



Haverling

L O N D O N B O R O U G H

ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE AGENDA

7.30 pm

**Wednesday
5 November 2014**

**Town Hall, Main Road,
Romford**

Members 6: Quorum 3

COUNCILLORS:

Ray Morgon (Chairman)
Carol Smith (Vice-Chair)
Alex Donald

Patricia Rumble
Garry Pain
Barry Mugglestone

**For information about the meeting please contact:
Wendy Gough 01708 432441
wendy.gough@onesource.co.uk**

Protocol for members of the public wishing to report on meetings of the London Borough of Havering

Members of the public are entitled to report on meetings of Council, Committees and Cabinet, except in circumstances where the public have been excluded as permitted by law.

Reporting means:-

- filming, photographing or making an audio recording of the proceedings of the meeting;
- using any other means for enabling persons not present to see or hear proceedings at a meeting as it takes place or later; or
- reporting or providing commentary on proceedings at a meeting, orally or in writing, so that the report or commentary is available as the meeting takes place or later if the person is not present.

Anyone present at a meeting as it takes place is not permitted to carry out an oral commentary or report. This is to prevent the business of the meeting being disrupted.

Anyone attending a meeting is asked to advise Democratic Services staff on 01708 433076 that they wish to report on the meeting and how they wish to do so. This is to enable employees to guide anyone choosing to report on proceedings to an appropriate place from which to be able to report effectively.

Members of the public are asked to remain seated throughout the meeting as standing up and walking around could distract from the business in hand.

What is Overview & Scrutiny?

Each local authority is required by law to establish an overview and scrutiny function to support and scrutinise the Council's executive arrangements. Each overview and scrutiny sub-committee has its own remit as set out in the terms of reference but they each meet to consider issues of local importance.

The sub-committees have a number of key roles:

1. Providing a critical friend challenge to policy and decision makers.
2. Driving improvement in public services.
3. Holding key local partners to account.
4. Enabling the voice and concerns to the public.

The sub-committees consider issues by receiving information from, and questioning, Cabinet Members, officers and external partners to develop an understanding of proposals, policy and practices. They can then develop recommendations that they believe will improve performance, or as a response to public consultations.

Sub-Committees will often establish Topic Groups to examine specific areas in much greater detail. These groups consist of a number of Members and the review period can last for anything from a few weeks to a year or more to allow the Members to comprehensively examine an issue through interviewing expert witnesses, conducting research or undertaking site visits. Once the topic group has finished its work it will send a report to the Sub-Committee that created it and will often suggest recommendations to the Council's executive.

Terms of Reference

The areas scrutinised by the Committee are:

- Environment
- Transport
- Environmental Strategy
- Community Safety
- Streetcare
- Parking
- Social Inclusion
- Councillor Call for Action

AGENDA ITEMS

1 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman will announce details of the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building's evacuation.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

(if any) – received.

3 DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Members are invited to disclose any pecuniary interest in any of the items on the agenda at this point of the meeting.

Members may still disclose any pecuniary interest in an item at any time prior to the consideration of the matter.

4 MINUTES (Pages 1 - 16)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 4 September 2014 and the Joint Committee (budget) held on 8 September 2014 and authorise the Chairman to sign them.

5 MAINTENANCE OF GREENS AND HEDGES IN THE BOROUGH (Pages 17 - 20)

The Committee will receive a briefing note setting out the maintenance programme for greens and hedges in the borough.

6 LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN: ANNUAL SPENDING SUBMISSION (Pages 21 - 28)

The Committee will receive a report setting out the key areas within the Mayor's Transport Strategy and London Plan and how additional "in year" funding from Transport for London will be allocated.

7 SCOPING DOCUMENT FOR ROAD AND PAVEMENTS TOPIC GROUP (Pages 29 - 30)

The Committee are asked to agree and note the terms of reference for the Roads and Pavements Topic Group.

8 COUNCIL CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT MODEL

To note that the following Cabinet decisions are due for review of progress under the Council Continuous Improvement Model and to decide whether to take an update at the Committee's next meeting:

- Keeping town centres vibrant by reducing on street parking charges and maintaining turnover of visitors.
- Progress against the GLA's Exemplar Borough qualifying criteria to become a designated Cleaner Air Borough.
- Neighbourhood Responsibility Member Project.
- Approval to access energy efficiency funding through Green Deal and ECO via a GLA framework.

9 FUTURE AGENDAS

Committee Members are invited to indicate to the Chairman, items within this Committee's terms of reference they would like to see discussed at a future meeting.

Note: it is not considered appropriate for issues relating to individuals to be discussed under this provision.

10 URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any other items in respect of which the Chairman is of the opinion, by reason of special circumstances which shall be specified in the minutes, that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency.

**Andrew Beesley
Committee Administration
Manager**

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
JOINT (ALL) OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
Council Chamber - Town Hall
8 September 2014 (7.30 - 11.10 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Conservative Group John Crowder, Robby Misir, Garry Pain, Carol Smith and Frederick Thompson

Residents' Group June Alexander, Clarence Barrett, Nic Dodin, Alex Donald, Gillian Ford, Jody Ganly, Linda Hawthorn, Ray Morgon, Barry Mugglestone, Stephanie Nunn, Linda Van den Hende, Julie Wilkes and Darren Wise

UKIP Group Philip Hyde, Phil Martin and Patricia Rumble

Independent Residents Group Michael Deon Burton and David Durant

All decisions were taken with no votes against.

The Chairman reminded Members of the action to be taken in an emergency.

1 MEMBERSHIP AND CHAIRMAN OF MEETING

With the agreement of all Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members present, the Chair was taken at this special meeting by Councillor Clarence Barrett.

2 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman advised all present of action to be taken in the event of an emergency evacuation of the town hall becoming necessary.

3 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from the following Members:

Children & Learning Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

Councillor Jason Frost (substituted Councillor Robby Misir)

Councillor Philippa Crowder (substituted by Councillor Frederick Thompson)

Councillor Reg Whitney (substituted by Councillor Stephanie Nunn)

Councillor John Glanville (substituted by Councillor Phil Martin)

Crime & Disorder Committee:

Councillor John Wood (substituted by Councillor Linda Hawthorn)

Councillor Dilip Patel (substituted by Councillor Robby Misir)

Councillor John Glanville (substituted by Councillor Phil Martin)

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

Councillor Keith Roberts (substituted by Councillor David Durant)

Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

Councillor Dilip Patel (substituted by Councillor John Crowder)

Councillor Joshua Chapman (substitute by Councillor Robby Misir)

Councillor Jason Frost (substituted by Councillor Frederick Thompson)

Individuals Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

Councillor Ray Best (substituted by Councillor Frederick Thompson)

Councillor Viddy Persaud (substituted by Councillor John Crowder)

Councillor Roger Westwood (substituted by Councillor Robby Misir)

Councillor Keith Roberts (substituted by Councillor David Durant)

Towns and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

Councillor Jason Frost (substituted by Councillor John Crowder)

Councillor Steven Kelly (substituted by Councillor Carol Smith)

Value Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

Councillor Philippa Crowder (substituted by Councillor Frederick Thompson)

Councillor Steven Kelly (substituted by Councillor Carol Smith)

Councillor Barbara Matthews (substituted by Councillor Stephanie Nunn)

4 **DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no disclosures of interest.

5 **THE COUNCIL'S FINANCIAL STRATEGY**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Roger Ramsey explained that large cuts in Council expenditure were required by Central Government and grant levels, of which Havering already received one of the lowest amounts per head in London, would therefore be cut further. The Council had not taken lightly any proposed cuts to services but it was nonetheless necessary to balance the budget.

Comments made at the meeting would be considered by Cabinet on 24 September. A period of statutory consultation would commence for approximately three months from shortly after the 24 September Cabinet meeting. Some staff consultation would not commence until after proposals had been finalised.

Confirmation of the final settlement figure from Government for 2015/16 was expected in December 2014. The final budget and level of Council Tax would therefore be set by full Council at its meeting in February 2015.

Having scrutinised the budget proposals, the Overview and Scrutiny Committees noted:

1. The financial position of the Council.
2. That the report was formally consulting them on the proposed Corporate budget adjustments and that this was the opportunity to scrutinise the budget proposals.

Answers to questions raised by Members on specific items of the budget are shown in the appendix to the minutes.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX: JOINT MEETING OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES, 8 SEPTEMBER 2014, ANSWERS TO MEMBER QUESTIONS ON THE COUNCIL'S FINANCIAL STRATEGY

Questions were asked by Members on the areas shown below and answers were given by officers or Cabinet Members as follows:

1. Consultation on 2% Council Tax increase – It was not feasible to consult on this as the final decision on the level of Council Tax would not be taken until February 2015. A referendum would be required if a higher increase was wanted and there would not be the time to organise this which would also be a costly exercise. A question relating to the Council Tax increase may be able to be included in the consultation.
2. Transformation Costs – These costs were built in for the first two years only and there were no budgeted transformation costs by the end of year 4.
3. Pensions – It was not the case that an additional £40m had been paid into the Council pension scheme although there had been a large increase. This had been stipulated by the Council's actuary in order to balance the pension fund, given that both assets and liabilities had increased substantially. A one-off contribution of £10m had been made last year in order to reduce annual extra contributions and to allow the pension fund to invest in local infrastructure. The Council had to keep to its legal requirements on this issue.
4. Funding for maintained schools – It was the case that academies currently received slightly more funding than maintained schools but this gap had now almost closed. Schools were generally funded equally per pupil although there were different weightings given for each borough. Further information on the variation in schools funding between boroughs could be provided by officers.
5. Impact of change in national Government policy – The proposed cuts were for a period of two years and it was possible that the position may change after this. The Shadow Minister for Local Government had however recently indicated in a letter to the Leader that there would not be any increase in funding for Local Authorities and that money may also be transferred to more 'needy' Councils.
6. Use of reserves – Reserves had been used to for example fund the £10m contribution to the pension fund and would also be used to meet redundancy costs. Strategic reserves were earmarked for specific purposes and verified

by an auditor. The in-year contingency had been lowered from £2m to £1m and Members regularly took advice on how to best use the reserves. The current General Fund balance of £11m was not earmarked but it was felt that at least £10m of this would be needed to fund changes required under the Care Act. The Group Director was happy to discuss the use of reserves with Members further.

7. Proposed Development Company – The Council was currently working with Capita to assess the viability of this proposal. The final cost would be known in approximately two months. The cash amounts held by the Council could be used for this sort of scheme. Risks would be factored in and a report on the Development Company would be brought to Cabinet.
8. Other savings from Economic Development – The Council was supporting businesses to come into Romford. The proposed saving was a stretch target based on economic conditions and the amount of vacant office space. Members could be briefed separately on this.
9. Interest shortfall – There was not an interest shortfall of £5m as this was mixing up General Fund borrowing with Housing borrowing. Housing borrowing had increased to £200m two years ago when the Government changed the housing finance system. The Housing Revenue Account was ringfenced and maintained separately from the General Fund Account.
10. Streetcare – Non-contractable items related to recharges for support services. A full survey of lamp columns was needed to check they were suitable for LED lighting. A further risk was a change in energy prices although this could be mitigated. The current energy budget was £650k.
11. Communications – The annual cost of producing Living Magazine is approximately £60k although not all of this could be delivered as a saving as the staff involved also work on other, separately funded publications which offset the budget. A likely general fund saving from not producing Living would be around £30k. A list of events run by the Council and their cost could be provided. There is no set twinning budget as twinning activity is not consistent and costs are sometimes covered by the twinning partner. There has been no twinning expenditure for some time. Reputation management referred to dealing with the press, social media and managing emerging issues related to the Council. It was planned to reduce the budget for the Havering Show by £17k through attracting more sponsorship.
12. Customer Transformation and Channel Shift – While more people were using on-line Council services, it was still proposed to retain a face to face channel.

13. Culture and Leisure – The proposed Music School saving was considered robust given the successful new model operating in the Music School. MyPlace savings could be found via increasing income and efficiencies from integrating management between MyPlace and the neighbouring sports centre. The Stubbers Centre had been leased to a charity for a peppercorn rent. Both the lease and rent level expired in two years and this would need to be renegotiated and hence produce more income.
14. CCTV – The two CCTV systems would be moved onto one site at Waterloo Gardens. There was however no reduction proposed in the CCTV hours of service. Officers would provide details of the numbers of prosecutions brought about the use of CCTV. Number plate recognition software was being introduced with the Police although the Police would not be making any financial contribution to this, they would be using personnel to work jointly with the CCTV to detect crimes associated with cars.
15. Supporting People Review – A number of options were being considered, and staff proposed to consult with tenants before deciding on the way forward. One option was proposed that support and housing management tasks could be combined in one role and that a dedicated scheme manager be provided for every two schemes. Some Members felt this was a high risk strategy. It would not be possible to run a pilot scheme as the saving needed to be made next year.
16. Private Sector Leasing – There were around 1,000 properties managed in this sector. Complaints received were responded to in the same way as for a council tenant. The proposed £500k saving over four years was based on increasing the number of units let although the market was changing. The rent paid by landlords was based on levels at the lower end of the market as seen in areas such as Harold Hill and Rainham. Several Members felt that many landlords in Harold Hill were sub-dividing properties excessively. Officers accepted this but it was noted that, for some people, a single room in a shared house was their only affordable option. A vetting system for landlords was in place for larger HMOs. Some Members felt there was a danger of ghettoisation in Harold Hill with too many people being put in the area. Officers responded that they had to procure properties where they could afford to do so, and unfortunately they did not control the market.
17. Meals on Wheels – The current provision of Meals on Wheels would be reviewed. A new staffing model would be considered in order to generate savings.
18. Care Act and Better Care Fund – More successful reablement was now seen in people's homes than at Royal Jubilee Court although Royal Jubilee Court

continued to very effective as a step-down facility following hospital care. Community Treatment Teams had demonstrated an impact and this had led to the use of pooled funding opportunities from the Better Care Fund. The performance element of the Better Care Fund would be decided later that week at the Health and Wellbeing Board. This was a new and complex area and work was progressing with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) on e.g. undertaking joint assessments at Queen's Hospital. Commissioning work such as this would be taken through the Health and Wellbeing Board and Individuals Overview and Scrutiny Committee for monitoring. The proposed cap would apply to existing clients.

19. Social Care Agency Staff – Officers were looking to retrain permanent staff to take on new roles and make processes more effective. Eight new children's social workers had started work that week. The allocation of admin work would be looked at as part of the review but it was also important that social workers took ownership of their assessments. Modelling of the impact of the Care Act was continuing but this had been factored into the proposals as far as possible. It was important to get the balance right in the use of agency staff.
20. Social Care Staffing – It was not possible to guarantee that serious incidents seen in areas such as Rotherham would not occur. The implications of the Rotherham inquiry for Havering would be looked at shortly by the Crime & Disorder Committee. Services were however scrutinised by Members. Social worker pay was benchmarked and a recruitment & retention strategy was in place. Havering social workers were more interested in support, career progression and a manageable caseload than they were in money.
21. Younger Adults – While current users would be affected, the assessment criteria for younger adults was not going to be altered. It was aimed to deliver services in the most appropriate way and appeal procedures would be in place.
22. OneSource – It was planned to change the Council's job evaluation scheme and avoid any negative impact on lower paid staff. A new pay line for lower paid staff would be introduced if necessary. A new job evaluation scheme for the highest paid staff was also likely to be introduced. There were approximately 2,500 staff that may be affected but the proposed saving was only £500k from a £95, total wage bill. It was hoped to introduce a consistent set of practices and to agree these with the unions.
23. Council Tax Support – The GLA precept made up 20% of Council Tax bills and it was also necessary to consult with the GLA on changes to the Havering scheme. The second person rebate normally applied to households that were

not eligible for other Council Tax support and the Council's preferred option proposed therefore to abolish this. It was emphasised that the proposal only applied to working age applicants, not retired people.

24. Parking – The proposals had been amended but it was wished to allow a period of free parking for everybody. A breakdown of expenditure on parking could be supplied to Members. It was not possible to be certain of the impact of the proposed new tariffs. The additional schemes referred to related to the introduction of a broader parking strategy. Officers would look at the impact of a 40p rather than £1 charge after the free first 30 minutes in order to assess whether this would reduce parking in side streets. It was proposed to introduce charges for car parking in parks but a free period for the first 30 minutes was under consideration. The 10 minute grace period applied to any duration of parking ticket. It was noted that revenue gathering was not the purpose of parking enforcement. It was planned to introduce parking at football pitches and some Members felt this could result in people parking in nearby streets. Officers agreed to consider this.
25. Moving Traffic Offences Powers – These had now been adopted by all but six London Boroughs. Once adopted, decisions would be made on how these powers would be applied. Details could be provided to Members on the advantages of using these powers. A report on adopting the powers would also be brought to full Council. Some Members felt that taking on these powers could make the Council unpopular with local residents.
26. Trading Standards – Savings could be made via a restructure and no longer undertaking some of the non-statutory functions carried out by Trading Standards. While enforcement of underage alcohol sales would continue it was felt that e.g. the training of shop staff did not need to be carried out by Trading Standards officers. The banking protocol also no longer needed to be led by Trading Standards. Enforcement work would not be affected and there was not felt to be a risk to revenue generation from the proposals. Officers wished to move the service to a more intelligence-led way of working. Officers would supply details of the income recovered from proceeds of crime.
27. Voluntary Sector Review – The reduction of the grant to HAVCO was due to the closure of their Community Accountancy Service. Rate relief for charities would be unaffected by any of the proposals. It was clarified that Council grants were often given to not for profit organisations in order to employ people so it was not simply a matter of increasing volunteer numbers. Other Members felt that most volunteers in Council services did come from charities. It was also possible that some extra work could be commissioned from charities in connection with the requirements of the Care Act.

28. Libraries – All libraries, including the four most strategically important libraries, would have reduced opening hours compared to the current position. Officers could provide further details if necessary. There was no suggestion that any libraries would close. Officers had thought seriously about the viability of the proposals which were based on library service models that ran successfully elsewhere. The local studies library was a valuable service and efforts would be made to recruit more volunteers to help operate it. Officers would supply details of library footfall. The new Rainham and Harold Hill libraries would continue to operate. There were a total of 93 people currently employed in Council libraries although as many of these were part-time staff, this equated to 53.1 FTE posts.
29. Health and Wellbeing – This category related to leisure centres and ‘Policy, Marketing and Administration’ referred to expenditure on support services. Services provided by the Health and Wellbeing Team included the arts service and sports development, as well as the leisure services role.
30. Queen’s Theatre – Officers met on a quarterly basis with the Queen’s Theatre and had discussed the budget options. Full details of options would be shared with theatre management once the consultation had started. The grant figure of £400k was not correct and the total grant to the Queen’s Theatre for this year was £546k.
31. Youth Service – It was proposed to no longer provide discretionary services. All youth services provided by the Council would be mapped by officers. Work with vulnerable young people such as dealing with any gangs in Romford town centre would be protected. It would also be possible to signpost to other youth provision. Some Members felt that Overview and Scrutiny should look at this area. An initial proposition had been received from staff to form an employee led mutual to take on aspects of the service and this would need to be worked through. Some staff would transfer to the over 12 service which would be combined with Early Help & Troubled Families. The Youth Service had direct contact with more than 200 young people but did a lot of other work with young people in addition.
32. Troubled Families – Savings in this area, after the first year, would be challenging and officers accepted there was a lot of work to do.
33. Children’s Centres – There would be more reliance on volunteers to run Children’s Centres but there were no current plans to involve the private sector. It was hoped to retain five or six of the current Children’s Centres but this could not be guaranteed at this stage.

34. Equalities Impact Assessments – All compulsory assessments had been completed and the complete set would be appended to the next Cabinet report on the budget. These would remain in draft as final decisions would not be taken until February 2015.

This page is intentionally left blank

STREETCARE HIGHWAY SHRUB BED MAINTENANCE.

Streetcare are responsible for maintaining 80,000 square metres of shrub bed throughout the borough roads.

These consist of a varied mix of shrub species, roses and trees.

All beds throughout the borough are part of an annual maintenance schedule which is undertaken by two teams – there are two cutting regimes in place

High Priority Areas - where shrubs are likely to grow and cause overhang to footpaths, driveways, and carriageways, or where they obstruct sightlines and road junctions or from driveways, are pruned on three occasions per annum – every 8 weeks

Shrubs are pruned to not less than 0.75 metre or more than 1.0 metre in height



Potential Sightline Issue
Before Works



After Completion of Works

General Pruning - The remaining beds around the borough are pruned twice per annum – every 26 weeks.

Shrubs are pruned to not less than 0.75 metre and not more than 1.5 metre. If the general area or street condition of the shrub beds is significantly different from these measurements due to specific and agreed criteria, the shrub beds will continue to be maintained to their existing height.

If however there are problems in maintaining areas to a specified height and changes need to be made, a public consultation is arranged to ensure the wishes of the residents are fully considered in any decision making.



General Prune
Before Works



General Prune
Completion of Works

The schedule ensures the service maintains a consistent approach throughout the borough and can provide Cllrs, members of the public and residents with the current status of the programme within a given area.

The beds provide amenity value on the highway, with residents in some areas actively involved;

A number of beds have been redeveloped; new plant varieties have been introduced to ensure the borough is seen to be modern and “moving with the times”.

Species have been chosen to encourage and support native species and continue to increase and maintain the borough’s “green credentials”, as well as providing visual impact on the highway.

All staff involved in the shrub maintenance operation are qualified in Bollarding and Signage on the highway, PA1 and PA6 pesticide application and operation of all the vehicle and plant involved in the operation, to ensure all aspects of Health & safety are adhered to and the reputation of the authority is maintained.

Hedges on the rural roads are maintained on our behalf by the in-house Grounds Maintenance Unit.

Cutting is completed twice per annum, with limitations to cutting due to nesting birds during the period March to September as defined by DEFRA.

Cutting can be undertaken during this period if there proves to be Health & Safety and/or public safety issues identified in a specific area.

StreetCare **Maintenance of Grass Verges**

StreetCare are responsible for the maintenance of 900,54 square metres of grass verge (including Rural Roads) throughout the borough.

The grass is maintained on our behalf by the In-House Grounds Maintenance Unit.

Grass verges are cut on 9 occasions throughout the growing season, which starts during March.

All verges are cut with rotary action machines, no clippings are “boxed off” on the highway



“TORO OUTFRONT” Mower
Used to maintain highway grass verges

Where the cutting machine has limited access (bollards, trees, obstacles etc) the route is supported by a “Hand Cutting team, who access these areas with smaller hand mowers and trimmers to ensure a consistent cut is completed.

The hand cutting team are in operation to support the cutting regime throughout the season.



Hand Cutting Team

Briefing Paper to Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee on November 5 2014

Local Implementation Plan Annual Spending Submission

1. Why this report has been prepared

The report is in response to a Member requesting clarification on the Council's Local Implementation Plan Funding Submission for 2015/16 particularly in regard to the key areas within the London Plan and the Mayor's Transport Strategy which the Submission must address and how additional funding set out under paragraph 6 page 44 of the Cabinet report dated 30th July 2014 will be allocated.

2. Executive Summary

Each year the Council bids to Transport for London (TfL) for funding for its transport projects and programmes. In recent years, the allocation from TfL has been in the region of £3m per year. It represents the bulk of the money that the Council can put towards a wide range of transport activities and responsibilities.

The Council has to spend this money in line with criteria set out by TfL and against a background set out in the Mayor's strategies (mainly his planning and transport documents).

How the Council spends the money is also determined by Havering's own transport policy documents which are approved by TfL.

The Council has some scope to adjust how it uses its funding but this has to be agreed with TfL.

These circumstances mean that in practice the content of the Council's submission is 'shaped' before it is agreed by Members. There is relatively little scope for new items to be introduced or for changes to be made outside of the constraints set by TfL (although officers have effective links to their counterparts at TfL so that best outcomes for Havering can be secured wherever possible).

The Council always looks for further funding throughout the year from other sources to increase its spending power.

Last year it received additional money from the Government and TfL for road repairs because of the bad weather through winter.

3. Background

The Council makes an annual Local Implementation Plan (LIP) Spending Submission to Transport for London (TfL) for funding transportation initiatives.

This is the major source of funding for transport projects and programmes for the Council.

Every opportunity for further funding from other sources is, of course, pursued as necessary and appropriate.

In early spring of each year the Council receives an indicative funding allocation from Transport for London. This forms the basis of the subsequent Submission to TfL.

Havering's funding from TfL has three elements :

- **“Corridors, Neighbourhoods and Supporting Measures”** programme. These are comprehensive ('holistic') schemes and local area improvements. They include schemes to tackle congestion by smoothing traffic flows, measures to assist freight, contribute to regeneration, deliver environmental improvements, improve safety as well as projects involving spaces used by several users, Controlled Parking Zones, 20 mph zones, cycling, walking, bus priority and bus stop accessibility. It also covers 'Smarter Travel' schemes such as school and workplace travel plans, travel awareness initiatives, road safety education, training and publicity schemes.
- **“Principal Road Maintenance”**. This focuses on highway surface improvements to Havering's Principal Road Network (PRN). This is based on condition surveys to determine how much of the Principal Road Network across London requires structural maintenance. Havering's 2015/16 allocation for Principal Road Maintenance reflects the good condition of Havering's PRN following regular maintenance.
- **“Local Transport Funding”** (£100K for spending on projects of the Council's choice that support the delivery of the Mayor's Transport Strategy).

It is welcomed that boroughs have some limited flexibility with how the funding within these broad categories can be spent (subject to approval from TfL).

4. What Havering's formal Submission has to take account of

Havering's LIP submission must comply with :

- the Mayor of London's London Plan and his Transport Strategy
- the Council's approved Local Implementation Plan (LIP) strategy document
- the Council's approved 2014/15 to 2016/17 Three Year Delivery Plan
- the latest TfL Guidance on preparing Local Implementation Plans

This note sets out each of these areas in further detail.

a) London Mayor's London Plan and Transport Strategy

The London Plan (2011) sets out the Mayor's overarching strategic land use planning priorities and policies for London. It sets the overall context for most, if not all, of the Council's own strategies.

The Mayor's vision as set out within the London Plan is that :

"London should excel among world cities – expanding opportunities for all its peoples and enterprises, achieving the highest environmental standards and quality of life and leading the world in its approach to tackling, the urban challenges of the 21st century"

The London Plan has six overarching objectives including one with a transport focus to deliver this vision :

'A city where it is easy, safe and convenient for everyone to access jobs, opportunities and facilities, with an efficient and effective transport system which places more emphasis on walking and cycling and making better use of the Thames, and supports delivery of all the objectives of this plan'

The Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) interprets the Mayor's London Plan transport vision and details how he and his partners will deliver the plan over the next 20 years.

The MTS is a key part of the Mayor's strategic policy framework to support and shape London's social and economic development. It sits alongside his other key documents such as his economic development strategy and his housing strategy.

The Mayor is seeking to achieve his vision by achieving the following overarching goals:

- Supporting economic development and population growth
- Enhancing the quality of life for all Londoners
- Improving the safety and security of all Londoners
- Improving transport opportunities for all Londoners
- Reducing transport's contribution to climate change and improving its resilience
- Supporting delivery of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games and its legacy

The rationale and details of each of these is set out within the MTS. Table 2.1 of the MTS identifies the challenges which each goal is seeking to address along with the outcomes which the Mayor has identified. Table 2.1 can be found Appendix 1 of this report.

Havering has to show within its LIP Annual Spending Submission how it will work towards achieving the MTS goals, challenges and outcomes.

The Submission must also be consistent with the Mayor's 'High Profile Outputs' which include implementation of street trees, cycle parking, better streets, , cleaner local authority fleets and electric vehicle charging points. Every year boroughs have to report back to TfL on progress made on delivering these outputs within their LIP Programmes.

b) Approved Local Implementation Plan and Three Year Delivery Plan

As part of the legislative requirements set out under section 145 of the GLA Act 1999, Havering and every other borough has to prepare a Local Implementation Plan (LIP).

Havering's LIP is effectively our transport strategy and it sets out how the Council intends to implement the Mayors Transport Strategy (MTS) within its local area.

Havering's approved Local Implementation Plan was approved by the Mayor in 2012.

The Mayor and TfL say that '*A boroughs LIP is a vital tool in supporting jobs and growth and delivering a better quality of life for those who live and work in the Capital.*

Havering's LIP has several 'Borough Transport Objectives' that the borough is committed to working towards throughout the lifetime of the LIP.

Havering's LIP is supported by its 2014/15 – 2016/17 Three Year Delivery Plan which was prepared last year. It sets out the programme content of Havering's Annual Spending Submissions (ASS) for this period and was approved by TfL.

The Delivery Plan shows how Havering's Annual Submission(s) for each financial year will support the MTS Goals. It also addressed Mayoral targets for mandatory indicators including modal share, bus service reliability, asset condition, road traffic casualties and CO2 emissions and new Interim targets were set for these.

The Three Year Delivery Plan sets out in detail the schemes that the Council has committed to progress in each of the three years of the Plan. **The Three Year Delivery Plan should form the basis for each Annual Spending Submission.**

The most recent 2015/16 Annual Spending Submission was year 2 of the Three Year Delivery Plan.

The approach that the Council now has to follow for its LIP Submission is rather different to what happened a few years ago.

In previous years, Havering had to develop its annual spending submissions against TfL / Mayoral requirements and against indicative funding allocations advised by TfL.

Under the current arrangements, TfL now expects borough submissions to more closely align with the detail set out in their individual approved delivery plans (although TfL officers have informally indicated that boroughs can introduce some new schemes if they wish to subject to TfL's guidance being adhered to).

The current approach means that there can be much more certainty for boroughs over the expected content of their forthcoming annual spending submissions than in previous years.

On balance, officers consider that this approach is helpful and should be supported as it enables a more strategic, long-term and comprehensive approach to be taken to the delivery of LIP themed work.

c) LIP Guidance Notes

Every year Transport for London (TfL) publish guidance notes that Havering has to follow when preparing its LIP Submission.

The guidance notes often include any new Mayoral priorities that may have arisen since the last LIP Submission that boroughs will need to give consideration to when preparing their LIP Programme. For example within the 2015/16 LIP Guidance it draws attention to the Mayor's commitments relating to making it easier for people to Walk and Cycle, Road Safety, Air Quality, Freight, Bus Access and the Mayor's Roads Task Force.

Havering has to allocate funding to schemes that are already being progressed over more than one Financial Year. There are several examples over recent years where the Council has taken this approach including the Ingrebourne Valley Sustrans Connect 2 scheme, the Romford Public Realm Improvement schemes, and several casualty reduction schemes. Within the 2015/16 submission, the A1306/Sandy Lane Junction casualty reduction scheme is an example of this where the scheme is beginning in Quarter 4 of the 2014/15 Financial Year and will be completed in Quarter 1 of 2015/16 so has been included as part of the 2015/16 Annual Spending Submission.

Progressing schemes over more than one financial year and thus spreading the cost over two years will allow more schemes to be progressed within each LIP Programme.

It is important to note that LIP Financial Assistance is provided by TfL under section 159 of the GLA Act 1999. The funding is provided to support local transport improvements that accord to the Mayors Transport Strategy Goals Challenges and Outcomes. **Use of the funding for purposes other than those for which it is provided may result in TfL requiring repayment of any funding already provided and/or withholding provision of further funding.**

5. Additional “In Year” funding

The July Cabinet Report setting out the 2015/16 LIP ASS requirements referred to the opportunity that the Council has for obtaining additional “in year” funding.

Paragraph 6 of the report specifically referred to the additional funding that the Council has received for road surfacing improvements.

This is additional funding allocated from TfL and the Department for Transport (DfT). It has been received because of cold winters which have caused an increasing number of pot holes and damaged road surfaces.

The additional funding that was allocated by TfL was allocated to boroughs to spend on their Principal Road Network (PRN). These roads are effectively the “A” roads within the borough which are not part of the Transport for London Road Network (so excluding A12, A13, A127).

Since Havering has a “rolling” Principal Road programme in place, this has resulted in Officers being able to bring forward schemes that may not have been able to be implemented until 2015/16. On this particular occasion, officers were also allowed to allocate some of this funding to a section of Victoria Road which was in a particular poor state. TfL only allowed this to happen because this particular road is on a busy bus route.

The funding that was allocated to Havering directly from the DfT does not have the same restrictions attached to it and officers have been able to allocate this funding to other borough roads in need of repair.

In addition to the sums mentioned above, Havering regularly receives other in year funding from TfL including through the Borough Cycling Programme (BCP), Bus Stop Accessibility (BSA) Programme, TfL Training budget, Bus Enabling Works programme, Crossrail Complimentary Measures, Mayors Air Quality Fund and the Schools Programme.

These funding streams are designed to support key Mayoral priorities such as cycling, bus stop accessibility and Air Quality in addition to the financial assistance provided to boroughs through the LIP process. TfL emphasise that boroughs should not see these as alternative funding mechanisms and boroughs are expected to submit schemes that compliment these “Pots” of funding within their own Annual Spending Submissions.

Appendix One

High Level Mayoral Outcomes

Goals	Challenges	Outcomes
Support Economic development and population growth	Supporting population and employment growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balancing capacity and demand for travel through increasing public transport capacity and/or reducing the need to travel
	Improving transport connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving employers' access to labour markets Improving access to commercial markets for freight movements and business travel
	Delivering an efficient and effective transport system for goods and people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smoothing traffic flow (managing road congestion and reducing traffic journey time variability) Improving public transport reliability Reducing operating costs Bringing and maintaining all assets to a state of good repair
Enhance the quality of life for all Londoners quality of life	Improving journey experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving public transport customer satisfaction Improving road user satisfaction Reducing public transport crowding
	Enhancing the built and natural environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancing streetscapes, improving the perception of urban realm and developing shared space initiatives
	Improving air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing air pollutant emissions from ground-based transport, contributing to EU air quality targets
	Improving noise impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving perceptions and reducing impacts of noise
	Improving health impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitating an increase in active travel
Improve the safety and security of all Londoners	Reducing crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing crime rates (and improved perceptions of personal safety and security)
	Improving road safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing the numbers of road traffic casualties
	Improving public transport safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing casualties on public transport networks
Improve transport opportunities for all Londoners Transport opportunities	Improving accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving the physical accessibility of the transport system Improving access to jobs and services Ensuring the affordability of public transport fares
	Supporting regeneration and tackling deprivation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting wider regeneration outcomes
Reduce transport's contribution to climate change, and improve its resilience	Reducing CO2 emissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing CO₂ emissions from ground based transport, contributing to a London-wide 60% reduction by 2025
	Adapting for climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining the reliability of transport networks
Support delivery of the London 2012	Developing and implementing a viable and sustainable legacy for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting regeneration and convergence of social and economic outcomes between the five Olympic boroughs and the rest of London

Olympic and Paralympic Games and its legacy	the 2012 Games	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Physical transport legacy• Behavioural transport legacy
---	----------------	--

Source : Table 2.1 Mayor's Transport Strategy (May 2010)



ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

TIMETABLE FOR MAINTENANCE OF ROADS AND PAVEMENTS TOPIC GROUP

MEMBERS OF THE TOPIC GROUP:

Councillor Ray Morgan
Councillor Patricia Rumble
Councillor Alex Donald

• Objectives and Parameters

To understand the step by step process for dealing with service requests for a road or pavement defect from first report to completion.

To understand how planned work is completed and how proactive work is carried out.

To look at the technology used and how to improve the service in this area

• Target date for completion

It is anticipated that this scrutiny review will be completed by March 2015

• What witnesses (if any) will be called?

• Are visits to be undertaken

Central Depot

This page is intentionally left blank