

Environment, Economy, Housing and Transport Board

Agenda

Friday, 14 December 2018
1.00 pm

Westminster Room, 8th Floor, 18 Smith
Square, London, SW1P 3HZ

To: Members of the Environment, Economy, Housing and Transport Board
cc: Named officers for briefing purposes

Guidance notes for members and visitors **18 Smith Square, London SW1P 3HZ**

Please read these notes for your own safety and that of all visitors, staff and tenants.

Welcome!

18 Smith Square is located in the heart of Westminster, and is nearest to the Westminster, Pimlico, Vauxhall and St James's Park Underground stations, and also Victoria, Vauxhall and Charing Cross railway stations. A map is available on the back page of this agenda.

Security

All visitors (who do not have an LGA ID badge), are requested to report to the Reception desk where they will be asked to sign in and will be given a visitor's badge to be worn at all times whilst in the building.

18 Smith Square has a swipe card access system meaning that security passes will be required to access all floors. Most LGA governance structure meetings will take place on the **ground floor, 7th floor and 8th floor** of 18 Smith Square.

Please don't forget to sign out at reception and return your security pass when you depart.

Fire instructions

In the event of the fire alarm sounding, vacate the building immediately following the green Fire Exit signs. Go straight to the assembly point in Tufton Street via Dean Trench Street (off Smith Square).

DO NOT USE THE LIFTS.

DO NOT STOP TO COLLECT PERSONAL BELONGINGS.

DO NOT RE-ENTER BUILDING UNTIL AUTHORISED TO DO SO.



Open Council

Open Council, on the 7th floor of 18 Smith Square, provides informal meeting space and refreshments for local authority members and officers who are in London.

Toilets

Unisex toilet facilities are available on every floor of 18 Smith Square. Accessible toilets are also available on all floors.

Accessibility

If you have special access needs, please let the meeting contact know in advance and we will do our best to make suitable arrangements to meet your requirements.

Every effort has been made to make the building as accessible as possible for people with disabilities. Induction loop systems have been installed in the larger meeting rooms and at the main reception. There is a parking space for blue badge holders outside the Smith Square entrance and two more blue badge holders' spaces in Dean Stanley Street to the side of the building. There is also a wheelchair lift at the main entrance. For further information please contact the Facilities Management Helpdesk on 020 7664 3015.

Guest WiFi in 18 Smith Square

WiFi is available in 18 Smith Square for visitors. It can be accessed by enabling "Wireless Network Connection" on your computer and connecting to LGA-Free-WiFi. You will then need to register, either by completing a form or through your Facebook or Twitter account (if you have one). You only need to register the first time you log on.

The LGA also offers the Govroam network, a Wi-Fi network which gives Members seamless roaming internet access across multiple public-sector locations if you have also signed up for this service. This network is enabled throughout our Westminster building and allows Members and staff from other authorities who are part of the Govroam network to seamlessly connect to our Wi-Fi.

Further help

Please speak either to staff at the main reception on the ground floor, if you require any further help or information. You can find the LGA website at www.local.gov.uk

Environment, Economy, Housing & Transport Board
14 December 2018

There will be a meeting of the Environment, Economy, Housing & Transport Board at **1.00 pm on Friday, 14 December 2018** Westminster Room, 8th Floor, 18 Smith Square, London, SW1P 3HZ.

A sandwich lunch will be available after the meeting.

Attendance Sheet:

Please ensure that you sign the attendance register, which will be available in the meeting room. It is the only record of your presence at the meeting.

Political Group meetings:

The group meetings will take place in advance of the meeting. Please contact your political group as outlined below for further details.

Apologies:

Please notify your political group office (see contact telephone numbers below) if you are unable to attend this meeting.

Conservative:	Group Office: 020 7664 3223	email: lgaconservatives@local.gov.uk
Labour:	Group Office: 020 7664 3263	email: Lewis.addlington-lee@local.gov.uk
Liberal Democrat:	Group Office: 020 7664 3235	email: libdem@local.gov.uk
Independent:	Group Office: 020 7664 3224	email: independent.grouplga@local.gov.uk

Location:

A map showing the location of 18 Smith Square is printed on the back cover.

LGA Contact:

Thomas French
020 7664 3041 / thomas.french@local.gov.uk

Carers' Allowance

As part of the LGA Members' Allowances Scheme a Carer's Allowance of up to £7.83 per hour is available to cover the cost of dependants (i.e. children, elderly people or people with disabilities) incurred as a result of attending this meeting.

Environment, Economy, Housing & Transport Board – Membership 2018/2019

Councillor	Authority
Conservative (8)	
Cllr Martin Tett (Chairman)	Buckinghamshire County Council
Cllr Ainsley Arnold	Cheshire East Council
Cllr Simon Dudley	Windsor & Maidenhead Royal Borough
Cllr Louise Goldsmith	West Sussex County Council
Cllr Patrick Nicholson	Plymouth City Council
Cllr Catherine Rankin	Kent County Council
Cllr David Renard	Swindon Borough Council
Cllr Barry Wood	Cherwell District Council
Substitutes	
Cllr Alistair Auty	Wokingham Borough Council
Cllr Steve Bowles	Aylesbury Vale District Council
Cllr Colin Davie	Lincolnshire County Council
Labour (7)	
Cllr Judith Blake CBE (Vice-Chair)	Leeds City Council
Cllr Tony Newman	Croydon Council
Cllr Ed Turner	Oxford City Council
Cllr Rachel Blake	Tower Hamlets Council
Cllr Gillian Campbell	Blackpool Council
Cllr Michael Mordey	Sunderland City Council
Mayor Philip Glanville	Hackney London Borough Council
Substitutes	
Cllr Mazher Iqbal	Sheffield City Council
Cllr Peter Mason	Ealing Council
Cllr James Robbins	Swindon Borough Council
Liberal Democrat (2)	
Cllr Adele Morris (Deputy Chair)	Southwark Council
Cllr Peter Thornton	Cumbria County Council
Substitutes	
Cllr Stewart Golton	Leeds City Council
Independent (2)	
Cllr Rachel Eburne (Deputy Chair)	Mid Suffolk District Council
Cllr Linda Gillham	Runnymede Borough Council
Substitutes	
Cllr Philip Evans JP	Conwy County Borough Council
Cllr David Beaman	Waverley Borough Council

Agenda

Environment, Economy, Housing & Transport Board

Friday 14 December 2018

1.00 pm

Westminster Room, 8th Floor, 18 Smith Square, London, SW1P 3HZ

Item	Page
1. Chairman's Welcome, Apologies and Declarations of Interest	
2. Resources and Waste Strategy	1 - 8
3. Homelessness Prevention	9 - 14
4. Environment, Economy, Housing & Transport Board Update Paper	15 - 22
5. Any other Business	
6. Minutes of the previous meeting	23 - 27

Date of Next Meeting: Tuesday, 12 February 2019, 1.00 pm, Westminster Room, 8th Floor, 18 Smith Square, London, SW1P 3HZ

14 December 2018

Resources and Waste Strategy

Purpose of report

For direction.

Summary

The Government will be publishing its Resources and Waste Strategy in the next few weeks. At the time of writing this report the strategy was not available. The strategy will open up a broader debate around key issues such as reform of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) and Deposit Return Schemes (DRS) as highlighted in the Budget and Ministerial statements. There is further potential that consistency and performance could also become key themes in any debate. This report is giving Members an early opportunity to consider the Boards position on these key issues and to provide a steer for future lobbying activity.

Recommendations

The Board is asked to consider the questions raised in paragraph 16. Members are asked if there any key principles Members would like to see delivered through any reform of the system.

The Board is asked to consider DRS and how it could best work with existing local government services (paragraphs 21-27).

The Board is asked to consider how we should engage in any discussions around consistency and performance. And to consider any more key points (paragraphs 28-31).

Action

Officers to take members comments forward.

Contact officer: Sonika Sidhu
Position: Senior Adviser
Phone no: 0207 664 3076
Email: Sonika.sidhu@local.gov.uk

Resources and Waste Strategy

Background

1. Since 2000, local government has made significant progress in recycling municipal waste. Between 2004-2014 as a nation we have improved our municipal waste recycling and composting by 15 per cent taking us up to 8th place out of 34 European countries.¹ The pursuit of existing EU waste targets since 2000 has required a doubling of spend by English authorities to £3.28 billion. This makes collection and disposal of waste and recycling the third highest cost service for English local authorities.
2. The current household recycling rate in England is 45.2 per cent² and there has been limited improvement over the last few years. 73 per cent of UK packaging waste is either recycled or recovered and 26 per cent of waste ends up in landfill. The European Commission has set a number of challenging waste and recycling targets for the future:
 - 2.1. A common EU target for recycling 65 per cent of municipal waste by 2030
 - 2.2. A common EU target for recycling 75 per cent of packaging waste by 2030
 - 2.3. A binding landfill target to reduce landfill to maximum of 10 per cent of all waste by 2030
3. As a nation we are currently committed to these targets.
4. Achieving the targets on municipal waste and landfill represents an enormous challenge for councils. Our estimates show that current spending on waste by English authorities would need to increase significantly to include additional collection services (in particular food waste) just to meet the existing 2020 target of 50 per cent. Increased levels of ambition in recycling performance are becoming progressively more expensive to achieve above the existing target levels. Over the past few years LGA lobbying has focussed on highlighting the need for additional funding in order to meet the ambitious targets set by the EU. We have suggested resourcing these services via redistribution of landfill taxes and also stressed the need for greater producer responsibility to be part of the Government's approach.

Current Position

5. The broadcast of the BBC series Blue Planet II has had a significant impact upon the public's collective conscience. This has led to environmental issues moving significantly

¹ EEA Waste Recycling report – December 2016

² From DEFRA's 2016 figures for UK waste from household recycling rates

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/746642/UK_Statistics_on_Waste_statistical_notice_October_2018_FINAL.pdf

14 December 2018

up the political agenda. The current Secretary of State has given a number of high level speeches about the Government's commitment to delivering wide ranging environmental change and the Prime Minister personally launched the publication of the 25 Year Environment Strategy¹. There is currently a real appetite within DEFRA to deliver some meaningful change, and Brexit could potentially provide an additional opportunity to review our approach as a nation.

6. The 25 Year Environment Strategy promised the development of a Resources and Waste Strategy. This strategy is key for local government. It is aimed at making the UK a world leader in resource efficiency. It will set out the government's approach to reducing waste, promoting markets for secondary materials, incentivising producers to design better products and suggest how we can manage materials at the end of life by targeting environmental impacts.

7. It is anticipated that the Resources and Waste Strategy will be published in the next few weeks. It will present Government's position on the issues outlined above. It is also our understanding that the strategy will introduce a debate around reform of some key issues as suggested in the Budget³ and key ministerial announcements⁴. These issue are most likely to be:
 - 7.1. The extended producer responsibility scheme (EPR)
 - 7.2. Deposit return schemes (DRS)
 - 7.3. And possibly consistency and performance.

8. It is expected that these reforms will radically change the future of waste and recycling services in local government and so this paper is aimed at supporting the Board to begin its consideration of these issues.

9. The outcome of these debates could lead to significant amounts of money being invested in waste and recycling services in this country. Figures between £500m to over £1 billion have been mentioned in different forums. It is imperative therefore that members have the opportunity to engage in this issue early on to set the direction for our lobbying work. In preparation for this work we have conducted an LGA survey which has gone out to all councils and achieved a 40 per cent return rate. The findings from the survey will be discussed below.

Key issues: Reform of the Extended Producer Responsibility Scheme

10. Producer responsibility schemes exist to ensure that businesses which manufacture, import and sell certain products are responsible for their end of life environmental impact. The UK scheme focuses on packaging, waste electrical and electronic equipment,

³ The chancellor announced reform of the Packaging Producer Responsibility System, which will aim to increase producer responsibility for the costs of their packaging waste, including plastic (*2018 Budget Book, Page 48, paragraph 3.56*)

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/deposit-return-scheme-in-fight-against-plastic>

14 December 2018

batteries, end of life vehicles and hazardous substances. It is likely that the packaging element of this scheme will come under review. The UK is unique in that it runs a market-based Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) scheme for packaging, known as the Packaging Waste Recovery Note (PRN). Here, obligated producers have to purchase a set number of PRNs from reprocessors, which serve as evidence that their packaging has been recycled. The system is meant to subsidise packaging recycling, however it's not very transparent and it remains unclear how the money is spent.

11. In 2017 the PRN system generated £72.6m and £64.2m in 2016. Of the £72.6m in 2017 just £22.3 million went towards funding waste and recycling collections, but this money did not go to local councils. By contrast, councils indicated in their 2016/17 financial returns to Government that they had spent £800 million on recycling over the last year (this figure covers all recycling not just packaging). This was funded primarily through council tax and business rates. There is a general consensus amongst councils that the current PRN system does not help local government and that the scheme does not raise enough income to cover the true cost of recycling packaging waste.
12. There are around 400 EPR schemes in operation across the world, most of which are mandatory. Outside of the UK, countries such as France and Japan have taken EPR a lot further. France has 14 mandatory EPR schemes in place covering additional product streams including furniture, tyres and infectious healthcare waste. Japan has an extensive EPR law that covers the lifecycle of products from various industries – part of this legislation requires manufacturers to use recycled materials and reusable parts in new products. In Germany, Austria, Belgium and Sweden they have compliance schemes where producers take full operational and financial responsibility for household collection of packaging waste, meaning that local authorities' operational role is limited to residual waste, with the full cost of recycling being picked up by producers.
13. There is real potential that the Resources and Waste Strategy will provide an opportunity to redesign the EPR system. Producers of packaging waste recognise that they must do more to deal with the waste they are generating and are willing to discuss contributing more funding to a fully reformed system. There are suggestions that this figure could be anywhere between £500m to over £1 billion. However, if this is true it is highly likely that producers will want greater influence over the waste services they are helping to fund.
14. Reform of the current EPR system may provide an opportunity to develop new funding models for the future. If significant funding is available there could be a number of options for how funding flows through the system; for example the establishment of a central EPR funding body, or a less regulated market driven approach. In the scenario of a central body, producers might pay into the body which could be made up of representatives from all sectors. The body would then pass funding out to councils/waste partnerships in a manner which drives improved recycling rates.
15. In a more market based approach there is no guarantee that councils would receive any direct funding. Councils would be seen more as a source of recycling material. The success of this approach would depend on the robustness of the market. The Government could use the Resources and Waste strategy to support the market by stimulating domestic demand for recycled material. In both models there is the potential for the PRN

14 December 2018

system to exist. However, feedback from councils has been that the current PRN system is not transparent and councils do not receive any funding from it.

16. The recent Budget indicated that reform of EPR is being considered⁵. In preparation for this it would be helpful for the Board to address some of the potential key issues which may arise from any reform. Some of the key issues for local government are:

16.1. How much risk do we want to take on as a sector? Is this an opportunity for us to develop a low risk model where we pass on the market risk around recyclates to producers?

16.2. What is the impact of removing all recyclable material from our waste services and does this impact on residual waste costs?⁶

16.3. How confident are we about delivering improved recycling rates if additional investment is made available?

16.4. How do we ensure a system of governance for any new scheme delivers transparency for local government?

17. It may also be useful to agree a set of principals the Board would like to see any EPR model delivering: These could be:

17.1. Full cost recovery (including some residual waste costs)

17.2. Freedom and flexibility for councils to deliver cost effective local waste services

17.3. Ensuring councils get direct funding

17.4. Transparency of any new process

18. The LGA survey asked councils how they would spend any additional income for waste and recycling services. 51 per cent of respondents prioritised either investing in technology and/or infrastructure or introducing food waste collections. Respondents were also asked how a new EPR system should deal with the risk of managing recyclates, which some councils are struggling with due to the China ban. Thirty five per cent would prefer that producers retain income from recycling and become responsible for market risk, whereas 28 per cent would prefer that income and risk remain with authorities.

19. The Board is asked to consider the questions raised in paragraph 16

⁵ The chancellor announced reform of the Packaging Producer Responsibility System, which will aim to increase producer responsibility for the costs of their packaging waste, including plastic (*2018 Budget Book, Page 48, paragraph 3.56*)

⁶ Councils spent £3.4bn in 2016/17 collecting and disposing residual waste whereas recycling spend significantly less - £800m (Figures from DEFRA waste survey 2017)

14 December 2018

20. Are there a set of key principles Members would like to see delivered through any reform of the system?

Key issues: Deposit Return Schemes

21. The Government announced in March 2018 that it is keen to introduce a DRS⁷ for single use drinks containers. A DRS scheme is one where you pay an additional amount when buying a drink. This additional amount is then returned to you when you return the bottle. It is likely that the DRS scheme will focus on recycling plastic drinks bottles, but it may also include glass and metal. UK consumers go through an estimated 13 billion plastic bottles a year⁸. Plastic bottles are an issue which regularly receives a lot of negative press coverage and has a lot of resonance with the public. DRS are popular in Denmark, Sweden and Germany. In Germany they have a 97 per cent recycling rate from their DRS.
22. DRS can be introduced in many ways. The specific detail of this is still to be announced. However, Members should be aware of the potential impact of different models on local government waste services. DRS can be specific towards bottles used “on the go” or much broader “all in schemes” encompassing all bottles used both on the go and in household waste.
23. The LGA has responded to the government’s previous consultations on DRS, coffee cups and plastic bottles and single use plastics. We indicated that the sector was keen to help increase the proportion of plastic bottles being recycled. However, we have no control over the number of bottles coming into the system and so clearly recommended that the producers of these items should be paying for their recovery costs. It will be important for us to clarify through a future consultation process how much funding a DRS would need and how this would impact on the EPR fund.
24. When speaking to council waste and recycling officers the general feedback is that plastic bottles are predominantly found in litter. Once they enter the litter stream they are generally contaminated and so cannot be dealt with as recyclate. There is however, comprehensive coverage of plastic bottle collection at the kerbside. 99 per cent of councils offer a kerbside recycling collection service that includes plastic bottles⁹. As a result there could be greater additionality with an “on the go” DRS scheme.
25. With a DRS scheme that also targeted bottles used at home and normally collected as part of a kerbside scheme, councils would need to think about how the removal of any specific waste stream could impact on the delivery of their waste service. Removal of plastic bottles may impact on residual waste amounts and make disposal cheaper. However, some councils may be able to sell the plastic bottles on and raise some income. Overall it is difficult to project any cost or income savings/losses.

⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/deposit-return-scheme-in-fight-against-plastic>

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/deposit-return-scheme-in-fight-against-plastic>

⁹ Figures from RECOUP 2018 plastics survey

14 December 2018

26. In the recent LGA survey 41 per cent of councils supported the “all in” model. 34 per cent were in favour of the “on the go” scheme. When questioned further 38 per cent of councils thought they would see a decrease in the cost of their residual waste collections if there was a reduction of packaging waste in the system (this would include plastic bottles). 13 per cent felt there would be an increase in their costs. However, there were high levels of uncertainty around this question.
27. The Board is asked to consider DRS and how it could best work with existing local government services.

Key Issue: Consistency and Performance

28. If a reformed EPR system leads to a significant increase in the financial contributions from producers, it is highly likely that they will expect specific outcomes from their investment. These are likely to focus around consistency and performance. It would be helpful for the Board to consider whether there is a sector held view on delivering specific outcomes. Some of the key issues could potentially be
- 28.1.A national expectation that the sector collect an agreed set of materials i.e. all councils pick up 6 agreed types of material
 - 28.2.Nationally consistent recycling services – so that the public knows which item goes in which bin across the country
 - 28.3.Collection of food waste – currently not delivered by all councils due to cost implications
 - 28.4.Improvement in recycling rates for lower performing councils – potentially a specific focus on the shared issues of the lower performer
 - 28.5.Modulated fees – recognising better performers to act as an incentive
 - 28.6.A national communication strategy – funded by the producers contributions
 - 28.7.Stronger compliance monitoring and enforcement of councils – who would do this?
 - 28.8.Lower levels of litter as producers are dealing with their packaging waste
 - 28.9.More processing carried out in the UK – which may impact on the waste contracts a council can let.
29. The position of the Board has been to support councils in being able to deliver the waste and recycling services they deem to be appropriate for their local communities. The Board has also reiterated that significant change cannot be delivered without additional resources. There are regular questions posed by Government, the media and the public as to why recycling is not more standardised. The issue remains that the materials entering the waste stream are not standardised and therefore it makes it challenging to offer a standard collection system. Recycling facilities vary in nature and location across the country as there is no national strategy for where they should be located, or what

14 December 2018

services they should be providing. Councils therefore are not able to offer a standardised system as their recycle will not be dealt with in a standardised manner. There is an opportunity for us to make the case for the rationalisation and recyclability of packaging more strongly now, but the quid pro quo may be that we are then asked to deliver greater consistency on our collections in order to access additional funds. Members may want to consider how these changing dynamics impact on the Board's position.

30. In the recent LGA survey 64 per cent of councils said that their existing services mapped onto one of the WRAPs consistency frameworks¹⁰. 17 per cent said that their services didn't map onto one of the frameworks but of this group 31 per cent would consider moving towards one of the frameworks in the future.
31. The Board is asked to consider how we should engage in any discussions around consistency and performance. Are there any key points that need to be made.

Implications for Wales

32. Waste and recycling services in Wales are a devolved function. We have been working closely with the Welsh LGA to share learning and will consult them once the consultations have been published.

Financial implications

33. These will become clear once the consultation documents have been published.

Next Steps

34. The publication of the Resources and Waste strategy will be very significant for local government. It will lead to debate about some of the most significant waste and recycling issues which will impact on our sector for years to come. We ask the Government to ensure that any consultation process which takes place is genuine in its approach to involve local government and provides ample opportunity for meaningful debate. Members will receive a full update on progress related to the Resources and Waste strategy at the next meeting.

¹⁰ <http://www.wrap.org.uk/collections-and-reprocessing/consistency>

Homelessness prevention

Purpose of report

For direction.

Summary

The Board's 2018/19 work programme contains the objective to 'reduce homelessness by continuing to work with councils and government to ensure that the implementation of the Homelessness Reduction Act is effective and sustainable; continue to lobby government for reforms reducing homelessness and the pressure on councils and their provision of TA, including adapting welfare reforms to reduce likelihood of homelessness; and influence policy on rough sleeping, particularly in terms of prevention'.

This paper sets out a proposed project for achieving this objective.

Recommendation

That the Environment, Economy, Housing and Transport Board gives direction for LGA policy work on homelessness prevention.

Action

Officers to progress as directed by members.

Contact officer:	Priya Thethi	Nick Porter
Position:	Adviser	Senior Adviser
Phone no:	02076643015	0207 664 3113
Email:	priya.thethi@local.gov.uk	nick.porter@local.gov.uk

Homelessness prevention

Background

1. This paper sets out our proposal for influencing policy on homelessness and rough sleeping, with a focus on a prevention-focused, council-led approach.
2. The scale of the challenge currently facing local authorities makes this piece of work particularly timely: councils are currently providing temporary housing to almost 80,000 households, including 125,000 children¹. The number of people sleeping rough on our streets has more than doubled to 4,751 since 2010² – the highest levels recorded since the years prior to the introduction of the Rough Sleepers' Initiative.
3. As well as a severe human cost, homelessness also carries high and rising financial costs for councils. To stand still and deliver the same homelessness services currently being provided – for which funding has been significantly reduced in recent years – councils would need an additional £113 million by 2019/20³. Beyond this point, there is no clarity over funding levels for councils, hampering meaningful efforts to tackle homelessness.
4. In recent years the Board has successfully influenced homelessness policy and practice in a number of ways. For example, it has successfully lobbied for the adaptation of some welfare reforms, the Government's Rough Sleeping Strategy which includes an additional £100 million for initiatives, and for changes to the Homelessness Reduction Act and its subsequent review (now underway). The LGA has also offered a range of support to councils, for instance via the Housing Advisers Programme, and through a range of advice and good practice, for instance on providing temporary accommodation.

Aim

5. There is now a real need and opportunity, in the lead up to a Government homelessness strategy and the 2019 Spending Review, to set out a positive well-evidenced case for enabling councils to end homelessness by preventing it happening in the first place.

¹ MHCLG, *Statutory homelessness and homelessness prevention and relief; Temporary accommodation tables January to March 2018*, Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/721296/Temporary_accommodation_tables.xlsx

² MHCLG, *Rough sleeping statistics, England autumn 2017*, Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/682006/Tables_1_and_2a_2b_2c_-_revised.xlsx

³ Local Government Association, September 2018, *Moving the conversation on: LGA Autumn Budget Submission to HM Treasury*, Available at: <https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Moving%20the%20conversation%20on%20-%20LGA%20Autumn%20Budget%20Submission%202018.pdf>

6. The aim of this project is therefore to produce a case for funding and policy reform that better enables councils to end homelessness. This will be developed via a programme of engagement with councils and partners, the commissioning of further investigation and research where necessary, and presented as a final report outlining a set of asks of central government, evidenced using good practice in local authorities.
7. The LGA already has strong policy propositions for how to address some of the drivers of homelessness, such as increasing the supply of suitable affordable housing and adapting welfare reforms. It is proposed we continue to develop the detail of this argument by, for instance, continuing to make the case for councils to provide affordable homes, and working with the LGA Resources Board to influence the progress of welfare reforms such as the Government's review of the Local Housing Allowance post 2020.
8. Furthermore, our recent engagement with councils has highlighted two other fundamental issues that are not being sufficiently considered by Government or partners in the homelessness sector, and on which the LGA is uniquely placed to develop a strong position. This includes:
 - 8.1. Ensuring councils have financial sustainability and certainty over the long-term in order to prevent and relieve homelessness for all - In the context of significant overall budget reductions and increasing demand for councils, the Government has chosen to invest in homelessness through a proliferation of national schemes with short term funding envelopes, creating fragmentation and uncertainty that is not conducive to tackling homelessness, or to allowing councils to create and deliver a long-term plan for preventing it. Councils are also reporting the inadequacy of funding for the Homelessness Reduction Act.
 - 8.2. Requiring other public sector agencies to play their full role in homelessness prevention and relief - Housing stress and homeless is complex and can create and reinforce other issues, which makes effective cooperation with other services critical for achieving good outcomes for all. While the new Homelessness Reduction Act includes new duties on partners to refer households onto councils, it does not include a duty to cooperate and so risks shunting more pressure onto councils, rather than enabling 'whole-systems' approaches best able to deal with the individual factors which make homelessness likely.

Issues

9. Below we have proposed a framework outlining the areas around which the project might be organised.
10. Defining homelessness prevention: This chapter will set out the framework for the report's analysis, defining what is meant by the different types of homelessness prevention (see point 14, below).

11. Defining the scale of homelessness: This will involve analysing national and local-authority data to draw conclusions about trends in, and causes of, homelessness in England. It will draw on data which has already published, including government statistics and reports from homelessness providers; we will also conduct fresh analysis using returns from local authorities following the implementation of the Homelessness Reduction Act.
12. The current policy environment: This chapter will summarise the recent legislative and policy framework for homelessness prevention. It will also set out an analysis of the fragmentation in homelessness prevention funding and services, highlighting inefficiencies such as gaps and duplication.
13. The following chapters will define the different types of homelessness prevention activities, and analyse trends in provision. We will consult local authorities to understand the barriers to prevention, collate evidence – primary and secondary – of best practice in prevention, and set out policy recommendations.
14. Universal prevention – This encompasses measures which reduce the risk of homelessness amongst the general population, e.g. an increase in the supply of affordable housing, poverty reduction measures
15. Targeted prevention – these interventions focus on people at a high potential risk of homelessness because of their characteristics, e.g. care leavers, people who have suffered childhood trauma
16. Crisis prevention – interventions which take place during the 56 day period during which someone is legally considered to be “threatened with homelessness”
17. Emergency prevention – these interventions focus on people who are immediate risk of homelessness, e.g. No First Night Out for people sleeping rough; Nightstop for young homeless people
18. Recovery prevention – here, measures are focused on preventing repeat or chronic homelessness, e.g. rapid rehousing

Implications for Wales

19. This policy area is devolved, and therefore this report’s recommendations will relate only to England.

Financial Implications

20. In the 2018/19 financial year, funding will be taken from the total amount allocated towards housing.

Next steps

21. To take forward as directed by the Board.

Environment, Economy, Housing & Transport Board Update Paper December 2018

Purpose of report

For information.

Summary

An update of the policy work that has been carried out over the summer for the Environment, Economy, Housing & Transport Board. As discussed in the recent Lead Members meeting, there is an update on Grenfell and building safety.

Recommendation

That members note the contents of the report.

Action

Officers to take forward any member comments for future policy work.

Contact officer: Eamon Lally
Position: Principal Policy Adviser
Phone no: 02076643132
Email: Eamon.Lally@local.gov.uk

Environment, Economy, Housing & Transport Board Update Paper December 2018

Building safety

Grenfell Update

1. Since the Board's last update on building safety, the government has made a range of announcements related to the national building safety programme. This paper updates the Board on the government's announcements and associated LGA work related to fire safety in high-rise buildings.
2. Response to the final report of the independent review of building regulations and fire safety (The Hackitt Review)
 - 2.1. In MHCLG's response to publication of the final report from the independent review of building regulations and fire safety, the department indicated it would be consulting on banning the use of combustible materials on the external walls of high-rise residential buildings. Following this consultation, the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government announced on 1 October that the government would be banning the use of combustible materials on the external walls of high-rise residential buildings. Details of the ban were published on 28 November as amendments to the building regulations, and the ban will take effect from 21 December 2018.
 - 2.2. In addition to the consultation on banning the use of combustible materials, MHCLG published a revised version of the guidance on how to meet the fire safety requirements of the building regulations – Approved Document B – on 19 July. The consultation on this guidance closed in October, and the government intends to follow this with a wider technical review of the building regulations in Autumn.
 - 2.3. The LGA has continued to engage with MHCLG officials as they develop the government's response to the recommendations in Dame Judith Hackitt's final report. The focus of this work has been on developing proposals on how the new Joint Competent Authority (JCA) recommended in the Hackitt Review could function, and has involved discussions with the NFCC, Local Authority Building Control, and latterly the Health and Safety Executive, as well as MHCLG. There is an on-going dialogue with MHCLG about how these key regulators and the LGA can work together and with the future JCA.
 - 2.4. MHCLG intends to publish a full plan for its implementation of the recommendations in Dame Judith's report in Autumn 2018.

14 December 2018

Other building safety issues

Progress in remediation work

3. Progress continues to be made in carrying out remediation to the council and housing association-owned blocks with combinations of aluminium composite material (ACM) cladding and insulation that have been found not to meet the building regulation standards.
4. The statistics published by MHCLG on the 6 December show that remediation has started on 116, or just over three-quarters, of the 160 social housing blocks. Work has finished on 34 of these buildings, and in the case of the council blocks the cladding has already been removed from a significant majority, with the work underway to remove it from the remaining buildings.

Private high-rise buildings

Data collection

5. While those social housing high-rise blocks with ACM cladding systems were identified last year, councils' work to identify private high-rise residential buildings with ACM cladding has taken a number of months. This is because they have had to gather information on over 6,000 buildings. The deadline for gathering this information was the end of May, and the results were first published in the data released by MHCLG at the end of June 2018.
6. Updated data published by MHCLG in December showed there are 272 private high-rise buildings with ACM cladding. So far remediation work has begun on 18 of the private high-rise buildings with ACM cladding, and has been completed on 29 of them.

Secretary of State's announcements

7. With remediation work currently underway on only a small number of these private high-rise buildings, the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government set out how the government would drive swifter progress by building owners in removing unsafe cladding in a statement at the end of June, followed by another statement at the end of November. The packages of measures in the June statement included:
 - 7.1. The establishment of a new taskforce to oversee the remediation programme on these private high-rise residential buildings, chaired by ministers and including the LGA, the NFCC, London Councils and local authorities with large numbers of these blocks as well as industry representatives.
 - 7.2. The convening of a joint inspection team by the LGA and the NFCC to help councils ensure building owners start remediation work on those private high-rise residential buildings with ACM cladding, and where necessary are supported to take

14 December 2018

enforcement action. £1 million will be made available to support enforcement action by councils.

- 7.3. The development of further statutory guidance by MHCLG to make it easier for councils to use their powers under the Housing Health and Safety Rating System (HHSRS) in relation to fire safety hazards posed by ACM cladding systems.
 - 7.4. Inviting industry representatives to develop their own solutions that progress the removal of unsafe cladding while protecting leaseholders from the costs. At the same time MHCLG said they would consider a range of other options if the industry does not provide solutions.
8. The November announcement updated on the above, and included the following additional measures of interest:
- 8.1. A new programme of soil testing in and around the Grenfell site, to take place alongside existing air quality monitoring which has been in place since the fire.
 - 8.2. A commitment to provide financial support for local authorities to take enforcement action against building owners who refuse to remediate unsafe ACM cladding. Support will be limited to compensation for works undertaken in default, and will be provided on the basis that local authorities seek to recover costs from private sector building owners.

Private sector remediation taskforce

9. The private sector remediation taskforce meeting has met twice since the last Board meeting. It has received updates on progress with the remediation of the private high-rise residential buildings with ACM, and heard from councils in London and the North West about the issues they have faced with ensuring building owners take action to remove ACM cladding systems.

Joint Inspection Team

10. The plans for the Joint Inspection Team discussed at the private sector remediation taskforce drew heavily on the proposal for such a team developed by London Councils and the LGA at the start of the year. Our preparatory work identified the skills and experience such a team would need, and the processes it will need to work through under the Housing Act and the HHSRS. We also suggested to MHCLG officials that the work of such a team would be assisted by changes to the HHSRS statutory guidance in relation to the fire safety hazards posed by ACM cladding.
11. The Joint Inspection Team will be run by the LGA, but paid for by MHCLG, and will report to the Private Sector Remediation Taskforce, chaired by the Minister for Housing.

14 December 2018

We have concluded discussions with MHCLG about the size of the team and costs, and intend to swiftly commence recruitment to the team. However, recruitment has not been able to proceed as swiftly as had originally been hoped, due to issues related to the professional indemnity of the team.

12. Once these issues are resolved, we will be contacting local authority chief executives to highlight the existence of the team and ask whether any of their environmental health officers could be seconded into the team.

Statutory guidance on powers under the Housing Health and Safety Rating System

13. The LGA, London Councils and the National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) worked closely with MHCLG on the drafting of this guidance. This involved seeking the views of environmental health officers and their testing of the new approach to ensure it is as robust as possible. The Housing Act requires any HHSRS guidance to be considered by Parliament before it can be used; the guidance was laid before Parliament on 28 November, and will be under consideration for a period of 40 days. It will be available for use by councils early in 2019.

Budget Highlights for EEHT

Housing Revenue Account, Housing Infrastructure Fund, strategic housing deals

14. The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) cap has been abolished from 29 October 2018 in England. (Page 62, paragraph 4.56)
15. The Housing Infrastructure Fund will increase by £500 million to a total £5.5 billion. (Page 62, paragraph 4.56)
16. The government will make £10 million capacity funding available to support ambitious housing deals with authorities in areas of high housing demand to deliver above their Local Housing Need. (Page 63, paragraph 4.60)

Accelerating housing delivery

17. Alongside the Budget, Sir Oliver Letwin has [published](#) his independent review. The Government will respond to the review in full in February 2019. (Page 62, paragraph 4.57)

Land value uplift

18. The Government is simplifying the process for setting a higher zonal Community Infrastructure Levy in areas of high land value uplift, and removing all restrictions on Section 106 pooling towards a single piece of infrastructure.

14 December 2018

19. The Government will also introduce a Strategic Infrastructure Tariff for Combined Authorities and joint planning committees with strategic planning powers. (Page 63, paragraph 4.59)

Planning

20. The Government has launched a consultation on new permitted development rights to allow upwards extensions above commercial premises and residential properties, including blocks of flats, and to allow commercial buildings to be demolished and replaced with homes. (Page 63, paragraph 4.58)
21. The Government will provide £8.5 million of resource support so that up to 500 parishes can allocate or permission land for homes sold at a discount (Page 64, paragraph 4.63)

Environment Plastic packaging

22. The government will reform the Packaging Producer Responsibility System, which will aim to increase producer responsibility for the costs of their packaging waste, including plastic. (Page 28, paragraph 3.56)

Economy: Highstreets

23. As part of Our Plan for the High Street and alongside changes to business rates, the government will launch a new Future High Streets Fund to invest £675 million in England to support local areas to develop and fund plans to make their high streets and town centres fit for the future. It will include £55 million for heritage-based regeneration. (Page 67, paragraph 4.76). The Government will consult on creating a more flexible and responsive 'change of use' regime with new Permitted Development Rights. It will also trial a register of empty shops with selected local authorities. (Page 67, paragraph 4.77)
24. The government is cutting Business Rates by one-third for retail properties with a rateable value below £51,000 for 2 years from April 2019. Local authorities will be fully compensated. (Page 46, paragraph 3.33- 3.37)

Transport

25. National Roads Fund – The government is hypothecating English Vehicle Excise Duty to roads spending, announcing that the National Roads Fund will be £28.8 billion between 2020-25. £25.3 billion will be the maximum allocated to Highways England. £3.5bn will be made available to councils for important local routes. See draft Roads Investment Strategy 2 [here](#) (Page 55, paragraph 4.8-4.9)
26. The government will allocate £420 million to local authorities in 2018-19 to tackle potholes, repair damaged roads. The government will also make £150 million of NPIF funding available to local authorities for small improvement projects. (Page 55, paragraph 4.10)

14 December 2018

27. Transforming Cities Fund extension – As part of the NPIF, the government is extending the Transforming Cities Fund by a year to 2022-23. This will provide an extra £240 million to the six metro mayors for significant transport investment. A further £440 million will be made available to the city regions shortlisted for competitive funding. (Page 55, paragraph 4.11)
28. Transforming Cities Fund: Future Mobility Zones – To support the Industrial Strategy Future of Mobility Grand Challenge, £90 million from the NPIF will be allocated to the Transforming Cities Fund to create Future Mobility Zones. (Page 55, paragraph 4.12)

Spending review

29. A Spending Review is a semi-regular exercise by the Treasury which delivers funding settlements, or department expenditure limits, to all Government departments for a set number of years. This includes a department expenditure limit for local government which is included as a sub-heading within the MHCLG expenditure limit. This does not necessarily include all funding for local government as it will exclude some funding that is routed through other departments.
30. The 2019 Spending Review will set funding totals starting from 2020/21. It is not clear at this stage how many years it will cover.
31. We don't have a date for the Spending review but it could be as late as Autumn 2019.
32. In preparation the LGA is undertaking the following work.
 - 32.1. Work to project the funding gap to 2025
 - 32.2. Building an evidence base of increased local government efficiency, as well as evidence of good investment
 - 32.3. A range of engagement work and media messaging in the lead up to the development of our SR submission and subsequent to its publication.

Fly Tipping

33. For the 2017/18 year, local authorities in England dealt with just under 1 million (998,000) fly-tipping incidents, a slight decrease of 1 per cent from the 1,011,000 reported in 2016/17, following annual increases since 2013/14. There were 494,000 enforcement actions carried out in England in 2017/18, a 4 per cent increase (of 18,000 actions) since 2016/17. The number of fixed penalty notices issued has increased, up 20 per cent to 69,000 from 2016/17 and up 91 per cent on 2015/16.
34. This is the second most common enforcement action (after investigations), and accounted for 14 per cent of all enforcement actions in 2017/18. This year Defra have

only published data on the cost of clearing large fly-tipping incidents (equivalent to a tipper lorry load). This was £12.2 million compared with £9.9 million in 2016/17. Defra have not published a figure on the total cost this year due to concerns over the quality of the data. For more information [here](#).

14 December 2019

Note of last Environment, Economy, Housing & Transport Board meeting

Title: Environment, Economy, Housing & Transport Board
Date: Friday 12 October 2018
Venue: Smith Square 3&4, Ground Floor, 18 Smith Square, London, SW1P 3HZ

Attendance

An attendance list is attached as **Appendix A** to this note

Item Decisions and actions

1 Welcome, Apologies, Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

2 Terms of Reference, Membership and Appointments to Outside Bodies

A query was raised as to the reason National Fly-tipping Prevention Group was suggested as becoming officer led.

Hillary Tanner, Senior Adviser, explained that as the group had become more focused on the procedural side of fly-tipping officers view was that this was no longer good use of members time. Hillary emphasised that the groups work was technical, it was not very strategic and that Councils represented on the group send waste or enforcement officers as opposed to their elected members.

The Chairman emphasised that fly-tipping should be revisited by the Board latter in the year.

Decision

The Environment, Economy, Housing and Transport Board:

- i. agreed its Terms of Reference (**Appendix A**);
- ii. formally noted the membership for 2017/18 (**Appendix B**);
- iii. noted the Board meeting dates for 2017/18 (**Appendix C**); and
- iv. agreed the Board's nominations to outside bodies (**Appendix D**).

3 Social Housing Green Paper

The Chairman welcomed Jane Everton, Deputy Director at the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, to the meeting of the Board.

Nick Porter, Senior Adviser, introduced the report and highlighted that the Prime Minister's announcement at the Conservative Party Conference that the HRA borrowing cap would be removed was a real victory for the LGA. He emphasised that this had been an LGA priority and focus of sustained lobbying since it was introduced in 2012. He also raised that there was a lot of work across the sector to demonstrate what lifting the HRA borrowing cap will mean and that it was anticipated that more details would be presented as part of the Chancellor's Budget.

Jane Everton, gave a presentation on her views on the Social Housing Green Paper. In particular she emphasised the role the Grenfell tragedy played in developing the Social Housing Green Paper and the need to acknowledge there are many further issues that need to be addressed coming out this. She also highlighted that 14 events were held across the country, where Ministers engaged with a range of residents including social housing tenants, with the aim of these events informing the Social Housing Green Paper. She also explained the Social Housing Green Paper would be in four chapters, of which the first three focus on experience including recommendations from the Hackett Review. The fourth chapter was focused on the stigma around social housing.

In the discussion that followed, the following points were raised;

- Following a query on whether there will be a review of decent home standards, Jane emphasised that whether decent home standards should be changed will be considered once they receive further information following the green paper.
- A concern was raised that central government need to consider a national standard on what a housing unit looks like.
- Jane encouraged Members continue to give evidence with their consultation responses.
- In response to a query an MHCLG official confirmed that Housing Association right to buy decisions would be evaluated in detail.
- In response to a query, Jane confirmed there was not yet a date for the spending review.
- In response to concerns raised about stigma, Jane emphasised the best course of action we can take is to continue to talk positively about social housing. Jane also highlighted that this has been acknowledged by government.

The Chairman gave thanks to Jane Everton for her presentation and invited Members to discuss the confidential draft LGA responses to the Social Housing Green Paper and Right to Buy consultations.

In the discussion that followed, the following points were raised:

- Views were expressed that the lifting of the HRA borrowing cap was a positive direction of travel.
- A view was expressed that really increasing the Social Housing supply would be crucial going forwards.
- The Chairman congratulated officers for their work, and emphasised the importance of local authorities getting back into the market and meeting the demand now the HRA borrowing cap has been lifted.
- The importance of homes being fully insulated was also raised.
- A view was expressed that the stigma on social housing was in part caused by under supply of social housing stock.

Decision

The Environment, Economy, Housing and Transport Board;

- provided direction and comments to incorporate into the submission on the Social

- Housing Green Paper; and
- agreed the consultation response on Right To Buy.

Action

Officers to incorporate Members comments into the submission on the Social Housing Green Paper.

Officers to submit consultation response on Right To Buy – as agreed by Members.

4 Town centre revitalisation

Cllr Graham Galpin, Portfolio Holder for Corporate Property at Ashford Borough Council, was invited by the Chair to speak to the Board. Cllr Galpin explained he was one of the eight members of the expert panel tasked to diagnose issues that currently affect the health of our high streets and advise on the best practical measures to help them thrive now and in the future. He also explained he was present to update the Board the work of the panel, take feedback from Board members, and share his view of local government's role.

In the following presentation, Cllr Galpin informed the Board of the following;

- That he had been chosen to take this position following the success of Ashford high street.
- He expressed a view that local authorities should take a leadership role in the revitalisation of local town centres.
- He advised local authorities appoint town centre portfolio holders or champions.
- He emphasised the importance of a Town Strategic Board in bringing key funders together and for place changing decision making.
- He highlighted that local authorities need to act fast to prevent high streets decaying.
- He also suggested it would be beneficial to have incentives put in place to turn retail into accommodation.

The Chairman invited Alan Harris, Partner at Montagu Evans, to also share his expertise on how local government can maximise its influence and control of important town centre assets.

In the following presentation, Alan Harris informed the Board of the following;

- He informed the Board that he had worked with around one hundred local authorities across the country.
- He emphasised the impact generational differences would have on our high streets.
- He advised that local authorities and local businesses needed to think about what is unique about their town.
- He highlighted the Grimsey Review as evidencing the need for a focus on place.
- The need for more people working in town centres and more agile co-working spaces.
- He advised local authorities put together a plan and know their targets.
- Regarding how local authorities can best control change – need to build relationships with local businesses etc.
- Consider different perceptions and change perceptions.

In the discussion that followed, the following points were raised:

- Alan highlighted that it would be important for Councillors to communicate the need

- to be less focused on retail in high streets going forwards.
- Concerns were raised as to the collapse of town centres in regions secondary towns.
 - The work done in Blackpool's city centre was raised as a prominent example of high street regeneration.
 - A view was expressed that a review of parking charges could help fund struggling high streets.
 - A view was expressed it would be helpful to ascertain if there is a difference for town centres reliant on more independents.

The Chairman thanked the speakers for a fascinating discussion, and suggested that visits to key examples of town centre revitalisation would be beneficial for the Board.

Decisions

The Environment, Economy, Housing and Transport Board considered the views of invited experts and gave a steer on the future work of the LGA in this area.

Actions

Officers to plan and organise visits for those Members who are interested to see town centre revitalisation projects across the country.

5 Board priorities and work programme 2018/19

The Chairman introduced the report setting out draft priorities for the Board together with a draft work programme for the period to July 2019.

In the discussion that followed, Members asked the following be included in the Board priorities and work programme;

- a greater emphasis on building communities in the planning section of the work programme;
- further emphasis on the viability of housing; and
- the importance of infrastructure alongside housing developments to be emphasised in the housing section of the work programme.

Decision

The Board considered and agreed a final version of the Board's priorities and work Programme.

Action

Officers to incorporate Members comments into the Board priorities and work programme.

6 Update paper

The Chairman introduced the update of the policy work that has been carried out over the summer for the Environment, Economy, Housing & Transport Board. He particularly brought Members attention to the updates on the impact on Chinese restrictions on waste imports and the importance of this issue.

Regarding Members interest in the current position with incinerators Eamon Lally, Principal Policy Adviser, emphasised that more would come out on this in the waste strategy. In the discussion that followed, Members also expressed an interest in an update on the waste strategy at the next meeting of the Board.

Decision

Members noted the contents of the report.

Actions

Officers to ensure the December EEHT Board meeting focuses on Waste.

7 Minutes of the previous meeting

The Environment, Economy, Housing and Transport Board agreed the minutes of the last meeting.

Appendix A -Attendance

Position/Role	Councillor	Authority
Chairman	Cllr Martin Tett	Buckinghamshire County Council
Deputy-chairman	Cllr Adele Morris	Southwark Council
	Cllr Rachel Eburne	Mid Suffolk District Council
Members	Cllr Patrick Nicholson	Plymouth City Council
	Cllr Catherine Rankin	Kent County Council
	Cllr David Renard	Swindon Borough Council
	Cllr Barry Wood	Cherwell District Council
	Cllr Tony Newman	Croydon Council
	Cllr Ed Turner	Oxford City Council
	Cllr Rachel Blake	Tower Hamlets Council
	Cllr Gillian Campbell	Blackpool Council
	Cllr Michael Mordey	Sunderland City Council
	Mayor Philip Glanville	Hackney London Borough Council
	Cllr Peter Thornton	Cumbria County Council
	Cllr Linda Gillham	Runnymede Borough Council
Apologies	Cllr Ainsley Arnold	Cheshire East Council
	Cllr Simon Dudley	Windsor & Maidenhead Royal Borough
	Cllr Louise Goldsmith	West Sussex County Council
	Cllr Judith Blake CBE	Leeds City Council

LGA location map

Local Government Association
 18 Smith Square
 London SW1P 3HZ

Tel: 020 7664 3131
 Fax: 020 7664 3030
 Email: info@local.gov.uk
 Website: www.local.gov.uk

Public transport

18 Smith Square is well served by public transport. The nearest mainline stations are: Victoria and Waterloo: the local underground stations are **St James's Park** (Circle and District Lines), **Westminster** (Circle, District and Jubilee Lines), and **Pimlico** (Victoria Line) - all about 10 minutes walk away.

Buses 3 and 87 travel along Millbank, and the 507 between Victoria and Waterloo stops in Horseferry Road close to Dean Bradley Street.

Bus routes – Horseferry Road

- 507** Waterloo - Victoria
- C10** Canada Water - Pimlico - Victoria
- 88** Camden Town - Whitehall - Westminster - Pimlico - Clapham Common

Bus routes – Millbank

- 87** Wandsworth - Aldwych
- 3** Crystal Palace - Brixton - Oxford Circus

For further information, visit the Transport for London website at www.tfl.gov.uk

Cycling facilities

The nearest Barclays cycle hire racks are in Smith Square. Cycle racks are also available at 18 Smith Square. Please telephone the LGA on 020 7664 3131.

Central London Congestion Charging Zone

18 Smith Square is located within the congestion charging zone.

For further details, please call 0845 900 1234 or visit the website at www.cclondon.com

Car parks

- Abingdon Street Car Park (off Great College Street)
- Horseferry Road Car Park Horseferry Road/Arneway Street. Visit the website at www.westminster.gov.uk/parking

