strong relationships with senior civil servants
- Supporting our political leaders to engage at political levels

We will also continue to draw on the public affairs expertise within the boroughs, and where appropriate intelligence from other partners including the GLA and London's Higher Education sector (for example, the Grantham Institute).

To deliver our policy development work, we may need to supplement these resources by commissioning support from independent experts, including where we need greater insight into equalities implications of climate policy options. London Councils also has a research budget which can be utilised to deliver targeted research projects, which we anticipate will be sufficient to address these requirements. In addition, we will proactively use training and development opportunities to support our policy development capacity.

Monitoring and evaluating our advocacy work

TEC, Leaders, CMT

We will report our progress to TEC, Leaders and CMT at appropriate intervals, and seek approval and sign off for emerging policy positions as required.

Monitoring action

We will need to record all of this work as we deliver it, and report as part of the Shared Ambitions process. The delivery plan will act as a project management tool to manage and record action.

Monthly comms meetings delivery discussions

We will use the monthly climate comms meetings to coordinate delivery of this work with the communications strategy.

Six monthly strategy review sessions

We will organise six monthly internal strategy review sessions where we assess what is working, and what we need to change.

Ongoing iterative learning

In the delivery plan we will outline an approach to iterative learning to ensure that we build on lessons from colleagues across LC who are undertaking similar influencing activities, as well as from staff training and development.

Appendix 1

Appendix 1: Key moments

As part of our strategy review process, we developed a strong list of upcoming key moments which we will be able to consider as we develop an advocacy delivery plan.

Publication of Skidmore review

In January Chris Skidmore published his 'independent' review of the government's net zero policies.

Publication of HMG response to CCC progress report

The CCC publish an annual progress report assessing government action towards net zero. Government must respond to this, and have delayed their next response until the new year.

Updated Net Zero Strategy

BEIS were taken to court by friends of the earth, who argued that the NZS didn't meet the obligations of the climate change act. The high court agreed, and gave government until March to update the strategy.

Spring Budget

In spring the government will publish its latest budget, which will include net zero spending.

Annual climate change polling

Our annual climate polling will be published in Autumn.

LCAW

London Climate Action Week is an annual event at which various organisations organise events and make announcements. It is a week when there is a strong focus on net zero action in London.

Ecocity summit

Organised every two years the summit brings together urban stakeholders from across the globe to focus on key actions cities and citizens can take to "rebuild our human habitat in balance with living systems." In 2023 it is being hosted in London.

Party conferences

In autumn the political parties will hold their annual party conferences, an opportunity to meet with representatives of each party and hold events.

COP28 & 29

The 28th session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC will convene from 30 November to 12 December 2023, in the United Arab Emirates. There will be an international focus on net zero during this period. COP29 will be in 2024.

National manifesto development process

The political parties will be developing their manifestos

CCC progress report

The CCC provides a regular cycle of annual statutory progress reports, the publication of which create a key moment

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Transport & Mobility Services Performance Information

Item
No: 06

Report by: Andy Rollock **Job title:** Mobility Services Manager

Date: 09 February 2023

Contact Officer: Andy Rollock

Telephone: 020 7934 9544 **Email:** andy.rollock@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report details the London Councils Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Q3 2022/23 and full year 2021/22.

Recommendation: Members are asked to note the report.

Performance Monitoring and Reporting

1. London Councils provides various transport and mobility services on behalf of the London boroughs. These include London Tribunals, Freedom Pass, Taxicard, the London European Partnership for Transport, the London Lorry Control Scheme, the Health Emergency Badge scheme and providing a range of parking services and advice to authorities and the public.
2. Appendix 1 sets out the latest position against key performance indicators for each of the main services. This report covers Q3 in 22/23, figures for Q2(22/23) and full year 2021/22.

Equalities Considerations

None.

Financial Implications

None.

APPENDIX 1: TRANSPORT & MOBILITY SERVICES: PERFORMANCE QUARTER 1

LONDON TRIBUNALS

	Target (where appropriate)	2021/22 Full Year	2022/23 Q2	2022/23 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA)					
No. of appeals received	N/A	49,306	11,652	10,030	N/A
No. of appeals decided	N/A	40,443	8,468	8,536	N/A
% allowed	N/A	45%	47%	46%	N/A
% Did Not Contest	N/A	23%	25%	24%	N/A
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time	80%	91%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	37 days	46 days	47 Days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	39 days	36 days	36 Days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	35 days	39 days	39 Days	Green
Road User Charging Adjudicators					
No. of appeals received	N/A	16,921	5,433	4,312	N/A
No. of appeals decided	N/A	13,703	5,049	4,093	N/A
% allowed	N/A	38%	40%	35%	N/A
% Did Not Contest	N/A	29%	31%	23%	N/A
% personal hearings started within 15 minutes of scheduled time	80%	98%	N/A	N/A*	N/A
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal)	56 days	73 days	76 days	89 days	Red**
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (personal)	56 days	66 days	51 days	46 Days	Green
Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined)	56 days	48 days	72 days	84 days	Red**
Overall Service					
Notice of Appeal acknowledgments issued within 2 days of receipt	97%	99%	99%	99%	Green
Hearing dates to be issued to appellants within 5 working days of receipt	100%	99%	99%	99%	Amber***

Number of telephone calls to London Tribunals	N/A	36,094	8,724	6,191	N/A
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	95%	95%	97%	Green

Comment

During this period, both Tribunals were scheduling personal hearings as face-to-face hearings at the hearing centre by default, with the option in the schedule letter to have a telephone hearing instead. A successful trial of video hearings took place in October with appellants, EAs and adjudicators providing positive feedback of their experience. A second pilot is currently being put together to refine the back-office process, which was manual during the first pilot placed significant administrative burden on tribunal staff.

*This metric is not available due to process changes post-COVID pandemic and is currently being reviewed.

** The targets for the Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (postal) and Average number of days (from receipt) to decide appeals (combined) were missed in RUCA. New adjudicators are being recruited to help address the delay in considering cases, though they are not due to start until Summer 2023

***The target for Hearing dates to be issued to appellants within 5 working days of receipt was missed as 1 case was processed incorrectly on receipt. The notification was actually dispatched on the 6th working day.

FREEDOM PASS

	Target (where appropriate)	2021/22 Full Year	2022/23 Q2	2022/23 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of active passes at end of period	N/A	1,125,793	1,163,317	1,144,849	N/A
Number of new passes issued (BAU)	N/A	101,920	26,571	25,902	N/A
Number of passes issued (2022 Renewal)	N/A	39,052	343	233	N/A
Number of replacement passes issued	N/A	70,551	18,769	20,899	N/A
Number of phone calls answered (BAU)	N/A	177,068	54,164	50,015	N/A
% Answered within 45 seconds (BAU)	85%	68%	51%	43%	Red
% of calls abandoned	<2%	5%	13%	27%	Red

Customer Satisfaction Survey rating (scoring 7 or above)	75%	84%	82%	69%	Red
Number of phone calls answered (2022 Renewal)	N/A	27,255	6,018	9,561	N/A
% Answered within 45 (2022 Renewal)	85%	68%	37%	48%	Red
Number of letters and emails answered	N/A	98,112	25,147	26,931	N/A
Number of emails answered (2022 Renewal)	N/A	6,361	1,440	7,061	N/A

(BAU = Business as Usual)

Comment

We have seen a worsening of contact centre performance over the period. This was the result of two factors. First, there was a significant increase in call traffic towards the back end of the quarter due to the mid-term eligibility review, where customers are asked to provide documentation to verify their address.

While increased call demand is normal during these exercises, Royal Mail industrial action meant that some customers evidence was caught up in the backlog of post deliveries and not received in the deadline given, meaning their pass was deactivated. This caused an increase in calls with customers questioning this action.

Unfortunately, the impact of the industrial action was not sufficiently considered when undertaking the deactivation task. However, once this was realised measures were put in place to mitigate against this and will form part of lessons learned for future reviews.

The above situation had an impact on customer satisfaction, with wait times increasing and some customers finding it difficult to make contact. However, with the remedial action taken and call volumes decreasing, we are beginning to see customer satisfaction rise, with the results for January at 78%.

TAXICARD

	Target (where appropriate)	2021/22 Full Year	2022/23 Q2	2022/23 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of active passes at end of period	N/A	58,379	59,141	59,506	N/A
Number of new passes issued	N/A	5,143	1,349	1,417	N/A
Number of replacement cards issued	N/A	2,426	815	720	N/A
Number of phone calls answered at London Councils	N/A	10,312	3,879	3,511	N/A
% Answered within 30 seconds	85%	96%	96%	97%	Green

Number of journeys using Taxicard	N/A	564,545	105,949	112,026	N/A
% in private hire vehicles	N/A	4.4%	28.2%	27.2%	N/A
% of vehicles arriving within 15 minutes (advance booking)	95%	95%	94%	95%	Green
% of vehicles arriving within 30 minutes (on demand)	95%	94%	93%	94%	Amber

Comment

Taxicard performance remains strong for this quarter with the contractor achieving target for advanced booking and being 1% under the required 95% for ASAP bookings. Although a reduction in journeys towards the end of the quarter, which is a historic trend would have played a part in this.

The contractor has also been able to bring on board more private hire suppliers to their platform, which has assisted in maintaining and improving overall performance across the scheme. They have also seen a good response to driver recruitment.

It is also noticeable that the reduction in fuel costs at the pump is encouraging more drivers to undertake more work generally, which is having a positive impact on the Taxicard scheme.

TRACE (TOWAWAY, RECOVERY AND CLAMPING ENQUIRY SERVICE)

	Target (where appropriate)	2021/22 Full Year	2022/23 Q2	2022/23 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of vehicles notified to database	N/A	35,461	10,309	9,549	N/A
Number of phone calls answered	N/A	17,910	5,903	5,127	N/A
% of calls answered within 30 seconds of the end of the automated message	85%	87%	93%	95%	Green

LONDON LORRY CONTROL SCHEME

	Target (where appropriate)	2021/22 Full Year	2022/23 Q2	2022/23 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of permits on issue at end of period	N/A	70,168	71,329	72,127	N/A
Number of permits issued in period	N/A	18,149	4,632	4,660	N/A
Number of vehicle observations made	10,800 per year 2,700 per quarter	12,526	2,919	2,801	Green
Number of penalty charge notices issued	N/A	5,104	1,060	1,145	N/A
Number of appeals considered by ETA	N/A	88	15	17	N/A
% of appeals to PCNs issued.	Monitor only	2%	1%	1%	N/A

Comment

Core activities enforcement, administration and case consideration are at normal levels and all KPIs show positive performance by LC officers and third-party contractors.

TRANSACTIONAL SERVICES: DEBT REGISTRATIONS AND WARRANTS

	Target (where appropriate)	2021/22 Full Year	2022/23 Q2	2022/23 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of debt registrations	N/A	797,576	188,265	142,809	N/A
Traffic Enforcement Court: number of warrants	N/A	622,674	200,013	145,179	N/A
Traffic Enforcement Court: transactions to be processed accurately within 1 working day	100%	100%	100%	100%	Green

HEALTH EMERGENCY BADGES

	Target (where appropriate)	2021/22 Full Year	2022/23 Q2	2022/23 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of badges on issue at end of period	N/A	18,175	4589	4,889	NA
Number of badges issued in period	N/A	2,863	741	660	NA

Comment

Current application assessment and badge production are good with a turnaround time of five days.

LONDON EUROPEAN PARTNERSHIP FOR TRANSPORT

	Target (where appropriate)	2021/22 Full Year	2022/23 Q2	2022/23 Q3	Red / Amber / Green (RAG) rating Q3
Number of Boroughs participating in EU transport funding projects	7	4	5	4	N/A

Comment

LEPT is engaged in minimal activity as we have not been able to secure LIP funding moving forward.

There remains a commitment to continue working with pan-European city networks such as POLIS to enable knowledge sharing and best practice.

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub-Committee

Transport Funding Sub-Group Update

Item
no: 07

Report by: Stephen Boon and
Katharina Winbeck

Job title: Director, Transport and Mobility
Strategic Lead Transport and Environment

Date: 9 February 2023

**Contact
Officer:** Stephen Boon

Telephone: 07872 377 126

Email: stephen.boon@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary This report provides an update on the activities of the London Councils transport funding sub-group.

Recommendations The Committee is recommended to:

1. Note the contents of this report.

Background

1. A stable and well-functioning transport network is a core requirement for London's residents and businesses as they support the UK's economic and green recovery. London boroughs play a crucial role in maintaining the city's highways (95 per cent of the London roads are borough roads), as well as delivering active and sustainable travel schemes.
2. Over the last four years, the boroughs have suffered significant reductions in transport funding. Consequently, the network is deteriorating – as outlined in the 2020 State of the City report and 2021 seminar jointly produced by London Technical Advisers Group (LoTAG) and London Councils – and boroughs' ability to contribute to local and national transport priorities has been set back.

3. Until TfL's latest funding deal, borough funding had been impacted by the short-term nature of previous deals, which contained reduced (and at times no) provision for borough schemes. In December 2021, the London Councils Transport and Environment Committee set up a Transport funding sub-group, in part to highlight to TfL and the government the impact, but also to ensure that borough transport funding needs were covered by any longer-term deal.
4. While it is difficult to know with certainty what impact these efforts had, TfL's current deal has offered boroughs a much greater degree of certainty and allocates £69 million per annum until March 2024 to London's local authorities, split roughly 50/50 between formula and non-formula elements¹. The funding allocations were developed at pace by TfL following the deal and there is an imperative in the deal to spend the allocations effectively and quickly.
5. There is also desire for the boroughs to begin working strategically with TfL to consider London's transport needs when the current deal expires. Therefore, TEC agreed that the Transport Funding Sub-group should be reconstituted. The group's aim is to:
 - a. Consider the issues related to transport funding across the London boroughs and coordinate a joint, strategic approach.
6. The group is made up of the following members:

Cllr Deirdre Costigan (Chair) (Lab, Ealing)
Cllr Clyde Loakes (Lab, Waltham Forest)
Cllr Rezina Chowdhury (Lab, Lambeth)
Cllr Cem Kamahli (Cons, Kensington and Chelsea)
Cllr Nichola Bennett (Cons, Bromley)
Cllr Alexander Ehmann (Lib Dem, Richmond)

Work to date

7. The transport funding sub-group met on 7 November 2022 and 12 December 2022. At the first meeting, members outlined concern regarding the amount of transport funding available for boroughs and the process through which funding had been allocated. Members also suggested that given the timing of the deal, spending the allocations within the financial year could also be challenging. In the medium to long-term, boroughs suggested that they would like a role in co-creating future funding programmes with TfL.
8. TfL agreed to consider changes to the way in which funding was allocated, but suggested there would be no increase to the overall funding envelope of £69m. TfL also stated that they were not prepared to change the funding formula but would be happy to consider the potential for a 'reward mechanism' and would consider whether it would be possible to consider carry over of funding from this financial year to next.

¹ The formula element uses a local implementation plan (LIP) funding methodology worked up in 2019, and the non-formula elements are for specific activities e.g. bus priority measures etc. Both the formula and non-formula elements must contribute to the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS).

9. Consequently, members of the TEC Funding Subgroup asked London Councils and borough officers to explore these issues further and bring back workable suggestions. To this end, London Councils officers convened the LIP working Group, which includes officers from each of the sub-regions as well as the two chairs of LoTAG and two LEDNet representatives
10. At the meeting on 12 December, officers provided members with an update on these issues and set out a number of recommendations, which were accepted. Regarding carry over of funding, DfT confirmed that they will allow a £10m carry over facility for LIP funding between 2022/23 and 2023/24. Since the meeting boroughs have been providing detail of how much carry-over they need to TfL to enable good oversight and management of this. Current indications are that this is in the region of £4-6m, which is encouraging. TfL is especially pleased with the amount of bus priority schemes coming forward.
11. If boroughs required additional carry-over, TfL are prepared to be as flexible as possible and would accept spending on the following types of scheme:
 - Additional funding to supplement Cycle Training and Cycle Parking
 - Dropped kerbs to improve accessibility
 - Green infrastructure (not necessarily in project footprints), creating more pleasant spaces and additional shelter
 - Street clutter removal, creating more pleasant spaces and making it easier to walk
 - Creating places to stop and rest
 - Acceleration of designs or construction proposed in 2023/24 including surveys, across cycling, walking and safety schemes
12. Officers added 'cycle and e-scooter parking' to this list, which TfL was happy to accept.

LIP funding allocation for 2023/24

13. Borough officers considered that the allocation for 2023/24 as set out by TfL should not be changed significantly, including the numbers of funding streams and the allocation for these streams. This was mainly because officers have now planned on that basis for both 2022/23 and 2023/24. However, officers would like TfL to consider the following:
 - Increase the cycle training funding stream
 - Explore funding for the sub-regional partnerships to be re-instated
 - Explore funding for capacity building in boroughs to help deliver schemes.
14. Borough officers did not reject the idea of introducing a reward mechanism; however, suggested they would need to see more details before making a judgement and there was a general feeling that this would be difficult to get agreement to from all involved.
15. TfL have agreed to increase the cycle training funding stream but were unable to fund the sub-regional partnerships. TfL is looking into some healthy streets training and other ways in which we can support each other with technical expertise and more general capacity. TfL have noted, however the general recruitment and retention challenges we are facing in this sector, so any secondments out of TfL are unlikely now.

Active Travel Funding beyond 2023/24

16. In TfL's business plan, TfL has made allowances for £150m for active travel each in the years 2024/25 and 2025/26. This is split 50/50 between LIP and TfL led schemes.
17. TfL have confirmed that they wish to work with London Councils and boroughs to allocate this active travel fund in the future and that they will be able to be more flexible in their approach. London Councils officers will engage with the borough LIP working group to discuss this and bring back any ideas to the TEC Transport Funding Subgroup for agreement.

Looking ahead

18. The next meeting of the sub-group is scheduled for 24 February. This will be an opportunity to reflect on progress in the areas covered above. Officers also propose to use this meeting to update members on progress of the pan-London infrastructure framework. The work will set out a prioritised set of schemes with strategic value for the capital has now progressed from consideration of projects for inclusion to exploring financing and partnership models for delivery.
19. Piali Das Gupta, the officer leading this work for London Councils, would like the TEC funding sub-group to help test and develop these options. The framework will be finalised at the end of March but, in readiness for MIPIM in mid-March, we will be working with Opportunity London to produce promotional material targeted at major private investors about key opportunities to invest in London.

Financial Implications

There are no direct financial implications for London Councils.

Legal implications

N/A

Equalities implications

N/A

Recommendations

The Committee is recommended to:

1. Note the contents of this report

Background papers

Transport & Environment Committee: 9 December 2021 : Item 9 – Transport Funding Sub-Group

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub-Committee

Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2022/23 Item No: 08

Report by:	David Sanni	Job title:	Director of Corporate Resources
Date:	9 February 2023		
Contact Officer:	David Sanni		
Telephone:	020 7934 9704	Email:	David.sanni@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary

This report outlines actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of December 2022 for TEC and provides a forecast of the outturn position for 2022/23. At this stage, a surplus of £957,000 is forecast. In addition, total expenditure in respect of Taxicard trips taken by scheme members is forecast to underspend by a net figure of £3.436 million, which reflects weaker than anticipated demand recovery following Covid-19. The net borough proportion of this underspend is projected to be £2.257 million, with £1.179 million accruing to TfL.

Recommendations

The Executive Sub-Committee is asked to:

- note the projected surplus of £957,000 for the year, plus the forecast net underspend of £3.436 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in this report;
- agree a transfer from General Reserves to the Freedom Pass Renewal Reserve to fund the 2025 re-issue process; and
- note the projected level of Committee reserves, detailed in paragraph 5 and 6 and the commentary on the financial

position of the Committee included in paragraphs 7-9.

Report

1. This is the final budget monitoring report to be presented to the Committee during the current financial year. The next report will be the provisional outturn figures for the year, which will be reported to the July 2023 meeting of this Committee.
2. The London Councils Transport and Environment Committee's income and expenditure revenue budget for 2022/23 was approved by the Full Committee in December 2021. The approved budget was revised to consider the developments listed below. The revised budget is set out in Appendix A (Expenditure) and Appendix B (Income). The appendices show the actual income and expenditure at 31 December 2022 and an estimate of the forecast outturn for the year, together with the projected variance from the revised budget. The revisions to the budget are:
 - confirmation of borough and TfL funding for the Concessionary Fares scheme for the year (a reduction of £4.243 million from the initial budget which was set early in discussions with TfL);
 - confirmation of payments made to the Rail Delivery Group (an increase of £757,000); and
 - confirmation of the resources carried forward from 2021/22 of £141,000 approved by this Sub-Committee in July 2022.

Variance from Budget

3. The current figures indicate that the Committee is projected to underspend gross expenditure budgets by £1.2 million and post a deficit of income of £243,000 over the approved budget target for the year. However, these figures include offsetting amounts of £3.436 million relating to payments and income for Taxicard trips and payments and receipts of £2.952 million in relation to Northampton County Court

registration of debts. The overall projected net surplus is therefore £957,000. When setting the budget for the Taxicard scheme, officers forecast a recovery based on observed demand trends, which suggested further increases in demand post-pandemic. However, demand for Taxicard did not continue to recover as anticipated this year. Officers intend to investigate this in the coming months. Table 1 below summarises the forecast position, with commentary that details the trends that have emerged during the year and provides explanations for the variances that are projected.

Table 1 –Summary Forecast as at 31 December 2022

	M9 Actual	Revised Budget	Forecast	Variance
Expenditure	£000	£000	£000	£000
Employee Costs	550	823	738	(85)
Running Costs	118	324	253	(71)
Central Recharges	402	536	536	-
Total Operating Expenditure	1,070	1,683	1,527	(156)
Payments in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	161,386	218,925	215,279	(3,646)
Direct Services	9,777	10,634	13,250	2,616
Research	-	40	40	-
System Developments	186	281	281	-
Other 3 rd Party Payments	248	345	331	(14)
Total Expenditure	172,667	231,908	230,708	(1,200)
Income				
Contributions in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	(161,434)	(218,989)	(215,743)	3,246
Income for direct services	(9,946)	(11,079)	(14,072)	(2,993)
Core Member Subscriptions	(73)	(97)	(97)	-
Interest on Investments	(18)	-	(24)	(24)
Other Income	(71)	(74)	(95)	(21)
TfL/TEC Environment Initiatives	(42)	(91)	(56)	35
Transfer from Reserves	-	(1,578)	(1,578)	-
Total Income	(171,584)	(231,908)	(231,665)	243
Net Expenditure	1,083	-	(957)	(957)

4. The projected surplus of £957,000 is due to the net impact of the following:
 - A projected overall surplus of £22,000 in respect of TEC parking traded services, after considering an estimate of the level of borough/TfL/GLA usage volumes during the third quarter.

- An additional overspend of £197,000 on the cost of administering the Hearing Centre at Chancery Exchange where the appeals are heard, largely as a result contract inflationary increases. This is matched by additional income recovered from TfL in relation to RUCA;
- Based on income collected to date, receipts from Lorry Control PCN income are forecast to exceed the £1 million budget by £300,000;
- Included within the £60,000 underspend on Lorry Control Administration is a budget of £141,000 which was carried forward from 2021/22 to contribute towards a review of the service. Due to the timing of this work, some of this will remain unspent, therefore a carry forward request will be made to members at the year-end in order to implement the remaining recommendations from the review in 2023/24.
- There is a forecast £85,000 underspend on staffing costs, which sit outside of the service administration budgets. This is inclusive of the maternity provision and member allowances, which will continue to be monitored throughout the year;
- The level of trips made in the claims submitted by the independent bus operators has not recovered to the extent anticipated post-pandemic, which was reflected when setting the 2022/23 budget. Trip data for the first nine months, which takes into account two operators leaving the scheme, indicates that expenditure is forecast to be £712,000 compared to an annual budget of £1.1 million, a projected reduction of £388,000. Details of the full year claims will be reported to this Committee as part of the pre audit outturn figures in July 2023;
- A projected overspend of £214,000 in respect of the £1.518 million budget for the issuing/reissuing costs of Freedom Passes, in part due to inflationary pressure on expenditure and contracts within this budget, along with additional costs associated with the postal strike. This, however, is based on activity to date so

may fluctuate as the year progresses. This budget will be monitored and managed throughout the remainder of the financial year;

- Based on income collected to date, receipts from replacement Freedom Passes continue to recover from the pandemic and its associated lockdowns. The 2022/23 revenue budget was increased by £150,000 to reflect this recovery. Of the £750,000 annual budget, forecast receipts are anticipated to be approximately £959,000 net of bank charges, resulting in a surplus of £209,000;
- An underspend on general running costs, not attributable to administrative services of £72,000. This is the result of a number of small underspends across a large number of budget lines;
- A forecasted amount of interest on investments of £24,000 for which there is no budgetary provision.
- In addition to the above variances there has been a significant reduction in the level of taxicard expenditure, based on actual trips taken to date. Expenditure against the £10.257 million budget is forecasted to be £6.821 million. This underspend of £3.436 million is matched with a corresponding decrease in income and therefore has no impact on London Councils net outturn for the year. £2.257 million of these savings will be passed back to the Boroughs.

Committee Reserves

5. Table 2 below updates the Committee on the projected level of reserves as at 31 March 2023, if all current known liabilities and commitments are considered:

Table 2– Analysis of Projected Uncommitted Reserves as at 31 March 2023

	General Reserve	Specific Reserve	Total
	£000	£000	£000
Unaudited reserves at 1 April 2022	3,826	1,944	5,770
Transfer between reserves	-	-	-
Approved in setting 2022/23 budget (December 2021)	(881)	(275)	(1,156)
Carried forward amounts from 2021/22	(141)	-	(141)
Indicative use of specific reserves including TEC special projects in 2022/23 and 2023/24		(539)	(539)
Projected Budget Surplus/(Deficit) 2022/23	962	(5)	957
Approved in setting 2023/24 budget	(463)	-	(463)
Estimated uncommitted reserves at 31 March 2023	3,303	1,125	4,428

6. To ensure sufficient funds are available for the Freedom Pass re-issue process, which is due to take place in 2025, Members are asked to approve a transfer from the General Reserve to the Freedom Pass Renewal Specific Reserve of £500,000. The effect on General Reserves, should this transfer be approved, is detailed in Table 3 below:

Table 3 – Projected Uncommitted Reserves at as 31 March 2023 following the proposed transfer

	General Reserve	Specific Reserve	Total
	£000	£000	£000
Estimated uncommitted reserves at 31 March 2023	3,303	1,125	4,428
Transfer between reserves	(500)	500	-
Revised Estimated Reserves 31 March 2023	2,803	1,625	4,428

Conclusions

7. This report reflects the position at the third-quarter stage in the current financial year and forecasts a surplus position of £957,000 for the year. In addition, taxicard trips are forecast to underspend by £3.436 million, with the borough proportion of this underspend projected to be £2.257 million and £1.179 million accruing to TfL.
8. The majority of the projected surplus is a net effect of various factors such as significant reductions in payments made to independent bus operators, an increase in Lorry Control income and an increase on projected income from replacement Freedom Passes compared to budget.
9. After considering the forecast surplus, known commitments and use of reserves in setting the 2022/23 budget, general reserves are forecast to be £3.303 million at the year-end, which equates to 21.7% of budgeted operating and trading expenditure of £15,231 million. Should the proposed transfer to the Specific Reserve be agreed this figure reduces to £2.803 million or 18.4% of budgeted operating and trading expenditure, which continues to exceed the Committee's formal policy on reserves, agreed in November 2015 that reserves should equate to between 10-15% of annual operating expenditure. There remains a level of uncertainty surrounding the Covid-19 pandemic recovery and rising inflation and the impact this may have on TEC budgets.

Recommendations

10. Members are asked to :

- note the projected surplus of £957,000 for the year, plus the forecast underspend of £3.436 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in this report;
- agree a transfer from General Reserves to the Freedom Pass Renewal Reserve to fund the 2025 re-issue process; 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 7-9.

Financial Implications for London Councils

As detailed in report

Legal Implications for London Councils

None

Equalities Implications for London Councils

None

Appendices

Appendix A (Expenditure), Appendix B (Income)

Background Papers

London Councils-TEC Budget working papers 2022/23
London Councils Income and Expenditure Forecast File 2022/23

	Revised 2022/23 £000	Month 9 YTD £000	Month 9 Forecast £000	Month 9 Variance £000
Payments in respect of Concessionary Fares				
TfL	197,350	148,013	197,350	0
ATOC	7,548	5,661	7,548	0
Other Bus Operators	1,100	534	712	-388
Freedom Pass issue costs	1,518	1,178	1,732	214
Freedom Pass Administration	522	385	518	-4
City Fleet Taxicard contract	10,257	5,172	6,821	-3,436
Taxicard Administration	630	444	598	-32
	218,925	161,386	215,279	-3,646
TEC Trading Account Expenditure				
Payments to Adjudicators- ETA	937	565	847	-90
Payments to Adjudicators - RUCA	917	345	518	-399
Northgate variable contract costs - ETA	311	185	278	-33
Northgate variable contract costs - RUCA	140	87	131	-9
Northgate variable contract costs - Other	204	194	258	54
Payments to Northampton County Court	4,000	5,452	6,952	2,952
Lorry Control Administration	909	530	850	-60
ETA/RUCA Administration	3,172	2,384	3,369	197
HEB Administration	43	35	47	4
	10,634	9,777	13,250	2,616
Sub-Total	229,559	171,163	228,529	-1,030
Operating Expenditure				
Contractual Commitments				
NG Fixed Costs	98	66	100	2
	98	66	100	2
Salary Commitments				
Non-operational staffing costs	773	542	714	-59
Members	20	8	19	-1
Maternity Provision	30	0	5	-25
	823	550	738	-85
Other Commitments				
Supplies and service	227	52	153	-74
Research	40	0	40	0
System Developments	281	186	281	0
Environmental initiatives	345	248	331	-13
	893	486	805	-87
Total Operating Expenditure	1,814	1,102	1,643	-170
Central Recharges	536	402	536	0
Total Expenditure	231,909	172,667	230,708	-1,200

	Revised 2022/23 £000	Month 9 YTD £000	Month 9 Forecast £000	Month 9 Variance £000
Borough contributions to TfL	197,350	148,012	197,350	0
Borough contributions to ATOC	7,548	5,661	7,548	0
Borough contributions to other bus operators	1,100	825	1,100	0
Borough contributions to FP issue costs	1,518	1,139	1,518	0
Borough contributions to freedom pass administration	0	0	0	0
Income from replacing lost/faulty freedom passes	750	208	959	-209
Income from replacing lost/faulty taxicards	18	1	1	17
Borough contributions to Comcab	2,257	0	0	2,257
TfL contribution to Taxicard scheme	8,000	5,172	6,820	1,180
Borough contributions to taxicard administration	324	323	323	1
TfL Contribution to taxicard administration	124	93	124	0
	218,989	161,433	215,743	3,246
TEC trading account income				
Borough contributions to Lorry Control administration	0	0	0	0
Lorry Control PCNs	1,000	1,041	1,300	-300
Borough parking appeal charges	1,072	496	749	323
TfL parking appeal charges	176	233	352	-176
GLA Congestion charging appeal income	1,057	434	650	407
Borough fixed parking costs	1,807	1,373	1,925	-118
TfL fixed parking costs	275	207	275	0
GLA fixed parking costs	1,188	871	1,269	-81
Borough other parking services	504	451	598	-95
Northampton County Court Recharges	4,000	4,841	6,952	-2,952
	11,079	9,948	14,071	-2,993
Sub-Total	230,068	171,381	229,814	253
Core borough subscriptions				
Joint Committee	46	35	46	0
TEC (inc TfL)	51	38	51	0
	97	73	97	0
Other Income				
TfL secretariat recharge	31	24	31	0
Investment income	0	18	24	-24
TfL Environment policy priorities	91	42	56	35
Sales of Health Emergency badges	43	47	64	-21
	165	131	175	-10
Transfer from Reserves	1,578	0	1,578	0
Central Recharges	0	0	0	0
Total Income Base Budget	231,908	171,584	231,664	243

London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee

Proposed TEC & TEC Executive Sub Committee Dates 2023/24

Item No: 09

Report by: Alan Edwards **Job title:** Governance Manager
Date: 9 February 2023
Contact Officer: Alan Edwards
Telephone: 0207 934 9911 **Email:** Alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report notifies members of the proposed TEC and TEC Executive Sub Committee dates for the committee cycle year 2023/24

Recommendations: It is recommended that Members:

- Note the proposed dates for TEC and TEC Executive Sub Committee meetings for the committee cycle year 2023/24, which will be presented to the Main Committee for agreement on 23 March 2023.

TEC (Main) Committee Proposed Dates

- Thursday 8 June 2023
- Thursday 12 October 2023
- Thursday 7 December 2023
- Thursday 21 March 2024

All the above meetings start at 2.30pm, with a pre-meeting for political groups at 1.30pm (1.45pm for the Conservative Group). All TEC (Main) Committee meetings will be held in-person.

TEC Executive Sub Committee Proposed Dates

- Thursday 13 July 2023
- Thursday 7 September 2023
- Thursday 16 November 2023
- Thursday 8 February 2024

TEC Executive Sub Committee meetings start at 10:00am and will be held in-person. There are no party group pre-meetings for these meetings.

Recommendations

It is recommended that Members:

- To note the proposed dates for the TEC and TEC Executive Sub Committee meetings for the year 2023/24, which will be presented for agreement at the Main TEC meeting held on 23 March 2023.

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.

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

Minutes of a formal meeting of the London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on 17 November 2022 at 10am in Meeting Room 5.

Present:

Mayor Philip Glanville	LB Hackney (Chair)
Councillor Deidre Costigan	LB Ealing
Councillor Mike Hakata	LB Haringey
Councillor James Asser	LB Newham
Councillor Alex Ehmann	LB Richmond (Virtual)

1. Apologies for Absence & Announcement & Deputies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Peter Craske (LB Bexley), Councillor Nicholas Bennett (LB Bromley), Councillor Krupa Sheth (LB Brent), Shravan Joshi (City of London Corporation), Councillor Cem Kemahli (RB Kensington & Chelsea) and Councillor Rezina Choudhury (LB Lambeth).

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Costigan confirmed that she was not a Member of the North London Waste Authority and that she should be removed from this declaration of interest.

3. Consultation of TfL Penalty Fare Increases Proposal – Presentation by John Conway, TfL

John Conway, Senior Enforcement & Prosecutions Manager, TfL, introduced the item and made the following comments:

- It was proposed to increase the TfL Penalty Fare (PF) from £80 to £100 (reduced by 50% if paid within 21 days). After 39 days of civil debt chasing (non- payment) the debt would be considered for prosecution for fare evasion.
- A steer regarding this proposed PF increase was now being sought from London Councils.
- No changes to the PF amount had been made since 2011 and fare evasion continued to be on the increase.
- The consultation period would now run from 18/10/22 to 10/01/23 and it was hoped that the increase in the PF would act as a sufficient deterrent. Fare recovery levels were currently very low and cost £100million a year across the TfL network.
- The third (and final) stage of the PF Appeals process would be heard by the Independent Appeals Panel. Their decision was final and binding. Non-payment constituted as fare evasion and would result in criminal proceedings. Prosecution could be avoided by paying the PF.
- The fare evasion process was being started up again after a number of years, as there was not sufficient recovery of non-payment of fares and TfL was expected to deal with fare evaders.

- TfL had carried out an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIAs) to look into the impact of the PF increase. Holders of a disabled Freedom Pass would not be affected by this proposal. Carers did not receive free travel and might be subject to a PF.
- Only 1 in 4 visually impaired people were employed, making them at a financial disadvantage. These passengers were also more susceptible to receiving a PF as they were more likely to require the most assistance when purchasing a ticket.
- Other vulnerable groups were also being looked at, including refugees, people on low incomes and homeless people. Homeless people were not affected by the proposal as they did not have a valid name and address. TfL also offered a "Veterans' Oyster Photocard" giving free travel, and as a result, veterans were unlikely to receive a PF.
- Safeguards were also put in place to mitigate any negative impacts, especially on disabled customers. TfL Protection Officers were being given guidance on the needs of disabled customers and more discretion and flexibility would be given to improve their knowledge of the barriers faced by disabled customers. The over 60s were also not affected by the proposal as they already had free travel.
- Prosecutions would only take place if a realistic prospect of conviction was likely and whether it was in the public interest to do so. TfL could withdraw the case from court.
- TfL was now seeking either an individual or collective response, through London Councils or from the boroughs.

Q and As

Councillor Costigan said that it made a lot of sense to increase the TfL PF if there had been no increase for over ten years. However, she voiced concern over the timing of the PF increase, especially in light of the current cost of living crisis. Councillor Costigan asked if TfL could shed any light on the reasons why people did not pay for their fares and whether this was linked to whether they could afford to and/or their age range. She asked whether any additional safeguards were being put in place to help people who could not pay and were on low incomes.

John Conway said that no formal surveys had been carried out previously. However, the surveys had now been restarted. He informed Members that there were a number of chronic offenders and also a number of people that were avoiding paying the correct fare for some of their journeys on their Oyster cards (eg by not registering the card in Zone 1 etc). John Conway said that a crackdown on fare evasion was very much appropriate now (up to £15million in unpaid fares). The PF could be paid for in instalments. Some younger people were also promoting ways to evade paying fares via Tik Tok and Youtube, and TfL now needed to take a stiffer line on this.

Councillor Costigan asked whether inspections had stopped as a result of the pandemic. John Conway confirmed that they had. Councillor Ehmann felt that a response to TfL's PF increase should come from London Councils. He voiced concerns over the timing of this though. Councillor Ehmann asked whether TfL would have to channel more resources into retrieving these costs. He asked whether the funds received back from PFs would be reinvested into the transport system. John Conway said that any funds received would go back into TfL services. He informed

Members that TfL would not be increasing the number of staff to help with PF retrieval.

The Chair asked whether any increase in funds would be needed to implement any of the PF increase proposals. John Conway said that some services were carried out through contractor proposals, but nothing else at this point, aside from a change to all the signage. This would cost approximately £500k.

Councillor Hakata asked about the data and demographics around fare evasion. He asked what the social position was of people that evaded fares and whether the majority of the £15.4million in unpaid fares was due to people that could not afford to pay fares. Councillor Hakata asked whether a large number of people that evaded fares were vulnerable people. He said that TEC Members would need to be reassured that TfL would be understanding when it came to prosecutions and vulnerable groups of people.

Councillor Asser asked whether any details were available on the breakdown of fare evasion could be given (ie details on the demographics). He said that in his borough of Newham, the majority of this was carried out on trust. The Chair asked how much human decision making was being carried out for prosecutions. The Chair felt that there could be potential dangers for vulnerable people at the automatic escalation of the PF prosecution process and Members needed reassurances around this. The Chair said that London Councils would want to make a formal response to the PF proposal, although TfL should also consult with the boroughs on an individual basis. He said that the response should not be an either/or from TEC's point of view.

John Conway said that TfL did not have detailed information on the demographics around fare evasion, although it did have details of people's ages and occupations. He confirmed that the courts did have safeguards in place and TfL did allow for extended payment plans. John Conway said that people could present their details on income throughout the three stages of the appeals. He said that he was happy with the safeguards that were already in place. John Conway said that the survey data that had been received back still showed an increase in fare evasion.

John Conway said that only approximately 1% of customers were checked to see if they had a valid ticket for travel. If they did not, this would be considered to be fare evasion. John Conway informed Members that the train operating companies (TOCs) had been conducting a PF evasion system for many years now and anyone travelling without a valid ticket would be subject to a fine. Prosecutors also had the power to withdraw any prosecutions that went to court ensuring that significant safeguards continued to remain in place.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee confirmed that a letter would be sent to TfL officers on behalf of London Councils in response to TfL's PF increase proposal. TfL could also discuss any issues individually with boroughs.

4. Update on Rental Bikes and E-Scooters

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that updated Members on London Councils' activity in relation to the micromobility agenda, including the e-

scooter trial, dockless bikes, the Transport Bill and longer-term plans for micromobility.

Agathe de Canson, Principal Policy & Project Officer, London Councils, introduced the report and made the following comments:

- The e-scooter trials had now been extended until 31 May 2024. London Councils and TfL were currently in the middle of a procurement process to select operators for a new contract.
- The contracts for the Santander bike hire scheme were due to end in 2025.
- Transport legislation to regulate micromobility rental schemes had been delayed. Dockless bikes were gaining in popularity and had now taken over the Santander hire scheme. However, some providers continued to operate without boroughs' prior agreement.
- A joined-up approach was now needed in order to deliver these modes of transport. One option was to have a joint contract for e-scooters and dockless bikes run by TfL. A pan-London approach was available for rental e-scooters through the e-scooter trial but not dockless bikes. There was also an opt-in for e-scooter trials.
- There were mandatory parking bays for e-scooters but for dockless bikes this was largely up to the operators. Boroughs could choose the location of parking bays for e-scooters. London Councils and TfL could also decide on the fleet size of e-scooters of all operators. This did not happen with dockless bikes.
- London Councils and TfL had a dedicated team to support boroughs that were part of the e-scooter trial but played no formal role for dockless bikes. Also, no SLAs were in place for dockless bikes unless specified as part of a contract with an individual borough and there were no requirements regarding data sharing between London Councils, TfL and boroughs. We do not have access to information for the whole of London when it comes to dockless bikes, unlike for e-scooters.

Q and As

The Chair said that he had met with Seb Dance, the Deputy Mayor for Transport, who had confirmed that there had been an increase in Santander bike hire take-up.

Agathe de Canson said that she had carried out a test drive on an e-scooter and was told that she could not park unless in a dedicated parking bay. This was not being done for dockless bikes. Councillor Hakata asked whether there would be the same geofencing for e-scooters and dockless bikes. Agathe de Canson said that this could be done as the same technology could be applied to dockless bikes and e-scooters. The right policies also needed to be in place around parking provision as this prevented users abandoning vehicles due to being unable to park. She said that parking bays were also "tidied-up" by all operators of e-scooters (this was a requirement), although this was not happening to the same extent with dockless bikes.

Agathe de Canson said that bi-weekly meetings were taking place with boroughs and TfL and London Councils to discuss issues arising. London Councils was also providing support to any boroughs that were entering agreements for dockless bikes. She said that advice about parking was being provided to boroughs and London Councils was meeting with operators of e-scooters and dockless bikes. A case for legislation to enable local transport authorities to grant permits to selected operators was also being made to the Government.

Councillor Ehmann said that the Borough of Richmond had a contract in place for dockless bikes which encouraged the use of parking bays. He queried the need for a pan-London contract for dockless bikes. Councillor Ehmann said that the size of the fleet in Richmond had been agreed with the borough. He said that no provider had come to Richmond without the borough's consent. Councillor Ehmann said that he felt that geofencing was not the "silver bullet" and asked whether other solutions were being looked into (eg "smart" sensors). The Chair also felt that geofencing was not the solution. He said that a photograph had to be taken when a user had finished their ride. If a photo had not been taken, the user would be issued with a fine. The Chair queried whether anything would be lost if boroughs were open to other operators, especially where there was already a good relationship taking place with certain operators.

Councillor Costigan said that she was relaxed about expanding a single contract model. She said that the Borough of Ealing had an existing MOU and a single contract would help to control the growing market, without committing the boroughs to do this. Councillor Costigan said that the 32 boroughs were spending a great deal of time on this with all their different providers. She said that ten boroughs were currently involved in the e-scooter pilots. She asked whether the window for other boroughs to join the e-scooters had now closed or whether boroughs could still join the trials.

Councillor Asser said that there were a number of Lime bikes in his borough that did not appear to get cleared very quickly. He felt that this issue needed to be looked at on a Londonwide basis. Councillor Asser said that there were resource issues concerning this and boroughs did not have the staff time to do this, especially as borough budgets continued to shrink. However, this issue would not go away and he felt that work needed to continue collectively among the boroughs. The Chair asked whether companies would pay charges to the boroughs under a single Londonwide contract model.

Councillor Hakata asked about the timescales and how long it would take to impact on the current arrangements between boroughs and operators. Councillor Ehmann said that he was sceptical of the implementation of a Londonwide bye law and was proved right in the end, as London Councils had attempted to do this over a number of years without success. He said that he was unsure that the boroughs would agree what the parameters were in a Londonwide contract, as boroughs had a different perspective on what the risks were.

The Chair asked whether officers could provide a breakdown of what the current arrangements in place were regarding dockless bikes and e-scooters. He said that a "model charter" was needed in order to promote best practice and futureproof arrangements. The Chair asked whether a letter was required on this from Lead Members and himself.

Agathe de Canson said that it would be too confusing for users if an individual borough approach was taken and this would not achieve operator compliance, especially as users often went across borough boundaries. She said that it was worth exploring the kinds of agreements that operators could put in place. For instance, practices around bays and geofencing for dockless bikes were not the same as what was in place for e-scooters (eg like marked bays). Agathe de Canson said that issues like these could be decided with the contractor and boroughs could designate open spaces.

Agathe de Canson informed Members that operators were carrying out a great deal of work on developing technological solutions, especially with regards to where vehicles could go and where they could be parked. This was clear when it came to the e-scooter trials. Agathe de Canson said that new boroughs could still join the e-scooter trials. Private e-scooters still remained illegal. Agathe de Canson said that she was unable to discuss financial negotiations as this was commercially sensitive. However, boroughs did receive contributions from operators both for the e-scooter trial and for dockless bikes.

Agathe de Canson said that the timescales were dependent on whether London Councils got the “go ahead”. She said that London Councils and TfL could potentially be going out to procurement at the end of 2023. Boroughs were being encouraged to build-in flexibility into their agreements for dockless bikes. The Chair asked whether it was worth going through the process of having a byelaw. Councillor Ehmann felt that it was not a profitable route. Agathe de Canson said that a bye law would not achieve a joint approach for dockless bikes and e-scooters and this was unlikely to get ministerial approval. An agreed approach was needed, along with a wider TEC discussion and discussions at officer level in the boroughs.

The Chair said that it would be beneficial if the TEC Executive Sub Committee could meet the operators. The TEC Executive could then update the wider TEC on the outcome.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed that officers would provide TEC with a breakdown of the arrangements in place between dockless bikes and e-scooters. A “model charter” was also needed that incorporated best practice in order to futureproof arrangements;
- Agreed that a letter on this would be written from the Chair of TEC to council Leaders;
- Noted that boroughs could still opt-in to take part in the e-scooter trials; and
- Agreed that operators would be invited to attend a meeting with TEC Executive Sub Committee members. An update could then be given to full TEC.

5. 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 2022/23 and full year 2021/22.

Andy Rollock, Mobility Services Manager, London Councils, informed Members that the contact centre staff were still underperforming on the Freedom Pass contract (ie answering calls within 45 seconds/percentage of calls abandoned). Some staff were now leaving their roles in the contact centre, which was causing problems with the service. However, improvements were being made to get the service back on track and this continued to be monitored. Andy Rollock said that customer satisfaction still remained at a high level.

Andy Rollock said that vehicle arrival times for the Taxicard service had an “amber” rating as targets were not being met. This was mainly due to a shortage of drivers at the

moment, as a large number of drivers were leaving the taxi trade. Efforts were currently being made to improve provision. Councillor Asser asked whether the drivers had given any reasons for leaving the taxi trade. He asked whether more drivers would move back into the trade as a result of the cost of living crisis. The Chair said that supplying the Taxicard service used to be popular, although this did not appear to be the case now. Andy Rollock said that he had contacted the taxi and private hire (TPH) organisation about the lack of drivers to the Taxicard service. The TPH said that there was still a great deal of work on the streets at the moment and taxi drivers were “picking and choosing” the more lucrative jobs (ie not Taxicard jobs). ComCab was now providing a lot of the work and were engaging with the private operators. Andy Rollock said that efforts were being made to get the service back up to scratch.

Stephen Boon, Director of Transport & Mobility, said that London Councils was working closely with TfL. He informed Members that there had been a 16.5% reduction in black cab drivers and a 13% reduction in PHV drivers. Stephen Boon said that aggressive pricing had also resulted in a reduction in supply. He said that Kalpini Dave, Chief Contracts Officer, London Councils, would be looking closely at what to prioritise with this and plans were being put in place to bring more PHV drivers “into the mix”. The Chair asked if there was anything that TEC Members could do to help support this. Stephen Boon said that the Taxicard contract re-procurement would be taking place soon and officers would come back to TEC on this in order to get a clear steer on what the priorities were.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that officers would come to TEC with the Taxicard contract re-procurement and ask Members to give them a clear steer on what their priorities were; and
- Noted the Transport & Mobility Performance report for Quarter 2.

6. Transport Funding Sub Group Update.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that provided an update on the activities of the London Councils' Transport Funding sub group.

Councillor Costigan said that a meeting of the sub group had taken place on 7 November 2022. She said that there were logistical problems with this meeting as there were a large number of people who attended the meeting, along with a great deal of items on the agenda that needed discussing in an one hour slot that was allocated. Councillor Costigan said that TfL had felt that the current funding round had been settled, but London Councils felt that more discussions were needed in respect of underspends and flexibility, especially with regards to the allocation of funding. She said that the next sub group meeting was being planned to take place before Christmas. This meeting would have less people in attendance along with a more focussed agenda. The Chair thanked Councillor Costigan for her continued input and support in chairing the Transport Funding sub group meeting.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted that another meeting of the sub group would be convened before Christmas. The agenda would have less items and be more focussed. Also, the number of additional people attending this meeting would be reduced.

7. TEC Month 6 Revenue Forecast 2022/23

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that outlined actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of September 2022 for TEC and provided a forecast of the outturn position for 2022/23. At this half year stage, a surplus of £1.09 million was forecast. In addition, total expenditure in respect of Taxicard trips taken by scheme members was forecast to underspend by a net figure of £3.585 million, which still reflected a reduction in demand following Covid-19. The net borough proportion of this underspend was projected to be £2.257 million, with £1.328 million accruing to TfL.

David Sanni, Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, introduced the report, which forecasted a surplus of £1.09million at this stage. He said that the next TEC forecast report would be presented to the Members at the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting on 9 February 2023. The Chair said that a case should be made for the investment in other TEC activities and what might need to be done for the Taxicard scheme.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted the projected surplus of £1.09 million for the year, plus the forecast net underspend of £3.585 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in the report; and
- Noted the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraph 5 of the report and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee included in paragraphs 6-8.

8. Proposed Revenue Budget & Borough Subscriptions & Charges 2023/24 and Medium-Term Financial Strategy

This report detailed the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2023/24, together with indicative income and expenditure budgets for 2024/25 and 2025/26.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee was asked to comment on these outline proposals in order that any comments could be considered in the further report going to the Main TEC Committee on 8 December 2022 where the detailed budget proposals and levels of subscriptions and charges would be presented for approval.

David Sanni introduced the report which set out the proposed budget in the context of higher inflation. He informed Members that London Councils would be carrying out a review of the operating model in January 2023. David Sanni said that the uncommitted general reserves of £3.4million, including the forecast surplus set out in the preceding paper, was 21% of the total operating expenditure, which was above the 10 to 15% threshold. The TEC reserves therefore, continued to be in a healthy position.

The Chair queried the weak take-up of the Taxicard service and asked whether this was due to capacity issues. Stephen Boon said that the budget was based on the demand trends from previous years. He said that demand had continued to plateau and had not increased. Stephen Boon said that a survey was being sent to Taxicard members to ask them what impact the cost of living crisis was having on their use of the service. The results from this would be sent back in January 2023.

Stephen Boon said that taxi tariffs had also increased which fed into what members paid into the scheme.

The Chair asked what assumption of inflation had been included in the draft budget. David Sanni said that a 4% increase in employee costs had been assumed. Also, some of the contracts were linked to inflation. He said that the 4% would be reduced to 2% in future years. The Chair asked whether the Elizabeth Line represented a cost to boroughs with regards to the Freedom Pass. Stephen Boon confirmed that the Freedom Pass assumed an RPI plus 1% for fare increases. He said that more information should become available as a result of the Government's Autumn Statement being announced today. The Chair asked whether London Councils were in contact with borough treasurers about these issues. Stephen Boon confirmed that this was the case. He said that the concessionary fares settlement was slightly up compared to the previous year but was still considerably below pre-Covid levels.

The TEC Executive-Sub Committee was asked to recommend that the main Committee approved at their meeting on 8 December 2022, the proposed individual levies and charges for 2023/24 as follows:

- (i) The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2022/23 - £1,500) (paragraph 9);
 - (ii) No charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass Administration Charge, which was covered by replacement Freedom Pass income (2022/23 – no charge) (paragraph 11);
 - (iii) The net Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,000 in total (2022/23 - £338,000); (paragraph 10);
 - (iv) No charge to boroughs and TfL in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which was fully covered by estimated PCN income (2022/23 – no charge) (paragraph 13);
 - (v) The Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.2975 per PCN, which would be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with the number of PCNs issued in 2021/22 (2022/23 - £0.3751 per PCN; paragraphs 15);
 - (vi) The Parking and Traffic Appeals Charge of £29.75 per appeal or £25.57 per appeal where electronic evidence was provided by the enforcing authority (2022/23 - £29.36/£25.55 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £23.49 for hard copy submissions and £22.65 for electronic submissions (2022/23 - £23.64/£22.88 per SD) (paragraphs 15);
 - (vii) Congestion Charging Appeals including the ULEZ scheme – to be recovered on a full cost recovery basis, as for 2022/23, under the current contract arrangement with the GLA (paragraph 20);
- The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2022/23 - £7.53) (paragraph 15);
- (viii) 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 (2022/23 - £15.23) (paragraph 15);
 - (ix) The TEC Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2022/23 - £0.175) (paragraph 15);
- and
- (x) The use of £721,000 of TEC reserves which consists of £258,000 of previously approved committed reserves to fund environmental initiatives, including climate change, from the TEC Special Projects Reserve. The residual amount of £463,000 would be funded from the £1.1 million forecast TEC surplus for 2022/23 and would not reduce the existing level of uncommitted reserves (paragraph 35)

Based on the above proposed level of subscriptions and charges, the Executive-Sub Committee was asked to recommend that the Main Committee approved at their meeting on 8 December:

- The provisional consolidated revenue expenditure budget for 2023/24 of £262.127 million, as per Appendix A of this report;
- The provisional consolidated revenue income budget for 2023/24 of £261.406 million and use of reserves of £721,000, also as per Appendix B;
- To consider the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 35-37 and Table 5 of this report

The Executive-Sub Committee was also asked to note:

- The indicative total charges to individual boroughs for 2023/24, dependent upon volumes generated through the various parking systems, as set out in Appendix C.1;
- The indicative income and expenditure budgets for 2024/25 and 2025/26 detailed at Appendices E-F;
- The proposed review of London Councils operating model to identify potential savings and efficiencies to ensure its financial arrangements remain affordable and sustainable.
- A survey had gone out to Taxicard members regarding the impact that the cost of living was having on their use of the service.
- Inflation had been added into the draft budget (4% of employee costs in first year, dropping to 2% in future years); and
- The Freedom Pass assumed RPI + 1% for fares increases.

9. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 14 July 2022 (for agreeing)

It was noted that Councillor Costigan's declaration of interest under the North West London Waste Authority should be removed (agenda item 2). Subject to this amendment, the minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on the 14 October 2022 were noted.

10. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 14 October 2022 (for noting)

The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 14 October 2022.

Post Meeting Note:

To collect better EqlAs data for the proposed penalty fare increase by TfL, and to probe responses, especially with regards to vulnerable groups.

The meeting finished at 11:54am

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee (In-Person) – 8 December 2022

Minutes of a meeting of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee held on Thursday 8 December 2022 at 2:30pm, in the Conference Suite, 59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL

Present:

Council	Councillor
Barking and Dagenham	Cllr Syed Ghani
Barnet	Cllr Geof Cooke
Bexley	Cllr Peter Craske (virtual)
Brent	Cllr Krupa Sheth
Bromley	Cllr Nicholas Bennett
Camden	Cllr Adam Harrison
Croydon	Cllr Scott Roche (virtual)
Ealing	Cllr Deidre Costigan
Enfield	Cllr Rick Jewell
Greenwich	Cllr Averil Lekau
Hackney	Mayor Philip Glanville (Chair)
Hammersmith and Fulham	Cllr Sharon Holder
Haringey	Cllr Mike Hakata
Harrow	Cllr Anjana Patel (virtual)
Havering	Cllr Barry Mugglestone
Hillingdon	Cllr Jonathon Bianco
Hounslow	Cllr Katherine Dunne
Islington	Cllr Rowena Champion
Kensington and Chelsea	Cllr Cem Kemahli
Kingston Upon Thames	Cllr Ian Manders
Lambeth	Cllr Rezina Chowdhury
Lewisham	Cllr Louise Krupski
Merton	Cllr Natasha Irons
Newham	Cllr James Asser
Redbridge	Cllr Jo Blackman
Richmond Upon Thames	Cllr Alexander Ehmann (virtual)
Southwark	Cllr Catherine Rose
Sutton	Cllr Barry Lewis
Tower Hamlets	-
Waltham Forest	Cllr Clyde Loakes
Wandsworth	Cllr Judi Gasser
City of Westminster	Cllr Paul Dimoldenberg
City of London Corporation	Apologies
Transport for London	Alex Williams

The Chair opened the TEC meeting, which could be accessed by the public online via a livestream. He reminded Members that TEC meetings were now taking place “in person” and Members would need to be present in the room in order to vote. The Chair said that the speakers in the Conference Suite were very sensitive and might pick-up any personal discussions that Members might have. Members were also asked if they could state their names and where they were from when addressing the Committee.

1. Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies

Apologies:

Shravan Joshi (City of London Corporation)

No deputies were given.

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

Freedom Pas, 60+ Oyster Card & Blue Badge

Cllr Sharon Holder (LB Hammersmith & Fulham)

Cllr Jonathon Bianco (LB Hillingdon)

Cllr Paul Dimoldenberg (City of Westminster)

North London Waste Authority

Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Waltham Forest)

West London Waste Authority

Cllr Anjana Patel (LB Harrow)

Western Riverside Waste Authority

Cllr Sharon Holder (LB Hammersmith & Fulham)

South London Waste Partnership

Cllr Scott Roche (LB Croydon)

Cllr Ian Manders (RB Kingston)

Cllr Natasha Irons (LB Merton)

Cllr Barry Lewis (LB Sutton)

Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (Thames RFCC)

Cllr Sharon Holder (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr Averil Lekau (RB Greenwich), Cllr Anjana Patel (LB Harrow) and Cllr Catherine Rose (LB Southwark).

3. Re-appointment of Environment & Traffic Adjudicators

The Committee received a report that proposed the reappointment of 5 environment and traffic adjudicators and the appointment of 4 environment and traffic adjudicators under the terms of the Traffic Management Act 2004.

Anthony Chan, Interim Chief Adjudicator, London Councils, introduced the report which was proposing the re-appointment of environment and traffic adjudicators. The second group of five adjudicators in the report were seeking to be re-appointed as a result of the adjudicator retirement age being extended to 75 years of age as agreed at the last TEC meeting.

Councillor Costigan asked what the male/female ratio was of environment and traffic adjudicators. Anthony Chan said that there was an historic imbalance of male adjudicators employed at London Tribunals. The Chair asked whether London Councils could work on addressing this imbalance. Anthony Chan said that the employment of new adjudicator appointments would be looked at in the future.

The Committee:

- Agreed that the following serving adjudicators were re- appointed for a period of five years from 5 December 2022:
Hamilton, Caroline
Parekh, Mamta
Teper, Carl
Thorne, Timothy
- Agreed that the following former adjudicators were re- appointed as follows
Aslangul, Michel until 26 July 2025
Houghton, Edward until 15 April 2026
Lane, John until 12 August 2024
Lawrence, Michael until 13 March 2026
Styles, Gerald until 7 May 2027
- Noted that the gender imbalance of the Environment & Traffic Adjudicators employed at London Tribunals would be looked into.

4. Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) Update by Alex Williams & Heather Preen (TfL)

The Chair said that the item was not seeking a position for London Councils at the moment and was a stakeholder update.

Alex Williams introduced the report which gave a brief update on the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) extension. The update would look at the background of the ULEZ, consultation, what had changed and the next steps. The ULEZ extension throughout London would be expanding from the 29 August 2023. It was a Mayoral decision and would improve air quality in London. A 700-page report had been produced which was a very comprehensive evidence-based report that highlighted the impact of the scheme. The existing ULEZ already had a very high vehicle compliance rate and had reduced NO_x and CO₂ by 20 percent.

Heather Preen, Head of Local Communities & Partnerships, TfL, said that 58,000 responses to the consultation had been received back so far. 59 percent of those respondents were against an extension to the ULEZ. However, the decision to extend the ULEZ had already been taken. Heather Preen informed Members that there were a number of changes that were important to note, including more help for people with disabilities (standard rate of disability allowance) and the introduction of a new scrappage scheme (£110million had been put aside for this), especially for people on low incomes.

Heather Preen informed Members that new signage now needed to be introduced, and to go through the Section 8 Highways Act and resolve any issues before Christmas. New CCTV cameras would also need installing (around 2,000 within the zone). TfL had

powers through the GLA to deliver the scheme. Work was also starting on marketing the new extension scheme, with the aim being to encourage people to comply to help improve air quality. The scrappage scheme would be going live on 30 January 2023.

Councillor Kemahli asked whether any modelling was available to show the effects of having no ULEZ extension. Councillor Bianco asked where the power for the cameras would come from. Councillor Costigan said that the expansion of buses in inner London was very welcomed. She asked how TfL would be engaging with the boroughs to let them know where changes to bus services were. Alex Williams informed Members that a comparison of having a ULEZ compared to the impact of not having a ULEZ resulted to approximately 20 percent better air quality. This could be found in the report six months on from having the ULEZ. He said that the power for the new cameras would come from the existing power source (work had started on the UKPN network on the boundary). Alex Williams said that borough officers would already have most of this information. A large number of changes were taking place on bus services in outer London, along with £25million on changes in central London (20 percent). Money for enhancements to bus services was being made available in outer London and TfL needed to do more to communicate the details on this.

Councillor Lewis asked whether any additional resources would be made available to the Borough of Sutton to help manage the implementation of new cameras and signage. Councillor Manders said that he supported the ULEZ extension but voiced concern that there were no accurate figures available on the number of vehicles that did not qualify for scrappage (TfL appeared to have a number of incorrect postcodes). He also asked whether discussions had taken place with people in neighbouring councils, like Surrey, that were outside of the GLA. Alex Williams confirmed that TfL had already carried out the work for where the new cameras and signage went. He said that Heather Preen had been in contact with borough CEXs about this. With reference to the question on the number of vehicles that qualified for scrappage, Alex Williams said that there was data available on the usage of vehicles, but not yet on a "borough-by-borough" breakdown of ownership. He said that he would find out more about this.

Alex Williams said that people with vehicles outside the ULEZ could still apply for the scrappage scheme. He said that the issue of bus services and ULEZ would be looked at together (integrated). Councillor Hakata asked whether there was any impact on the number of vehicles entering London in general and not just a reduction in polluting vehicles. Members asked whether polluting vehicles could be traded in for e-bikes and other means of transport in the new scrappage scheme. Work also needed to be carried out around schools, like promoting the use of buses rather than vehicles to take children to school. Councillor Patel asked about modelling for the health implications in outer London boroughs. Councillor Bianco asked when officers needed to respond to the consultation. Councillor Ehmann asked how the ULEZ had impacted on the ownership of vehicles and also resources. He asked whether TfL had consulted the boroughs on the new scrappage scheme.

Alex Williams said that the ULEZ did reduce overall vehicle ownership, but only by around 1 to 2 percent for a Londonwide ULEZ. He confirmed that people could use the scrappage scheme to buy e-bikes and to sign-up to other offers like car clubs. Alex Williams confirmed that TfL did engage with local authorities outside of London about the ULEZ extension. He informed Members that there were also some issues regarding bus services that were on the peripheral of London. Work around schools was being carried out and was part of the schools' outreach programme. Alex Williams confirmed that the deadline for responses to the consultation was 23 December 2022. TfL would then go through the responses and "take stock". Alex Williams said that all the

modelling around the ULEZ and health implications could be found online. He said that between 102 to 118 premature deaths had been caused as a direct result of poor air quality and this had now become an urgent health challenge. Alex Williams said that he would look into getting ownership data and usage. He said that TfL would also be happy to look at going into partnership (or something similar) with local companies. TfL would also share details of the scrappage scheme with the boroughs. The Chair said that it would be useful if TfL could share with TEC the “communications pack” when it was available on 9 January 2023, as TEC would like to be part of the comms network. Alex Williams confirmed that details of the comms package and scrappage scheme would be shared with the boroughs as soon as they were made available.

Councillor Asser asked whether the scrappage scheme was just available to vehicles in the extended ULEZ. Alex Williams confirmed that the scrappage scheme would apply to all of London. Councillor Krupski thanked TfL for extending the ULEZ as this would help save lives. The Chair agreed and asked whether there was the option for boroughs to become involved in road user charging and zero emissions. Councillor Loakes said that he was grateful that there was finally a Londonwide ULEZ and that a proper scrappage scheme was now in place and could be used to fund e-bikes and other options like car clubs. He said that it was great that a global approach to combatting air pollution was now being taken forward. Councillor Loakes said that he also welcomed any new investment in buses but said that more money was needed for Active Travel infrastructure in outer London.

Alex Williams said that no decisions had been taken yet regarding road user charging, but a report would be needed to make an analysis of this. He said that the sum of £150million for Active Travel infrastructure had been approved in the TfL Business Plan, which was not as much as what was available pre-pandemic but was still very welcomed. The Chair thanked Alex Williams for the update on the ULEZ extension and new scrappage scheme. He said that TEC looked forward to receiving more information on this as it became available.

5. Direct Vision Standard (DVS) Phase 2 and HGV Safety Permit Scheme: Seeking Approval for Proposed Consultation

The Committee received a report that sought approval for TfL to undertake a stakeholder consultation on the proposed Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) Safety Permit Scheme’s Progressive Safe System (PSS) planned to come into effect from October 2024 when the Direct Vision Standard (DVS) for HGVs tightened from one star to three stars. The PSS aimed to further improve indirect vision through HGV cab windows with the goal of reducing collisions where sight was a contributing factor. TfL proposed to run the consultation process for 8 weeks from early February 2023 until early April 2023.

Alex Williams introduced the report and said that TfL had been working with London Councils to help make a real difference when it came to safety as a direct result of poor visibility in HGVs. He said that 191,769 permits had been issued in Phase 1. Phase 2 would ensure that zero-star, one-star and two-stars rated vehicles would meet the minimum 3-star rating by October 2024, if it was approved by this Committee. Alex Williams said that the aim was to go out to consultation in February 2023, with the aim of bringing this back to TEC in the summer of 2023 (the first stage was in process). This would end up making roads safer. TfL would come back to TEC with further information in due course.

The Chair asked whether Brexit had made it more difficult for TfL to engage with HGV companies. Councillor Lewis felt that the fines for breaking the law were fairly low and

asked whether this was the maximum fine that could be charged. Alex Williams said that the fine was in the Order. He said that the compliance rate for the current fine that was charged for this was high for this scheme. Alex Williams said that he was uncertain of the effects that Brexit had had with regards to engaging with HGV companies.

The Committee:

- Approved TfL's request to consult on the PSS in February 2023 and to report back to this Committee in summer 2023 with the outcomes of that consultation and details of the proposed Permit Scheme's Progressive Safe System (PSS).

6. Concessionary Fares 2023/24 Settlement & Apportionment

The Committee received a report that informed 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 2023/24. It also sought members' approval to the proposed settlement and apportionment of £236.868 million.

Stephen Boon, Director of Transport & Mobility, London Councils, introduced the concessionary fares item which was a statutory scheme and set out the process of negotiations with the Train Operating Companies (TOCs). He informed Members that there would be an increase of 14 percent to the cost of the scheme, mainly attributable to the increase in passenger fares. The figures that were being presented to TEC today represented the maximum settlement and incorporated the increase in demand for rail journeys including the recently opened Elizabeth Line. The individual levels of apportionment varied by borough. Stephen Boon said that Members were being asked to approve the seven recommendations for the settlement, as outlined in the report.

The Chair asked whether officers had spoken to borough treasurers about the concessionary fares settlement. Stephen Boon confirmed that dialogue had taken place with treasurers throughout the year. Councillor Hakata asked whether the removal of 24-hour free travel was still going to take place now the pandemic was over. Heather Preen said that it was expected that this would take place after Christmas, but the Mayor was yet to sign this off. Councillor Hakata asked what the financial impact of the settlement would be for the boroughs. Stephen Boon said that TfL picked-up the main costs of this. Only actual journeys were calculated and fed into the settlement.

The Committee:

- Agreed the TfL settlement of £217.012 million for 2023/24;
- Agreed to the RDG settlement of £17.238 million for 2023/24;
- Agreed a budget for non-TfL bus services of £1.1 million;
- Agreed the reissue budget for 2023/24 of £1.518 million;
- Agreed the borough payments for 2023/24 of £236.868 million;
- Agreed the payment profile and dates on which boroughs' contributions were paid as 1 June 2023, 7 September 2023, 7 December 2023 and 7 March 2024; and
- Agreed the 2021/2022 London Service Permit (LSP) bus operators (non-TfL buses) Concessionary Scheme.

7. Chair's Report

The Committee received a report that updated Members on transport and environment policy activity since the last TEC meeting on 14 October 2022.

The Chair said a great deal of work continued to take place since the last TEC meeting in October, including the LIP/TfL funding deal, micromobility, bus consultation and continuous engagement with TfL. He informed Members that TEC would be taking a leading role on dockless bikes. A meeting would be taking place with dockless bike operators on 15 December 2022. Boroughs would feed into this meeting and then all TEC Members would be invited to discuss any issues with the operators after this meeting.

The Chair said that TEC's work on the environment was continuing and included work on initiatives on green finance, the Skidmore Review and influencing the Government to fund work on decarbonisation. A great deal of work also continued to take place on improving air quality and pollution as a result of climate change. The Chair said that all Leaders would be written to regarding details and the latest position surrounding dockless bikes.

Councillor Manders said that a conclusion regarding the legality of e-scooters was needed now. He said that many young people were riding on e-scooters outside of the law. The Chair said that the legislation covering e-scooters had been postponed. He said that London Councils was actively engaged with the DfT but the timetable had slipped. Katharina Winbeck confirmed that the announcement regarding the Transport Bill had been delayed, although officers were doing everything they could to influence e-scooter legislation. Councillor Manders felt that London Councils needed to use its influence now to ensure that action was taken with regards to e-scooters. The Chair said that TEC could pick this thread up and be clearer about it.

Councillor Costigan said that the Borough of Ealing was already involved in the e-scooter trial. She said that the point of the trial was to test what could be put in the legislation (eg speeds, the wearing of protective helmets etc). However, she said that the Government was not bringing forward any legislation in this parliamentary period. Councillor Kemahli said that there were difficulties with regards to dockless bikes crossing borough boundaries. He said that he would like to see a more unanimous and streamlined approach. Councillor Kemahli said that delivery drivers were also using motorised bicycles even though there was no legislation available on their use. The Chair felt that this needed to be challenged. Councillor Loakes thanked officers for the large amount of policy work that was being carried out and paid credit to all those involved. He said that the Chair's Report outlined a very important set of agendas.

The Committee noted the Chair's Report.

8. Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordination Update

The Committee received a report regarding London Councils' continued role in coordinating and supporting boroughs in delivering electric vehicle charging infrastructure. The report also provided a progress overview of the coordination activity and a forward look, outlining current engagement with the Government and London partners

Femi Biyibi, Principal Projects & Policy Officer, London Councils, introduced the report which looked at boroughs delivery for electric vehicles (EVs), a bespoke framework for EVs, government funding and borough matched funding to deliver a number of public

charge points. He said that this was a key piece of work which the Government had committed £450million to deliver a step-change in the scale of deployment of local, primarily low-power, on-street charging infrastructure across England, and to accelerate the commercialisation of, and investment in, the local charging infrastructure sector. The funds were made up of a Capital pot (£400million) and a Capability (reserve) pot (£50million).

Femi Biyibi said that it was important to ensure that London received its fair share of funding and London Councils was engaging with Office for Zero Emission Vehicles (OZEV) to look at how this could be delivered. London Councils was also working with sub-regional partnerships and with the boroughs and TfL to help deliver the projects. The Crown Commissioning Service had now replaced the Go Ultra Low City Scheme (GULCS) to deliver the charge points (ie procurement). London Councils would also support TfL to deliver the guidance and to work with OZEV to ensure that London received its fair share of the LEVI fund. Femi Biyibi said that work was continuing with partners to help unlock private finance opportunities. The Chair thanked Femi Biyibi and the team at London Councils for the work being carried out on the EV roll-out, which was Nation-leading and well ahead in regards of innovation and delivery.

Councillor Bennett asked whether any funds would be available to help pay for the trunking of charge point cables across the pavement. Councillor Ehmann said that the Borough of Richmond had a number of charge points and had two bidders to deliver hundreds of those charge points. He said that boroughs might need to become more selective in order to keep energy costs down. Councillor Lewis said that Sutton was also looking at the safety aspect of putting cables across pavements for charge points. He said that it would be very helpful to hear about work that had already been carried out on this. Councillor Costigan said that Ealing had temporarily paused the charges on lamp posts as some resilience issues had found. She asked whether there was any more information available on this.

Femi Biyibi informed Members that there had been some issues with the trailing of cables, which was being investigated. He said that public funding applications would be dependent on whether the parking related to on-street or off-street parking (eg garden to kerb-side). Trailing cable issues had been raised and the “pros” and “cons” highlighted, particularly the utilisation of the London ‘template’ for the CCS VCIS *dynamic purchasing system* procurement model. (*check with Femi*). Councillor Bennett asked how cables could be trunked without people tripping over them. Femi Biyibi said that engagement with TfL was taking place on this. He confirmed that London Councils was aware that there were issues with some kinds of charge points. Katharina Winbeck said that the Government was very keen for the boroughs to explore ways of procuring more private funding. She said that some providers would supply these services at no extra cost.

The Chair said that the Borough of Hackney had a blended finance model of one fifth local authority financed and the rest through private financing. He asked whether the LEVI funding could be more of a blended-type model. There were also questions around whether London would get its fair share of funding. Femi Biyibi said that there was more flexibility with a greater mix of public/private funding and to ensure London received its fair share of funding through working with OZEV (the conversations that had taken place with OZEV on this had been very encouraging and it was hoped that this would continue).

Councillor Rose felt that there was a hierarchy of delivery when it came to the roll-out of EV and domestic re-charging. She said that a larger rapid charging infrastructure was needed as it would mean less reliance on doorstep charging. Councillor Bianco said that there were concerns with street charging points, as there was a lack of control

when it came to the pricing of electricity, especially if it was overpriced. He said that evolving technology would mean that EV charging would be different in, say five-years' time, especially for those people that did not have a charge point in their homes. Councillor Loakes said that he was against digging-up borough pavements to lay cables for charging. He said that some places were already having to pull-out of deals. The Chair said that he was conscious of the different approaches being taken when it came to EV charging.

Femi Biyibi said that rapid charging hubs and the modelling of charge points were in the Mayor's EV Strategy. He said that the strategy presented outlined that there should be a mix of charge points. TfL was already active when it came to rapid charging hubs and was concentrating on five rapid charging hubs for Londoners to use. Femi Biyibi said that control of energy prices was challenging and London Councils was very much aware of this issue (ie when providers chose to increase costs) and were working on ways to address this.

The Committee noted the EV Infrastructure Coordination update report.

9. Flood Partnerships Update

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

The Chair informed Members that the first meeting of the Surface Water Flooding sub-group had met this morning. He said that Claire Bell from the EA was present. Katharina Winbeck introduced the report which was a regular update that was presented to TEC. She thanked the sub-regional flooding partnerships for providing the update. Some very good collaborative work had taken place and London Councils was making efforts to support this work even more.

Claire Bell, Area Flood & Coastal Risk Manager, EA, said that a direction had been set to manage surface water flooding in the future, and consultants were being looked at to help assist in this work. A framework would also be provided to put into borough flood prevention plans. Claire Bell said that there were some resources available from the Thames RFCC (the RFCC was getting a Chair). She said that dialogue had also taken place with the Commissioner from New York, who was already carrying out a great deal of good work and it was hoped that all this work could be brought together.

Claire Bell said that the Thames RFCC covered the largest area across England and Members of that committee were TEC councillors that represented seven areas in London. She said that some of the levy that the Thames RFCC received was used to put in place the terms to deliver the projects for inner and outer London and also helped with technical flood support and application processes. Members should contact Claire Bell should they have any specific questions. Claire Bell said that there was a £52billion flood programme across England, with approximately £800million for the Thames region. However, not all projects were deliverable and others had not been "well formed".

Claire Bell said that SUDs modelling had been carried out and was moving on to the next stage. Funding would be used to help influence and deliver projects (SUDS schemes). The projects were about innovation and trying new things and it was hoped to bring these projects forward. Other important areas of work included the effects of climate change, air quality, water quality and green infrastructure. Thames Water was funding a post to help engage with the leading flood local authorities. Less funding

was being allocated and this meant that there was less protection to households. This was the same across all twelve flooding regions. Clare Bell said that there was a lack of resources owing to a number of different reasons including the war in the Ukraine and high inflation etc (which were being looked at). She said that Member induction sessions also took place for Thames RFCC members in October/November every year, and TEC Members were encouraged to attend these sessions. Elected members would have to invite TEC councillors. There were two virtual meetings and two face-to-face meetings that took place each year and TEC Members should get in touch with London Councils if they wanted to attend.

Councillor Hakata said that it was worth TEC Members joining the induction sessions that were given to Thames RFCC members. Councillor Holder said that boroughs were experiencing resource issues and not all local authorities had a designated officer to carry out this flooding work. She said that some boroughs had to share an officer to help with this and flood risk needed to be put higher up the agenda. Councillor Krupski asked when the Thames Barrier was going to be renewed, especially in light of the problems being caused by climate change. She said that the modelling that was carried out on the Thames Barrier would now be out of date. Councillor Lewis said that invites to any meetings/sessions should be sent out at the earliest opportunity. Katharina Winbeck said that the invites could be circulated via TEC. The Chair suggested that an officer be made responsible for this. He said that borough Leaders should also be sent an invite to the meetings.

The Chair asked if Members needed to be made aware of any issues around funding at the moment and also the position that Lee Valley was in at the moment. Claire Bell said that a flood risk exercise was being carried out on the Thames Barrier (tidal risk etc) in January 2023 with the Borough of Bexley. She said that there was also a Thames Estuary 2100 team working on this. The Thames Barrier had reached a 10-year point now and had been reviewed. Some of the dates had also been brought forward, especially in light of the climate change impacts on river banks. Findings on this would be taken from the Thames Estuary 2100. Claire Bell said that a new location for the Thames Barrier was being looked into and all options were being kept open. She said that she would be happy for any invites to meetings be put through TEC and passed on to the right people. Funding for 70/70 would need approval within the next 6-months. Claire Bell said that this would need to have a flood risk benefit and would need to capture as much as possible. A hundred or so of these projects would then be sent around, alongside the PROSPER projects at the beginning of January 2023.

The Chair said that it was a very challenging environment when it came to funding at the moment. Claire Bell agreed and said that the levy funding would not be able to provide the resource to deliver flood risk development (there was £1million for SUDs work). She said that there was no ring-fencing of money and it would be down to local authorities to how they used this funding.

The Committee noted the Flood Partnerships Update report and the proposal to invite TEC Members and Leaders to attend the induction sessions (via TEC officers) that were given to Thames RFCC members in October/November each year.

10. Climate Change Update

The Committee received a report that provided a 6-monthly update to the Transport and Environment Committee on the progress of the London Councils' seven climate change programmes. The report included a summary of the key achievements of each of the programmes, as well as the work facilitated by London Councils to support collaboration between programmes and their development as they moved from action planning to implementation.

Hannah Jameson, Programme Director of Climate Change, London Councils, introduced the report that came to TEC every 6-months for an update and covered the seven climate change programmes that were being led by boroughs to address the biggest climate challenges. She said that climate “action plans” would be published over the next eight years and would look at developing these programmes (ie programme delivery) and to improve coordination. London Councils would help with engagement and would look two years’ ahead and look at resourcing issues as well.

Hannah Jameson said that the climate change programmes were very ambitious, especially considering the lack of resources available to take them forward. She said that Retrofit London had been an award winning programme that looked at improving energy efficiency. An important and valuable funding model was available along with a great deal of learning and coordination work. Work was taking place on decarbonisation and procuring clean energy and carrying out new research on the green economy. Hannah Jameson informed TEC that early delivery would be taking place over the next two years.

The Chair thanked Hannah Jameson for the very comprehensive update. He said that there were challenges when it came to renewable power and the decarbonisation of existing networks (heat networks and community energy). The Chair asked whether TEC was providing enough support in these areas. He said that the City of London was already very interested in low carbon with regards to the construction industry.

Councillor Lewis said that this was a very large area of work that could be very confusing. He said that the Borough of Sutton was now moving to finalise its plans and had a Green Enterprise Partnership (SMBs had a 70 percent rate relief to spend this money on green initiatives). Hannah Jameson said that energy was a fast moving field and the programme did not have enough resources to do all of the things that were hoped from it. She said that a great deal more work needed to be carried out, especially around “Power Purchase Agreements” and heating networks. Dialogue was taking place with the GLA as well as the boroughs on these issues. Low carbon development was also part of the ambition for that programme in Sutton. Hannah Jameson said that the “action plans” would be showcased in the new year, and ways in which they could be monitored would be looked into, including inequalities. She said that sharing information and learning from others would help to move all this forward.

The Committee:

- Noted and commented on the achievements of the programmes; and
- Noted the work taking place to agree resourced implementation plans for each programme, and that an update on this would be brought back to TEC in early 2023

11. Taxicard Budget Update

This item had now been moved to the exempt part of the agenda and could be found at agenda item E1.

12. Proposed Revenue Budget and Borough Subscriptions and Charges 2023/24 and Medium Term-Financial Strategy

The Committee received a report that detailed the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2023/24, together

with indicative income and expenditure budgets for 2024/25 and 2025/26.

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 approved these proposals.

David Danni, Director of Corporate Services, London Councils, introduced the report that presented the budget for the next financial year. The figures presented for recommendation to TEC had been set in the context of high inflation. David Sanni said that London Councils had been carrying out a review of its current operating model to resolve any reliance issues and to identify potential savings (eg by proposing to move London Councils to a smaller premises). The revenue budget showed a proposed amount of £3.4million in reserves, along with a surplus of over £1million, which highlighted a healthy set of TEC accounts (reserves).

Councillor Bennett asked whether boroughs would be able to receive any funds back from what they were paying for the costs of appeals. The Chair said that these costs were paid for from borough subscriptions and there was little scope to reduce these costs, which had remained frozen for a period of 12 years. Stephen Boon said that the appeals service had to be a free service and would require changes to primary legislation to alter this. Councillor Loakes asked about increases in PCN rates. Stephen Boon confirmed that some exploratory work was taking place on this.

The Committee approved:

The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2022/23 - £1,500) (paragraph 9);

(ii) No charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass Administration Charge, which was covered by replacement Freedom Pass income (2022/23 – no charge) (paragraph 11);

(iii) The net Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,000 in total (2022/23 - £338,000); (paragraph 10);

(iv) No charge to boroughs and TfL in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which was fully covered by estimated PCN income (2022/23 – no charge) (paragraph 13);

(v) The Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.2975 per PCN, which will be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with the number of PCNs issued in 2021/22 (2022/23 - £0.3751 per PCN; paragraphs 15);

(vi) The Parking and Traffic Appeals Charge of £29.75 per appeal or £25.57 per appeal where electronic evidence was provided by the enforcing authority (2022/23 - £29.36/£25.55 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £23.49 for hard copy submissions and £22.65 for electronic submissions (2022/23 - £23.64/£22.88 per SD) (paragraphs 15);

(vii) Congestion Charging Appeals including the ULEZ scheme – to be recovered on a full cost recovery basis, as for 2022/23, under the current contract arrangement with the GLA (paragraph 20);

The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2022/23 - £7.53) (paragraph 15);

(viii) 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 (2022/23 - £15.23) (paragraph 15);

(ix) The TEC Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2022/23 - £0.175) (paragraph 15); and

(x) The use of £721,000 of TEC reserves which consists of £258,000 of previously approved committed reserves to fund environmental initiatives, including climate change, from the TEC Special Projects Reserve. The residual amount of £463,000 will be funded from the £1.1 million forecast TEC surplus for 2022/23 and will not reduce the existing level of uncommitted reserves (paragraph 35)

- (xi) The provisional consolidated revenue expenditure budget for 2023/24 of £261.716 million, as per Appendix A of this report;
- (xii) The provisional consolidated revenue income budget for 2023/24 of £260.995 million and use of reserves of £721,000, also as per Appendix B;
- (xiii) To consider the current position on reserves, as set out in paragraphs 35-37 and Table 5 of this report.

The Committee also noted:

- The indicative total charges to individual boroughs for 2023/24, dependent upon volumes generated through the various parking systems, as set out in Appendix C.1;
- The indicative income and expenditure budgets for 2024/25 and 2025/26 detailed at Appendices E-F; and
- The proposed review of London Councils operating model to identify potential savings and efficiencies to ensure its financial arrangements remain affordable and sustainable

13. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee Meeting held on 17 November 2022 (for noting)

The Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 17 November 2022 were noted.

14. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 14 October 2022 (for agreeing)

The minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 14 October 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.

The meeting finished at 16:57pm