

REPORT	CABINET 7 June 2021
SUBJECT:	RESPONSE TO CALL-IN REPORT: CRYSTAL PALACE & SOUTH NORWOOD LOW TRAFFIC NEIGHBOURHOOD RESPONSE TO THE CONCERNS OF THE SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE
LEAD OFFICER:	Sarah Hayward – Interim Executive Director, Place Steve Iles – Director, Public Realm
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Muhammad Ali - Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon
WARDS:	Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood and South Norwood

SUMMARY OF REPORT:

This report responds to concerns raised by the Scrutiny and Overview Committee (the Committee) following its consideration of the Key Decision to implement an Experimental Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) at Crystal Place and South Norwood. It also summarises some of the considerations set out in the report to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee (TMAC) in January, and the subsequent addendum report to the February meeting. It provides updates where guidance has been newly published or updated, and where relevant research findings have been published since those meetings.

POLICY CONTEXT/AMBITIOUS FOR CROYDON:

The Key Decision (that was the subject of the Call in) addresses the Council's Corporate Plan priorities:

- Easy, accessible, safe and reliable, making it more convenient to travel between Croydon's local places
- Less reliance on cars, more willingness to use public transport, walk and cycle and
- Invest in safe cycle lanes between central Croydon and local centres and priorities in the Climate Change report and the resulting declaration of a 'Climate Emergency', priorities including: Croydon Council become carbon neutral by 2030;
- Work with the Mayor of London to meet the aim for London to be a zero-carbon city by 2050;
- Work with communities across Croydon to ensure that all residents and businesses are empowered and encouraged to play their part in making the Croydon the most sustainable borough in London;
- Role of all elected Members in leading this agenda.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

There is no impact on the General Fund as this scheme is to be funded by external LIP funding and the carryover of Active Travel Funding from 2020-21.

KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.: 6520SC

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 The Cabinet is asked to consider this report in the light of the Decision in report 11a on the agenda, and the concerns of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee set out in that report.

2. CONSIDERATIONS WHEN DECIDING TO IMPLEMENT AN EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC ORDER AND THE SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE'S CONCERNS REGARDING CERTAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Summary and Update on Matters in the Reports to TMAC

- 2.1 The January report to TMAC drew on Guidance to local authorities issued by the DfT in May 2020 (as amended in November). The Guidance has since been further updated (25th February 2021)¹. In his Forward to the further updated Guidance, the Secretary of State continues to draw out the transport (and health and environment related) lessons from the Covid19 Pandemic. He highlights how the initial lockdown '*resulted in cleaner air and quieter streets, transforming the environment in many of our towns and cities*' and that '*millions of people discovered, or rediscovered, cycling and walking*'. He emphasises '*We need people to carry on cycling, and to be joined by millions more*' and that '*According to the National Travel Survey, in 2017-18 over 40% of urban journeys were under 2 miles – perfectly suited to walking and cycling.*'
- 2.2 The January report to TMAC set out the considerations when taking a decision as to whether to make an experimental traffic order to implement an Experimental LTN at Crystal Palace and South Norwood (considerations expanded on in the February addendum report). The recommended experimental traffic order would be made under Section 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. In exercising its powers under the Act, the Council is required, (by s122 of the Act), to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off street, whilst at the same time having regard to the following considerations:
- the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;
 - the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run;
 - air quality (and specifically the National Air Quality Strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995);

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/reallocating-road-space-in-response-to-covid-19-statutory-guidance-for-local-authorities/traffic-management-act-2004-network-management-in-response-to-covid-19>

- the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and
- any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

2.3 The matters relevant to the taking of the Decision set out in the January report, include 'Health'. Inactivity is having profound health effects and is a major contributory factor to the levels of obesity in Croydon. On the 18th May 2021 NHS Digital reported that admissions to NHS hospitals where obesity was a factor, exceeded one million for the first time in 2019/20². An increase of 17% on 2018/19. Nationally, just as in Croydon, obesity is an equalities issue with admissions directly attributable to obesity being over three times more likely in the most deprived areas compared to the least deprived.

2.4 'Environment' linked to health and inequality were other matters addressed in the TMAC reports. The January report explained that the approach of both central government and the Mayor of London to reducing road transport emissions of locally important pollutants and globally harmful CO₂, is to:

- reduce reliance on the private car and other motorised transport including through the encouragement of active travel
- reduce harmful emissions from the remaining vehicles.

It also explained that whilst advances in vehicle propulsion technology are reducing harmful emissions from each vehicle, on Croydon's and London's streets there are important trends working against this positive effect. From 2009 to 2019, traffic on London's streets increased to its highest ever at 22.6 billion vehicle miles. The increase in vehicle miles has been entirely on London's unclassified roads / minor streets. Traffic on the unclassified minor roads almost doubled between 2009 and 2019, reaching the point where London's minor roads/streets are carrying almost as much traffic as its A Road network. The February addendum report to TMAC summarised research published in January (commissioned by the GLA and TfL) into the air quality effects of implementing Mayoral policies. UCL research into systemic inequalities in indoor air pollution exposure in London³ has since been published. Its findings include:

- Exposure to indoor air pollution can lead to health inequalities depending on socio-economic status. Differences in housing quality and characteristics of the surrounding areas mean low-income households are likely to bear a disproportionate risk of elevated exposure to indoor air pollution.
- Members of low socio-economic status groups are more likely to spend less time outdoors, due to a variety of factors including higher levels of unemployment, fewer after-school clubs and little access to green spaces. This raises their susceptibility to developing health conditions from increased exposure to indoor air pollution

²² <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/statistics-on-obesity-physical-activity-and-diet/england-2021>

³ <https://journal-buildingscities.org/article/10.5334/bc.100/>

and supports the statement in the January TMAC report that small particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) is no respecter of boundaries or major or minor streets, the report stating that the whole LTN Area (streets both within and around it) were above World Health Organisation guideline limits.

- 2.5 In late March TfL issued two sets of interim guidance:
- 'Interim Guidance for Delivery Using Temporary and Experimental Schemes'⁴ and
 - 'Interim Monitoring Guidance for Boroughs'⁵

These do not affect the recommendation to implement an Experimental LTN. Rather, they encourage and help good practice in implementing and operating such an experiment. The first of the above interim guidance notes addresses several of the concerns raised by the Scrutiny and Overview Committee. In particular it addresses:

- **Monitoring of Experimental Schemes** including preparing a monitoring plan which includes objectives against which the success of the scheme will be assessed and the data to be used to measure success, referring the reader to the second of the above interim guidance notes for further advice and guidance.
- **Consultation**, including guidance on the preparation and implementation of a consultation and engagement plan.
- **Proposals affecting traffic on roads/streets in another borough**; in particular TfL's statutory role in the process, the relevant part of TfL to engage with, and when and how to engage.

Scrutiny and Overview Committee's Concerns

- 2.6 Upon Call-in, implementation of the Key Decision was halted. Consequently the activity, planning and research to provide full answers to the Committee's concerns has yet to be concluded (but will be in a matter of weeks, should the Key Decision be confirmed). As requested by the Committee, fuller information would be provided to the Streets, Environment and Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee in an update to the Sub-Committee, prior to the coming into operation of the proposed Experimental LTN. The following section of this report addresses each of the Committee's concerns.

Monitoring

Concern 1. The Committee was concerned that the lack of clarification on the baseline data sources to be used for the experiment would make it difficult to quantifiably demonstrate the potential benefits arising from the experiment to the local community. As such that further work was needed to identify and refine the quantifiable data sources that would be used for the project. Additionally, in order to build public trust, confirmation of these data sources had to be made publicly available, prior to the start of the experiment in South Norwood & Crystal Palace.

⁴ <https://content.tfl.gov.uk/interim-guidance-for-delivery-using-temporary-and-experimental-schemes-march-2021.pdf>

⁵ <https://content.tfl.gov.uk/interim-monitoring-guidance-march-2021.pdf>

- 2.7 **Response 1.** The January report explained how planned traffic surveys were cancelled due to the first COVID19 Lockdown (and the resulting dramatic change in travel behaviour). Consequently, (in order to assess the effects of the series of temporary interventions implemented over the previous summer (interventions that became the 'Temporary LTN'), against a pre COVID19 'baseline'), consultants were commissioned to use data derived from in-vehicle telematics to paint a picture of traffic in the area pre-COVID19. The consultants also employed TfL iBus (journey time and reliability) data to further provide an indication of changes before and during the period of what became the Temporary LTN. They also used the most recent modelling of London's air quality (2016) mapping concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂), and particulate matter. TfL undertook its own study using iBUS and SCOOT data (drawn on within and appended to the January report).
- 2.8 Para 3.15 of the January report summarised the reasons for recommending implementing an Experimental LTN. In doing so, it states that Croydon officers should seek to agree a monitoring strategy with Bromley Council and TfL. Whilst implementation of the Key Decision has been halted, there has been one meeting with TfL regarding potential monitoring. It has been agreed that a joint monitoring strategy is to be developed with clear objectives. It is expected that this will in part employ TfL's 'Surface Intelligent Transport System' ('Surface Digital Twin') which incorporates a series of real time data sets including, iBus, SCOOT and INRIX (vehicle flow, speed etc on 60,000 links on London's principal road network and bus network) going back to before the COVID19 Pandemic. The monitoring strategy will follow TfL's 'Interim Monitoring Guidance for Boroughs'. It will be guided by the monitoring activity for schemes suggested by TfL (as summarised in Table 1 of the interim guidance (see below)) and TfL's 'Interim Guidance for Delivery Using Temporary and Experimental Schemes'.

Table 1 – Suggested monitoring activity for schemes

Examples of monitoring activity	New cycle lanes and wider pavements	Space for active travel in town centres and interchanges	Low-traffic neighbourhoods	School streets
All-vehicle traffic counts	✓ Link counts	✓ Cordon counts	✓ Cordon counts	✓ Cordon counts
Pedestrian and cycle counts	✓ Link counts	✓ Cordon counts	✓ Cordon counts	✓ ⁴
Pedestrian comfort evaluation	✓	✓	✓	✓
Individual surveys	✓ User	✓ User	✓ Resident	✓ Pupil, parent/carer and/or resident
Business surveys	✓	✓	✓	✗
Traffic speeds	✓	✓	✓	✓
Parking counts (car and cycle)	✗	✓	✗	✓
Bus speeds/journey times	✓	✓	✓	✗
Safety data	✓	✓	✓	✓
Penalty Charge Notices issued	✗	✗	✓	✓
Air Quality	✓	✓	✓	✓
Review of ongoing public feedback	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ongoing liaison with emergency services	✓	✓	✓	✓

- 2.9 Timescales are such that an Experimental LTN could not be implemented before the 21st June, the date central government hopes to be in a position to remove all COVID19 related legal limits on social contact. This would allow monitoring to be undertaken prior to the implementation of an Experiment LTN which will provide a new 'post COVID19' baseline. However, it is not known how long it might take for people's travel behaviours to stabilise to a post COVID19 'new normal'. (Concern 1 is further addressed in the response to Concerns 2 and 3).

Success Criteria

Concern 2. The Committee was concerned that it would be difficult for the public to have confidence in the benefits arising from the experiment without clearly defined success criteria. As such urgent work was needed to define a framework by which the success of the scheme would be assessed. This needed to be completed and made publicly available prior to the start of the experiment in South Norwood & Crystal Palace.

- 2.10 **Response 2.** The January report explained that a Low Traffic Street is a High People Street. LTNs/Healthy Neighbourhoods seek to create calmer and quieter street space where people can choose to travel actively/healthily and where the street's traditional function of community and social space can be

reclaimed, all with the aim of supporting physical and psychological health and wellbeing. Hence success will be measured by the degree to which vehicular traffic levels, traffic speeds and casualty numbers (and severity) are all reduced and numbers of people in the streets, and active travel have increased. This will be balanced with other matters of importance including the journey time and reliability of bus services on the neighbouring A Roads and the vitality of the Upper Norwood Triangle. The indicators of success will be set out in the monitoring strategy to be developed with TfL and ideally neighbouring local authorities, principally Bromley. The focus will be on finalising the monitoring strategy swiftly. In turn, the detail regarding the monitoring strategy will be provided to the Streets Environment and Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee in the up-date to the Sub-Committee.

Whilst published during and focussed on the third COVID19 Lockdown, TfL's 'Interim Guidance for Delivery Using Temporary and Experimental Schemes' suggests schemes objectives equally appropriate post Lockdown:

- **Improved safety** for all users and reduced fear of road danger especially for active modes,
- **Enabling cycling and walking** through a pleasant and good quality experience, encouraging active travel and preventing a car-based recovery
- **Reliable and efficient bus operations**, schemes should make every attempt not to impact bus operations
- **Essential traffic not impacted unreasonably**, allowing for freight, emergency services and those journeys which can only take place by private car, taxi or PHV to reach their destinations in a timely manner
- **The public and businesses not disproportionately affected** by experimental schemes including not adversely impacting groups with protected characteristics

2.11 The same interim guidance importantly reminds local authorities that monitoring against clear objectives is not only to gauge success at the end of an experiment. Monitoring should also inform on going management and adjustment related to the operation of the experiment. An example TfL gives is assessing the need to adjust traffic signal timings, something important to assess in relation to the A Roads bounding the proposed Experimental LTN.

Potential Wider Effects

Concern 3. The Committee was concerned about the potential impact the experiment may have upon the roads surrounding the LTN, particularly in regards to air quality. As such any monitoring installed as part of the experimental scheme needed to include the wider area. Additionally, given the potential negative impact on the air quality in the surrounding roads, mitigation needed to be identified as a matter of urgency, should there be a significant deterioration in air quality.

2.12 **Response 3** The specification for the equipment (and the locations for that equipment) with which to continuously record traffic flow (by vehicle type, including people on bikes and walking, and vehicle speeds), has been developed with monitoring consultants. The sites identified are within the area

of the proposed Experimental LTN and the A Roads bounding it within Croydon, including the Upper Norwood Triangle. This is in addition to the real time data / monitoring available via TfL's 'Surface Intelligent Transport System' ('Surface Digital Twin'). Locations for additional monitoring equipment have not yet been proposed in Bromley (see the response to Concern 4 below).

- 2.13 TfL's 'Interim Monitoring Guidance for Boroughs' advises that 'Air quality monitoring should only be considered where there is likely to be a significant impact on emissions. A significant impact on emissions is not anticipated from this one experiment. However, monitoring of air quality will be undertaken, reflecting the importance attached to the matter of air quality, by both the public and the Committee.
- 2.14 Consultants have been engaged to advise on and implement the monitoring of air quality effects potentially arising during the Experimental LTN. It is planned to deploy a combination of portable sensors and 'passive' diffusion tubes in and around the Experimental LTN.
- 2.15 Important caveats need to be attached to the monitoring and assessment of potential air quality effects. The report of the Air Quality Expert Group 'Assessing the Effectiveness of Interventions on Air Quality' (prepared for DEFRA (2020))⁶ states that in terms of air quality and health effects '*The assessment of interventions can be challenging for several reasons*'. It suggests an 'accountability chain' approach may provide a useful way to consider the impact of an intervention, from a change in activity through to potential health effects i.e. activity → emissions → concentrations → health outcomes. However it warns that effects become increasing difficulty to assess/quantify as one moves along the 'chain':
- 2.16 Mitigation is intended to be provided directly via the implementation of the Experimental LTN itself, the LTN providing quieter and calmer street space in which people can choose to cycle and walk short journeys. Mitigation relating to air quality concerns is also expected to be provided by the changes to the London wide Low Emission Zone and the expansion of the Ultra-Low Emission Zone. Further mitigation will be investigated. The outcome which will be included in the update to the Streets, Environment and Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee. Mitigation by changes to traffic signal trimmings on the surrounding A Road network, would be kept under constant review and adjustment with TfL during the experiment.

Bromley Council

Concern 4. The Committee was concerned that the level of engagement with Bromley Council to date had not resulted in an agreed way forward for the experiment, which was likely to result in a detrimental impact for those Bromley residents living closest to the scheme. As such further engagement with the London Borough of Bromley needed to be

⁶ https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat09/2006240803_Assessing_the_effectiveness_of_interventions_on_AQ.pdf

prioritised, to ensure that the appropriate mitigation was in place before the start of the experiment.

2.17 Response 4. The January report to TMAC advised that:

- Bromley Council had, in the strongest terms, called for the previous temporary measures to be removed, indicating that it would only talk with Croydon Council once the Temporary LTN was removed.
- TfL had however, facilitated an officer level discussion between Bromley and Croydon Councils, officers having met twice.

The January TMAC meeting was advised of a letter sent (just prior to the TMAC meeting) from the Bromley Council Chief Executive. It stated Bromley Council's position, namely that the Temporary LTN should be removed directly, and the Experimental LTN should not be implemented until any potential effects on air quality are known⁷.

2.18 The Key Decision was taken in two stages, the first stage of the Decision being to remove the Temporary LTN. In taking the first part of the Decision, the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon resolved to request additional information and questions be put to TMAC. Including:

*'e) **Engagement with the London Borough of Bromley** Officers to report to TMAC on a regular basis to allow for the updating of the committee as we work together with Bromley to progress the scheme.'*

The officer report to February TMAC confirmed that officers would report to TMAC on a regular basis, updating the Committee on the work with Bromley and other neighbouring Highway and Traffic Authorities (including TfL) to progress the Experimental LTN. The Key Decision before Cabinet includes:

'Instruct officers to continue to seek to work with those in Bromley Council to mitigate effects predicted to arise from the Experimental LTN in certain residential access streets in Bromley and to address concerns about potential effects on air quality.'

2.19 The March meeting of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee was addressed by:

- 1.** The Executive Member for Environment and Community Services at Bromley Council, who explained that it was the ethos of Bromley to look to improve facilities for active travel, rather than working against other forms of travel and they looked to improve the flow on roads rather than limit the flow, and that the proposed scheme in its current format was unlikely to be supported by Bromley residents.
- 2.** The Assistant Director of Traffic & Parking at Bromley Council, who advised the Committee that the impact of the Temporary LTN on Bromley had been negative but that going forward, Bromley Council would be happy to engage with Croydon about potential options and alternatives to the LTN.
- 3.** A Bromley Councillor for Crystal Palace ward, advised that given the proximity of the proposed scheme to Bromley, it should be viewed as a cross borough issue and as such needed to be developed on a cross-

⁷ letter provided to the decision taker and appended to the Key Decision Notice

boundary basis. This should include Councillors working together to set strategic objectives followed by officers designing the technical scheme. At present, it was not clear there was a scheme available that would be acceptable to both authorities, but one could only be developed by both boroughs designing it together.

(Draft Minutes of the Meeting of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee 23 March 2021)

- 2.20 Engagement with Bromley is likely to benefit from the continuing involvement of TfL. The involvement of TfL will be important for a number of reasons. The January report advised that under S121B of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA 1984), a London local authority may not implement a traffic regulation order (including an experimental order) if to do so will affect, or is likely to affect a road in another borough, unless:

- it has notified TfL and the other local authority; and
- the proposal has either (a) been approved by the other local authority; (b) received no objection within one month from the other local authority; (c) any objection has been withdrawn; or (d) the GLA has given its consent after consideration of the objection.

As well as TfL being the body to be notified, the GLA is most likely to take advice from TfL in deciding whether or not to consent to the making of the experimental traffic order.

- 2.21 It is proposed that the reengagement with Bromley Council be based around the point highlighted by the Scrutiny and Overview Committee:
- 'a benefit of using Experimental Traffic Orders is that they enable the Council to carry out iterative testing. This allowed the Council to gather data to establish the extent to which any such scheme positively contributed towards either reducing car usage or improving air quality in the borough.'*

whilst also:

- emphasising the temporary nature of the experiment
- encouraging Bromley Council to be a part of the development of the monitoring strategy and the engagement strategy
- seeking to work together to protect residential / local access streets in Bromley at the edge of the proposed Experimental LTN, from predicted displaced / diverting traffic.

Regarding the latter point above, TMAC heard evidence from a representative of Milestone Road (Bromley) residents (and residents of neighbouring/linked access streets in Bromley) regarding the street/traffic environment and driver behaviour they had experienced following the temporary restriction on motor vehicles introduced in Fox Hill, Stambourne Way and Sylvan Hill creating the Temporary LTN. The residents were particularly concerned to highlight road rage incidents witnessed in their streets in early December 2020. Similarly a representative of Southern Avenue (South Norwood) residents described the street/traffic environment and driver behaviour they had experienced over many years, and the relief provided by the Temporary LTN. A key objective of

any scheme promoted at this location should be 'Healthy Low Traffic Access Streets', be they in Bromley or Croydon boroughs.

- 2.22 Officers further propose offering to work with Bromley Council to undertake feasibility testing of alternative proposals Bromley might suggest. The results of this feasibility potentially being provided to Public Inquiry (see Response to Concern 5) were one to be held.

Engagement Strategy

Concern 5 Although reassurance was given about the level of consultation that would be undertaken throughout the experiment, it was agreed that the engagement strategy for the Crystal Palace & South Norwood LTN project needed to be made publicly available as soon as possible.

- 2.23 **Response 5** The drafting of the engagement strategy will be finalised (ideally with the involvement of Bromley Council), and the Streets, Environment and Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee updated. The engagement strategy will be guided by TfL's 'Interim Guidance for Delivery Using Temporary and Experimental Schemes'
- 2.24 The Call-in of the Key Decision suggested consideration be given to 'staging a Citizens Assembly on the LTN and the delivery of the Fresh Air Suburb'. The RTRA 1984 allows the holding of a Public Inquiry before the making of a traffic order. It similarly allows the GLA to call a public inquiry before deciding whether to consent to the making of a traffic order by one authority, potentially affecting another authority's roads (in the event of an otherwise unresolved objection). If, in the light of experiment, the experiment is potentially to be made permanent, then the holding of a Public Inquiry (potentially with the GLA) prior to the making of a permanent traffic order, is probably the more appropriate mechanism, and would be given careful consideration (including with the GLA as necessary). There may well be a role for a Citizens Assembly to consider in broader terms, the means by which the Fresh Air Suburb might be remade.

Traffic Signs

Concern 6. In light of concerns raised during the meeting about the level of signage used during the previous temporary scheme, there needed to be an ongoing review of the signage used during the life of the experimental scheme.

- 2.25 **Response 6.** The signing strategy will seek to ensure that motorists on the boundary roads are advised / reminded that restrictions are in place on the roads that form the entrance to the Experimental LTN or within it. The strategy will be more effective if it can be implemented on boundary roads and other streets in Bromley, with the agreement of Bromley Council. All mandatory signing for the scheme will be in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016. The advisory signing warning of the restrictions ahead would be subject to ongoing review during the period of

operation of the Experimental LTN, public feedback on the legibility etc of the signing, being an important part of the review.

Route Finding Apps

Concern 7. The Committee had a concern that it would be difficult to reduce congestion on residential roads while route-finding apps continue to include these roads as potential route options for motorists. As such the Committee would ask the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon to give a commitment to working with other London boroughs to address the issue of route finding apps directing motorists through residential streets.

- 2.26 **Response 7** Whilst the frustrations of residents living in local access streets, and the concerns of the Committee are fully acknowledged, there is no unilateral action Croydon Council can take to prevent mobile apps routing vehicles down inappropriate streets. Officers will pursue the matter with other London local authorities including via London Councils and the London Technical Advisers Group (LoTAG).

Reporting Back

Concern 8 In light of the above concerns, it is requested that the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon provides two updates to the Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee. Firstly, before the start of the experiment to provide a response to the concerns of the Scrutiny & Overview Committee. Secondly, at the conclusion of the experiment to provide an update on the outcomes.

- 2.27 **Response 8** Updates will be provided to the Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee. Consideration will be given as to the form of update in the light of the frequency/infrequency of meetings of the Sub-Committee over the summer. Similarly the previously confirmed reporting to TMAC on a regular basis, will be reviewed in the light of the updating of the Sub-Committee.

3. CONSULTATION

(See Response 5 above plus the [January 2021 TMAC Report](#) and the [February 2021 Addendum Report](#))

4. FINANCIAL AND RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 The Financial Impact summary at the start of the January TMAC report stated that costs arising from implementing, consulting on and monitoring the Experimental LTN are proposed to be met from Active Travel Funding provided to London by the Secretary of State for Transport (via TfL), and from funding allocated to Croydon Council by TfL to support the Council to implement its Local Implementation Plan. The 'Finance and Risk Assessment Considerations' section of the report advised that TfL had confirmed that Active Travel Funding (provided by the DfT and administered by TfL) is

available to Croydon Council for 2020/21, but with the flexibility of being able to carry funding into this year for delivery, if schemes are committed in 2020/21. It advised that the request had been made to TfL to use Active Travel Funding, with LIP Corridors funding for design, implementation, consultation and monitoring costs arising from the recommended Experimental LTN, to which TfL had agreed. It also advised that the recommendation / decision to implement the Experimental LTN order is subject to Spending Control Panel agreeing the expenditure of the ring-fenced grant funding. Whilst the Council is no longer subject to S114, the Spending Control Panel and the requirement for it to approve expenditure, remain in place.

- 4.2 The 'Risks' subsection of the January report advised that:
- significant delay to making the experimental traffic order is likely to impact on the ability to spend all of the TfL and DfT funding allocated to the project for 2020/21.
 - removal of the Temporary LTN is intended to allow discussion with Bromley Council regarding the recommended Experimental LTN and reduce the risk around making of the traffic order and financial risk potentially associated with delay.
- 4.3 The 'Finance and Risk Assessment Considerations' section of the February Addendum report advised revision of the Equality Analysis had resulted in a slight change to the proposed Experimental LTN predicted to increase the project cost by approximately £25,000. Meeting this additional cost to be included within the Council's ask to TfL when seeking release of LIP Funding for 2021/22.
- 4.4 TfL remains reliant on funding from central government. The funding agreement concluded with central government in March, extended TfL's funding until the 18th May 2021. As a consequence TfL advised local authorities that LIP funding would only be provided until 18th May. TfL has since written to the local authorities advising LIP funding will be extended until 28th May. It is anticipated that LIP funding will be provided for the remainder of the year, but as yet, is not confirmed. However, the control will remain in place (as stated in the recommendation to TMAC and Key Decision) that implementation of an Experimental LTN at Crystal Palace and South Norwood is subject to Spending Control Panel agreeing to the spending of ring fenced grant funding.

Approved by: Geetha Blood, Interim Head of Finance, Place and Resources on behalf of S151 Officer

5. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

(See the [January 2021 TMAC Report](#) and the [February 2021 Addendum Report](#), plus the Legal Considerations set out in the main report bringing the Key Decision to Cabinet).

6. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

(See the [January 2021 TMAC Report](#))

7. EQUALITIES IMPACT

(See the [January 2021 TMAC Report](#) and the [February 2021 Addendum Report](#), plus the updated Equalities Analysis at appendix 3 to the Addendum Report)

8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

8.1 (See the [January 2021 TMAC Report](#) and the [February 2021 Addendum Report](#) plus the additional information in Section 1 of this report)

9. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

9.1 (See the [January 2021 TMAC Report](#))

10. HEALTH IMPACT

10.1 (See the [January 2021 TMAC Report](#) plus the additional information in Section 1 of this report)

11. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPACT

11.1 (See the [January 2021 TMAC Report](#))

12. DATA PROTECTION IMPLICATIONS

12.1 (See the [January 2021 TMAC Report](#))

CONTACT OFFICER: Ian Plowright, Head of Transport

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: Letter from TfL Head of Network Sponsorship, Investment Delivery Planning - Surface Transport. 18th May 2021.