

Transport for London

Minutes of the Meeting

**Committee Rooms 4 and 5, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London
10.00am, Wednesday 4 February 2015**

Members

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Boris Johnson | Chairman |
| Isabel Dedring | Deputy Chairman |
| Peter Anderson | Member |
| Sir John Armitt CBE | Member (from item 05/01/15) |
| Sir Brendan Barber | Member |
| Richard Barnes | Member |
| Charles Belcher | Member |
| Roger Burnley | Member |
| Brian Cooke | Member |
| Angela Knight | Member |
| Michael Liebreich | Member |
| Eva Lindholm | Member |
| Daniel Moylan | Member |
| Bob Oddy | Member |
| Steve Wright | Member |

Staff

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Steve Allen | Managing Director, Finance |
| Mike Brown | Managing Director, Rail and Underground |
| Howard Carter | General Counsel |
| Jill Collis | Director of Health, Safety and Environment (for 06/01/15) |
| Leon Daniels | Managing Director, Surface Transport |
| Richard de Cani | Director of Transport Strategy and Policy |
| Vernon Everitt | Managing Director, Customer Experience, Marketing and Communications |
| Sir Peter Hendy CBE | Commissioner |
| Terry Morgan | Chairman, Crossrail Limited |
| Andrew Pollins | Interim Chief Finance Officer |
| Clive Walker | Director of Internal Audit |
| David Burgh | Secretariat Officer |

01/01/15 Apologies for Absence and Chairman's Announcements

Apologies for absence had been received from Baroness Grey-Thompson DBE and Keith Williams. Apologies for lateness had been received from Sir John Armitt CBE.

02/01/15 Declarations of Interest

The following interests were declared: Peter Anderson as a director of the Canary Wharf Group plc in relation to the Cycle Superhighways proposals; Sir John Armitt as Chairman of the National Express Group plc, Deputy Chairman of the Berkeley Group plc and a Member of the Airports Commission; Sir Brendan Barber as Chairman of ACAS; Charles Belcher as a member of Atos Origin Advisory Council on Transport;

Michael Liebreich as Chairman of the Advisory Board of Bloomberg New Energy Finance; Daniel Moylan as a Councillor for the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Chairman of Urban Design London and a non-executive director of Crossrail Limited (appointed by TfL); Bob Oddy on taxi related issues and in relation to the Cycle Superhighways proposals; and Steve Wright on matters relating to private hire vehicles.

03/01/15 Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 December 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2014 were approved as a correct record and the Chairman was authorised to sign them.

04/01/15 Matters Arising, Actions List and Use of Delegated Authority

Howard Carter introduced the item.

There had been no exercise of authority delegated by the Board since the last meeting.

The Board noted the actions list.

05/01/15 Commissioner's Report

Sir Peter Hendy introduced his report, which provided an overview of major issues and developments since the report to the meeting on 10 December 2014, and updated Members on significant projects and initiatives.

TfL had made substantial efforts to mitigate the impact of the major modernisation works to London Bridge station, with the delays to National Rail trains adversely affecting Overground service performance. There had been increasing demand for the Jubilee line. Additional staff had been deployed to provide assistance and information to customers, and extra buses had been laid on to meet demand. The Mayor took the view that a great deal of the difficulties arising from these works might have been avoided if, through devolution of railway responsibilities, TfL had been responsible for these rail services.

The huge programme of improvements and maintenance work on London's roads over Christmas and New Year had been completed on time. In addition, a substantial programme of work on service reliability on London Underground had also been successfully undertaken in the holiday period, when there had been less demand on the Tube and London Overground, and traffic levels had been 25 per cent lower than usual.

Leon Daniels reported on the proposed bus strike, which was due to take place on 5 February 2015. This was not a TfL issue, but had arisen from a disagreement between Unite and the various bus companies. The basis of the dispute was the differences between bus driver rates of pay, which were negotiated and agreed between Unite and the bus companies individually, under a long-standing and jointly agreed process. Only 16 per cent of bus drivers had voted for strike action.

In December 2014 the Commissioner, with the Mayor, had announced £148m of Local Improvement Plan funding to London Boroughs, to support transport and public realm improvements across the Capital.

Members welcomed the continuing initiatives on road safety issues, which had been marked by the first anniversary, on 22 January 2015, of the Industrial HGV Taskforce, a multi agency team dedicated to enforcing against the non-compliant and dangerous commercial vehicles on the roads. The completion of the Safer Lorry Scheme would see enforcement of a ban on lorries without sideguards, starting in September 2015.

TfL still strongly desired to seek a declaration from the High Court on whether the smartphone provided by Uber to its drivers was a taximeter, as defined in private hire legislation. The High Court would not consider the matter while there were criminal proceedings extant on the same legal issue. However, the Licensed Taxi Drivers Association (LTDA) had recently said it would withdraw its criminal summonses, and TfL had subsequently written to the LTDA on 3 February 2015 asking for clarification of its position, to permit progression to the High Court for a declaration on the matter.

Members noted that TfL had undertaken successful prosecution of National Grid Gas (NGG) in connection with two offences of unsafe execution of street works and for failing to cooperate with TfL in taking all reasonable steps to rectify the identified unsafe working practices, despite the risk to public safety and inconvenience to other road users. TfL had prosecuted NGG for similar offences in 2012 and it had since been issued with over 250 Fixed Penalty Notices for various other street works related offences committed across London. The Board noted that the maximum possible fine after a statutory discount for early plea was £3,000, and that this did not reflect the gravity of the health and safety concerns, nor the cost of the disruption that resulted. TfL would lobby to seek an increase to the maximum fine.

TfL had responded to the Department for Transport consultation on the deregulation of electrically assisted pedal cycles. The potential impact the removal of the weight and wheel limit would have on the safety of road users, eroding the limited powers that TfL and the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) had to regulate pedicabs, was a grave concern. However the MPS was continuing to take action against any such vehicles found to be contravening existing laws.

Members noted with pleasure the award of CBEs to Michèle Dix, Managing Director of Planning and Dr Alice Maynard, Chair of TfL's Independent Disability Advisory Group, in the New Year's Honours list. Michèle Dix would move to her new role as Managing Director, Crossrail 2 in early February 2015. In addition, London Underground had been named the European Metro Operator of the Year at the European Rail Congress awards celebrating excellence and innovation in rail across Europe, for the second year running.

The Board noted the Commissioner's report.

06/01/15 Health, Safety and Environment Report 2013/14

Sir Peter Hendy introduced the paper, which had been considered by the Safety, Accessibility and Sustainability Panel, at its meeting on 18 December 2014. The highlights from the report included:

- (a) details of TfL's continuing work to improve cycling safety;
- (b) a considerable reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured on the Transport for London Road Network of 31 per cent compared with last year;

- (c) continuing improvements across TfL's networks in terms of accessibility;
- (d) achievement in the introduction of Euro V, VI and hybrid buses, to meet the challenging targets that TfL had set for improving air quality and cutting CO₂ emissions;
- (e) the collection and recycling of more waste from the transport system than ever before;
- (f) the award of the London Healthy Workplace Charter, at the excellence level, for TfL's work to enhance occupational health for its staff; and
- (g) the progress of TfL's campaigns on reducing customer injuries across the TfL network, with serious accidents to customers having fallen on London Underground to the lowest for 10 years.

In response to a Member's question, it was agreed that the data for road safety casualties in the report would be stated as a rate per thousand/million as well as in numbers.
[Action: Jill Collis]

The Board noted the TfL Health, Safety and Environment Report 2013/14.

07/01/15 Proposed Cycle Superhighway Schemes

The Mayor opened the item.

Howard Carter, General Counsel, reminded Members that, in advance of the meeting, he had emailed them with general advice concerning declarations of interests. He reiterated his advice and that it was a personal decision for Members to decide whether they had an interest in respect of this item.

Howard Carter also advised that where any Members did declare an interest, the Board could decide to close the meeting at an appropriate moment to enable those Members to make personal statements. The meeting would then be formally reopened and those Members that had declared interests would not be able to participate in any deliberation or decision of the Board.

Daniel Moylan, as a Councillor for the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, took the view that there was no conflict with this role and he was free to participate. Sir John Armitt CBE, as Chairman of National Express Coaches, indicated that the company had not taken a stance on this matter and there was no reason why he should not participate.

Having considered Howard Carter's advice, Bob Oddy and Peter Anderson declared interests in this item and would take no part in the meeting, or the Board's deliberations or decision. Michael Liebreich confirmed that he had no interest to declare in relation this matter.

Howard Carter said that, prior to the meeting, a number of organisations had submitted letters to TfL containing representations about the Cycle Superhighway proposals and had asked that these be provided to all Members. These letters had been provided to all Members in advance, copies were available at the meeting and the letters would be made publicly available following the meeting.

Leon Daniels then introduced the paper, which sought approval for plans for the construction of four new Cycle Superhighways (CS), and upgrades to the four existing CS routes. The approvals sought included project and procurement authority and delegated authority to TfL Officers for certain matters.

The paper was introduced with the aid of a video presentation. The presentation commenced with a video of what roads are currently like for cyclists along part of the proposed East West Cycle Superhighway route. Leon Daniels explained that the video demonstrated some reasons why there are so many cyclists killed and seriously injured on London's roads: 14 cyclists were killed and 475 seriously injured in 2013, with 70 per cent of these collisions taking place in inner London. He explained that the Cycle Superhighway programme aimed to make huge improvements for cyclists, huge improvements in road safety for all road users; and was designed to encourage cycling, save lives and make the whole environment better for everyone. The routes covered in the Board paper were designed to attract nearly 4,000 additional cyclists every day in the morning busy peak, and would make a huge difference to how people could travel to work.

The video presentation included maps and details of the design proposals for CS 1, CS 2 Upgrade, CS 5 Inner, the North South CS, and the East West CS. Leon Daniels explained these, and the benefits and improvements they would bring – including to the urban realm, for pedestrians and cyclists, and to road junctions. With the exception of CS 1 (which had yet to go out to public consultation), he also explained in detail how the final proposals had changed in response to comments received during the consultations on each of the Cycle Superhighways. In relation to the proposed East West CS in particular, there had been a number of changes resulting from consultation, including the retention of two-traffic lanes westbound from Tower Hill to Northumberland Avenue. These changes meant that – as demonstrated by the traffic modelling figures – the delays predicted under the previous proposals were significantly reduced, and traffic flow greatly improved. For example, the delays from Limehouse link to Hyde Park Corner under the original proposals were modelled as approximately 16 minutes; under the new proposals this was modelled at just over six minutes.

Leon Daniels proceeded to explain how the highway network with Cycle Superhighways would work in practice. He explained that using its traffic signalling strategy, TfL would monitor and control the traffic signals across London to control the flow of traffic approaching the centre of London so that it arrived in the centre at a rate that the resultant network could cope with. This was what was done very successfully in the London 2012 Games. TfL was actually expecting the flow of traffic in central London to improve; although there may be some additional delays outside central London.

Leon Daniels explained that many of the delays currently experienced on the road network were caused by illegal parking and unloading, as well as breakdowns and other related issues. He explained that TfL would be doing a huge amount on enforcement to make sure any disruptions on the network, and any illegal parking or unloading, were dealt with extremely quickly.

He explained that TfL would be working very closely with the businesses and the freight and logistics industries to move deliveries and loading outside of peak times. TfL's freight strategy was designed to free up capacity on the network by using Travel Demand Management to mitigate the impacts of the proposals. Travel Demand Management was used successfully during the London 2012 Games and had been used ever since. It encouraged all road users to think about the journeys they were about to make: by which modes of transport, at what time, and via what route. This

meant that concerns about segregation taking up road space would be alleviated by the fact that some of the traffic that would have used that space would not be on relevant parts of the network.

He explained that there were some effects on the bus service but that, following the changes from consultation, these were quite small. TfL would be increasing the resources available to the bus service to mitigate those impacts, and where it could not mitigate directly in the area concerned, it would introduce compensatory measures elsewhere to ensure that any delays would be made up elsewhere.

Leon Daniels explained that in some correspondence submitted to the Board it had been suggested that the proposals for the East West Cycle Superhighway should be implemented on a trial basis to start with. He explained that it was not technically possible to do this, and that all the elements of that scheme were designed to fit together: traffic signal timings, the layout of junctions, carriageway width and priorities and banned turns – and it was not possible to change these temporarily to replicate conditions that would exist if the Cycle Superhighway was in place. He explained that, instead, TfL would very closely monitor and evaluate the impacts of the proposals as they were implemented, including the behaviour and volume of roads users, and, in the event of differences to those impacts that had been predicted, would immediately reconsider what would need to be done. He guaranteed continual assessment of the proposals.

Leon Daniels explained that, in general, the bias of traffic modelling tended to be slightly pessimistic and, if this was the case, the impacts of the proposals would be more positive than those presented to the Board. This had been true of the predictions from modelling undertaken for both the Congestion Charge and London 2012 Games schemes.

Leon Daniels concluded his presentation with a simulation of the proposed East West Cycle Superhighway, based on the actual traffic modelling used for the scheme. He believed it was the best scheme that could be delivered within the constraints that physically existed, and recommended the proposals to the Board.

Prior to commencing deliberation of the item, the Board agreed to suspend the meeting for a short period, to ask those members who had declared an interest in the item – Bob Oddy, in his capacity as Deputy General Secretary of the LTDA, and Peter Anderson, as a director of the Canary Wharf Group plc – to make any personal statements they should wish to make. Following this, the Mayor reopened the meeting to commence deliberation of the matter. Bob Oddy and Peter Anderson took no part in the reopened meeting.

The Mayor explained his position on the proposals. He said that as well as improving cycle safety, the proposals would help to bring environmental benefits, improvements in air quality and in the health of Londoners, and help to make London a more attractive city. He said he had seen correspondence from the Police that had been submitted to the Board in advance of the meeting, and did not detect any opposition from them. The Metropolitan Police actually supported the proposals because they would improve safety for cyclists particularly at many of the junctions along the route.

The Mayor explained how a great many of the objections raised by consultees – and in particular organisations representing commercial interests, including the Canary Wharf Group – had been listened to and met in the revised proposals. The result of this was that predicted traffic delays had been greatly reduced. He explained that the

consultation process for the Cycle Superhighways had not been rushed, as had been suggested by some; that the whole process had been going on for a considerable period of time, and that there had been some 20,000 responses to the consultation. He said that there was overwhelming public support for the proposals, and that, for the reasons given by Leon Daniels, the schemes could not be trialled first. It was now time to implement the schemes; noting that during implementation TfL would simultaneously and very closely monitor and evaluate the impacts of the proposals and take action as required.

Richard Barnes expressed support for the proposals. He asked questions on how disruption during the build process would be managed, how the Cycle Superhighways would operate in practice, and how it was proposed to deal with traffic enforcement and breakdowns.

In reply, Leon Daniels explained that the construction would form part of a sophisticated and integrated build programme that took account of all developments in London, which enabled TfL to manage disruption on the network. TfL would also very closely monitor the build programme, and was able to deal with situations as they arise. This was the same technique that was successfully used during the London 2012 Games. Leon Daniels reiterated that TfL would monitor construction and implementation of the schemes very closely, and would change what it was doing and its mitigation strategies as required. He explained that breakdowns were fortunately rare and most interruptions on the network were caused by illegal parking, loading and unloading, which were enforcement issues and would be dealt with by extra steps TfL would take in relation to enforcement. He explained that TfL would deal quickly with whatever arose on the network as it already did when, for example, buses broke down or when there were breakdowns in the Blackwall tunnel.

Charles Belcher expressed support for the proposals. He said that correspondence from the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) in response to consultation, and which had been circulated to Members before the meeting, demonstrated that overall the MPS supported the proposals. However, the MPS did raise a list of valid points and Charles Belcher wanted to know what progress had been made on these in the months since the MPS had responded to the consultation.

Sir Peter Hendy CBE, the Commissioner, responded to say that the schemes as amended largely addressed the points raised in consultation. The changes incorporated into the final proposals had significantly reduced traffic delays that were predicted to arise from the proposals consulted on, and so the concerns of the MPS had therefore been diminished. TfL would work with the MPS throughout implementation.

Sir John Armitt CBE said that he had some difficulty with the proposals. He said that while cyclists may be the largest number of vehicles travelling in rush hour, they were not the largest number of road users travelling during that time. The proposals were for the benefit of a minority of the city, and the business case for the proposals did not work. The proposals were also opposed by a range of professional organisations. He said that the level of support expressed for the proposals was meaningless as it was not known who had responded. Sir John Armitt CBE suggested that, in corporate governance terms, it was not possible to act properly because Members could not realistically be expected to have digested the volume of information contained in the papers.

The Mayor responded to say that the impact on buses would be very small, and that bus users would not be disadvantaged. Other road users would only experience a small

delay. The Mayor said that Londoners supported the proposals, which would create a cleaner, greener, London, with minimal disadvantages for all road users. They were in the interests of, and would benefit, the whole city.

Roger Burnley expressed support for the proposals, but raised a question for Leon Daniels in relation to loading and unloading because there was a safety aspect to this in terms of crossing a cycle lane.

Leon Daniels explained that TfL was working with the freight and logistics industry regarding delivery times. It was working and engaging with frontages and businesses in relevant areas to understand their loading and unloading needs, and to see what TfL could provide. TfL was moving away from a blanket loading and unloading policy, to a more flexible and needs driven one. There were some issues concerning wheelchair passengers alighting from taxis and coaches. TfL was working hard to ensure that it was possible to safely alight from a vehicle and cross a cycle lane. In some cases, this may mean building up the cycle lane so it was flat; in others it would mean alternative provision.

Sir Brendan Barber said he was attracted by the proposals, but thought that the Board was being pressed into making a decision and that the matter should have first been considered by the Finance and Policy Committee. He also considered that key aspects of the proposals could be trialled, and that an alternative way of dealing with the matter would be to delay the decision on the proposals to allow for more detailed consideration of the matter, including by Finance and Policy Committee prior to the Board.

Howard Carter advised there were no issues in terms of corporate governance. There was a lot of information contained in the papers, but this was necessary as the proposals were complex and it was in the public interest and in the interest of transparency that they contained this amount of information. The papers were sent to Members and published before the meeting in accordance with statutory requirements. Whilst the proposals would ordinarily have been considered by the Finance and Policy Committee before the Board, this would have resulted in a significant, additional six week, delay – when the Board would next meet. Leon Daniels later explained that such delay would have meant that the sophisticated, integrated, build programme would have to have been completely reprogrammed. A decision was therefore taken to proceed straight to the Board. This was permitted by TfL's Standing Orders.

Daniel Moylan wanted to be reassured that there would be no disbenefits to pedestrians.

Leon Daniels explained that the urban realm and pedestrian facilities would be greatly enhanced. The use of floating bus stops meant that bus passengers had to cross the cycle superhighway to reach the pavement. He explained that this was what already happens on the extension of Cycle Superhighway 2. TfL had been analysing video footage of this in operation and there had been no conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. What was proposed was far more sophisticated than existed in many other countries.

Leon Daniels said he genuinely believed the proposals would result in improved arrangements for pedestrians, including in terms of junctions and access. There would certainly be no worsening of provision, and pedestrians generally welcome the proposed improvements to the environment.

Michael Liebreich said he had visited TfL's traffic modelling team and had seen that modelling simulations were uncannily accurate. He considered that the proposals were too complex to trial. On the governance issues raised, he said he felt completely capable of digesting the papers and making a proper decision on this item.

On the Benefit to Cost Ratio of the proposals, Michael Liebreich said more emphasis should be placed on health and safety. A number of health organisations supported the proposals. He also explained that cities now very much compete on their urban realm, and the proposals would benefit London in this regard.

Michael Liebreich asked Leon Daniels whether, as the programme was rolled out, there would be provision – over and above what was normally in place – for concerns to be reported and taken on board on a rolling basis.

Leon Daniels confirmed that this would be the case and undertook that over and above everything that he had already explained would be done in terms of enforcement and mitigation, TfL would welcome and encourage feedback from anyone affected by construction and implementation to come forward. He undertook that where any points raised are found to be valid, TfL would do what it could to modify what it was doing as appropriate.

In conclusion, the Mayor took the view that the CS schemes would serve to improve the quality of life in London. There might be some minor inconveniences for motorists, but progressing these changes was overwhelmingly the right thing to do.

The Board:

- 1 noted the paper;**
- 2 noted and endorsed TfL's Consultation Responses (provided to Board Members separately) to the public consultations on each of:**
 - (a) the East-West Cycle Superhighway Phase 1 (Westbourne Terrace to Tower Gateway);**
 - (b) the North-South Cycle Superhighway (Elephant and Castle to King's Cross);**
 - (c) Cycle Superhighway 5 Inner (Oval to Pimlico); and**
 - (d) Cycle Superhighway 2 Upgrade (Bow to Aldgate);**
- 3 approved the final plans for each of:**
 - (a) the East-West Cycle Superhighway Phase 1 (Westbourne Terrace to Tower Gateway);**
 - (b) the North-South Cycle Superhighway (Elephant and Castle to King's Cross);**
 - (c) Cycle Superhighway 5 Inner (Oval to Pimlico); and**
 - (d) Cycle Superhighway 2 Upgrade (Bow to Aldgate);**

as set out in the paper and in the Consultation Responses referred to at paragraph 2 above but excluding the matters subject to further consultation as described in paragraph 5 below;

- 4 approved the proposals set out in the paper for:
 - (a) public consultation on the Cycle Superhighway 1 proposals; and
 - (b) completion of design work on the proposed upgrades to Cycle Superhighways 3, 7 and 8 and subsequent public consultation on the final proposals for the upgrades to those routes;
- 5 approved the proposals set out in the paper for public consultation:
 - (a) on detailed proposals for the section of the East-West Cycle Superhighway in Hyde Park and St James's Park;
 - (b) on proposals for the section of the North-South Cycle Superhighway from Farringdon station to King's Cross; and
 - (c) on significant design changes to aspects of the proposals for the East-West and North-South Cycle Superhighways previously submitted for public consultation, as described in the paper and in the Consultation Responses;
- 6 following the further public consultation referred to at paragraphs 4 and 5 above, authorised the TfL Officers (described at paragraph 13 below) to determine whether to approve and implement those proposals;
- 7 approved the implementation of each of the plans approved at paragraph 3 above (an Approved Plan) and:
 - (a) insofar as a Cycle Superhighway which corresponds to an Approved Plan is to be constructed and delivered on GLA roads or GLA side roads, the construction and delivery of that Cycle Superhighway on those roads in accordance with that Approved Plan, and
 - (b) insofar as a Cycle Superhighway which corresponds to an Approved Plan is to be constructed and delivered on borough highway, the construction and delivery of that Cycle Superhighway on that highway in accordance with that Approved Plan to the extent that the relevant London borough permits this;
- 8 noted that where in respect of paragraph 7(b) above, a London borough does not permit TfL to construct and deliver a Cycle Superhighway on its highway, the London borough will be responsible for deciding whether or not to approve the implementation of an Approved Plan, and for constructing and delivering the relevant parts of the relevant Cycle Superhighway on that highway;
- 9 authorised the TfL Officers to:
 - (a) do anything that is necessary or expedient for the purposes of implementing an Approved Plan or any proposal approved in accordance with paragraph 6 above, and constructing and delivering

the relevant Cycle Superhighway in accordance with the Approved Plans or any such proposals, and to do anything that is conducive or ancillary to those activities; and

- (b) make such changes as they consider appropriate to an Approved Plan, following Board approval, providing such changes do not materially alter the Approved Plan and do not alter the route alignment of the Cycle Superhighway contained within that plan;**
- 10 granted project authority in the sum of £95.1m (to increase existing project authority from £66.6m to make a total of £161.7m) for the purposes of implementing each and all of the Approved Plans (including as amended further to paragraph 9 above) and any proposals approved in accordance with paragraph 6 above, and the construction and delivery of the Cycle Superhighways in accordance with the Approved Plans and any such proposals;**
- 11 granted procurement authority in the sum of £77.5m for the purposes of procuring the implementation of each and all of the Approved Plans (including as amended further to paragraph 9 above) and any proposals approved in accordance with paragraph 6 above, and procuring the construction and delivery of the Cycle Superhighways in accordance with the Approved Plans and any such proposals; and**
- 12 authorised the TfL Officers to:**
- (a) finalise the terms of the contracts for the purposes of implementing each and all of the Approved Plans and any proposals approved in accordance with paragraph 6 above and constructing and delivering the Cycle Superhighways in accordance with the Approved Plans and any such proposals (“the Agreements”);**
 - (b) agree and execute (whether by deed or otherwise on behalf of TfL or any Subsidiary (as appropriate)) any documentation to be entered into in connection with the completion and implementation of the Agreements and any of the matters referred to in them (including, without limitation, all agreements, deeds, guarantees, indemnities, announcements, notices, contracts, certificates, letters or other documents); and**
 - (c) do all such other things as they consider necessary or desirable to facilitate the execution and implementation of the Agreements and the matters referred to in them.**
- 13 The following TfL Officers shall have delegated authority: the Commissioner, Managing Director Finance, Managing Director Surface Transport and General Counsel.**

08/01/15 Taxi and Private Hire Licence Fees

Leon Daniels introduced the paper, which sought approval for proposed changes to taxi driver and vehicle application and licence fees and set out proposed changes to the Knowledge of London appearance and examination fees, from 1 April 2015. The

meeting of the Finance and Policy Committee on 22 January 2015 had endorsed the recommendations in the paper.

The changes were in response to the increased cost of administering licences including the provision of a counter service from 2015 and additional resources in the compliance team. The changes featured a more accurate cost apportionment between the initial application and the ongoing renewal licence management process.

The Taxi Driver application fee increase took into account applicants need to spend several years studying the routes comprising the Knowledge of London, before applying to sit the written examination. Many applicants withdrew applications before reaching the formal stages of the Knowledge and the increase would align the fees more appropriately, to ensure existing taxi drivers were not funding those applicants who did not go on to become licensed taxi drivers.

The Board:

- 1 approved the proposed changes to taxi licence fees effective from 1 April 2015:**
 - (a) 60 per cent increase of £30 to the Taxi Driver application fee;**
 - (b) 3.5 per cent decrease of £7 to the Taxi Driver licence fee;**
 - (c) 1.5 per cent decrease of £1 to the Taxi Vehicle application fee;**
 - (d) 8.3 per cent decrease of £3 to the Taxi Vehicle licence fee;**
 - (e) 0.8 per cent decrease of £1 to the Digital Taxi Top advertising application fee; and**
 - (f) 8.3 per cent decrease of £3 to the Digital Taxi Top licence fee.**
- 2 noted the proposed changes to the Knowledge of London appearance and examination fees effective from 1 April 2015:**
 - (a) 14 per cent increase of £50 to the Knowledge of London appearance fee; and**
 - (b) 14 per cent increase of £25 to the Knowledge of London written examination fee.**

09/01/15 Taxi Fares and Tariffs Review 2015

Leon Daniels introduced the paper, which sought approval to a freeze in taxi fares and tariffs, deferring a minor decrease to 2016/17, and the extension of the fuel charge extra. Proposals for the 2015/16 annual tariff review had been presented to the meeting of the Surface Transport Panel on 30 October 2014. The meeting of the Finance and Policy Committee on 22 January 2015 had endorsed the recommendations in an earlier version of the paper.

The Board noted the paper and:

- (a) approved a freeze in taxi fares and tariffs based on the cost index for financial year 2015/16 and deferred a decrease of 0.1 per cent to 2016/17; and**
- (b) approved the extension of the fuel charge extra, a 40 pence additional charge for all taxi journeys, to be implemented only if London retail diesel prices (as measured by the AA fuel price report) reach the threshold level as set by TfL at any point between Saturday 11 April 2015 and Friday 1 April 2016, and which, if implemented, would not extend beyond Friday 1 April 2016.**

10/01/15 Structures and Tunnels Investment Portfolio – Hammersmith Flyover

Leon Daniels introduced the paper, and the related information on Part 2 of the agenda, which sought approval for increases in Financial, Project and Procurement Authority for the works, which the Finance and Policy Committee had previously identified as liable to be subject to unquantifiable additional cost pressures. The meeting of the Finance and Policy Committee on 22 January 2015 had endorsed the recommendations in the paper.

The benefit of delivering the project was to ensure the continued safe use of the flyover. Without the works the flyover was at risk of imminent closure, with the associated traffic impact and reputational damage for TfL. The project addressed the immediate closure risk and served to make significant savings in maintenance for decades to come.

- 1 The Board noted the paper and the supplemental information on Part 2 of the agenda and:**
 - (a) approved an increase in Financial Authority of £8.1m which was currently unbudgeted, to be funded by a draw down of centrally held management contingency;**
 - (b) approved an increase in Project Authority of £24.33m for the Structures and Tunnels Investment Portfolio – Work Package 3, giving a total Project Authority of £101.11m;**
 - (c) approved an increase in Procurement Authority of £24.24m for the Structures and Tunnels Investment Portfolio – Work Package 3, giving a total Procurement Authority of £97.41m;**
 - (d) authorised the TfL Officers and the Subsidiaries (as described in paragraph 2 below) of the authority to finalise the terms of the agreement to be entered into pursuant to the related paper on Part 2 of the agenda (the Agreement);**
 - (e) authorised the Agreement and execution (whether by deed or otherwise on behalf of TfL or any Subsidiary (as appropriate)) any documentation to be entered into in connection with the completion and implementation of the Agreement and any of the matters referred to in it (including, without limitation, all agreements, deeds, guarantees, indemnities, announcements, notices, contracts, certificates, letters or other documents); and**

- (f) authorised the TfL Officers and Subsidiaries to do all such other things as they consider necessary or desirable to facilitate the execution and implementation of the Agreement and the matters referred to in it.**

2 The following Officers and Subsidiaries shall have delegated authority:

- (a) TfL Officers: the Commissioner, Managing Director Finance, Managing Director Surface Transport; and**
- (b) Subsidiaries: Subsidiaries of TfL including Transport Trading Limited and any other subsidiary (whether existing presently or to be formed) of Transport Trading Limited and any of the directors of the relevant company shall be authorised to act for and on behalf of that company.**

11/01/15 iBus Contract Extension

Leon Daniels introduced the paper and the related information on Part 2 of the agenda, which updated the Board on proposals for extension to the iBus Contract for up to seven years to enable continuity of service during the staged replacement of iBus. This extension would achieve better value for money for the project. The meeting of the Finance and Policy Committee on 22 January 2015 had endorsed the recommendations in the paper.

1 The Board noted the paper and the supplemental information on Part 2 of the agenda and:

- (a) approved the extension of the iBus contract, as described in the paper, for a further period of up to seven years (the Extension) with a value up to £98.2m giving total procurement authority of £260.6m;**
- (b) authorised the TfL Officers and the Subsidiaries (as described in paragraph 2 below) to finalise the terms of the Extension described in the paper;**
- (c) authorised the agreement and execution (whether by deed or otherwise on behalf of TfL or any Subsidiary (as appropriate)) of any documentation to be entered into in connection with the completion and implementation of the Extension and any of the matters referred to in it (including, without limitation, all agreements, deeds, guarantees, indemnities, announcements, notices, contracts, certificates, letters or other documents); and**
- (d) authorised TfL Officers and Subsidiaries to do all such other things as they consider necessary or desirable to facilitate the execution and implementation of the Extension and the matters referred to in it.**

2 The following Officers and Subsidiaries shall have delegated authority:

- (a) TfL Officers: the Commissioner, Managing Director Finance, Managing Director Surface Transport, General Counsel and Chief Finance Officer; and**

- (b) **Subsidiaries: Subsidiaries of TfL including Transport Trading Limited and any other subsidiary (whether existing presently or to be formed) of Transport Trading Limited and any directors of the relevant company shall be authorised to act for and on behalf of that company.**

12/01/15 Report of the meeting of the Audit and Assurance Committee held on 17 December 2014

In the absence of the Committee Chairman, Steve Wright gave an update to the Board on the meeting of the Audit and Assurance Committee, held on 17 December 2014.

The Board noted the report.

13/01/15 Report of the meeting of the Safety, Accessibility and Sustainability Panel held on 18 December 2014

The Chairman of the Panel, Charles Belcher, gave an update to the Board on the meeting of the Safety, Accessibility and Sustainability Panel, held on 18 December 2014.

The Board noted the report.

14/01/15 Report of the meeting of the Finance and Policy Committee held on 22 January 2015

The Chairman of the Committee, Peter Anderson, gave an update to the Board on the meeting of the Finance and Policy Committee, held on 22 January 2015.

The Board noted the report.

15/01/15 Any Other Business the Chairman Considers Urgent

Members noted that Victoria Moss was leaving her role with TfL to take up a post as Deputy Company Secretary at the Post Office. Victoria was thanked for all her work supporting the Board and Members over the past seven years.

There was no other business to discuss that was not included on the agenda.

The next scheduled meeting would be held on Thursday 26 March 2015 at 10.00am.

16/01/15 Exclusion of Press and Public

The Board agreed to exclude the press and public from the meeting, in accordance with paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in order to consider the exempt appendices to the papers on Structures and Tunnels Investment Portfolio – Hammersmith Flyover and iBus Contract Extension.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 12.10pm.

Chair: _____

Date: _____