

From: [RUNECKLES, Ian](#)
To: [Tempest Amy](#)
Cc: [Jonathan Hartnett](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: Avery Hill - s106 bus contribution - LPA ref: 20/1660/F
Date: 19 July 2021 15:20:56
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[University of Greenwich - 08.07.2021_THL_149034229_1.DOCX](#)
[Comparite_THL_149050103_1.PDF](#)
Importance: High

Hi Amy

I hope that you are keeping well and enjoying the sun.

Jonathan at Greenwich has been in touch to say that TfL has provided further comments on the attached draft s106 (with comparite). I'm a bit surprised as I thought we'd agreed the TfL rider on 1 June.

The programme for the project has severely overrun due to planning delays and we need to get the s106 finalised by the end of this week. The TfL issues are the only outstanding matters.

In summary:

- The AM and PM peak periods should be 60 minutes. It does not seem reasonable to us to include after school clubs. We haven't done so on other projects and the Transport Assessment etc have all been predicated on AM and PM peak periods of 60 minutes duration. Once the peak period starts to drift towards commuting times, we could find ourselves in the position of a handful of Avery Hill school children boarding a bus and tipping it over capacity and triggering a significant payment for an additional bus service, when the children only make up a small percentage of passengers on that service.
- The deletion of "used by students of the School" in the definition of Route should be reinserted as the trigger for the "Bus Services Contribution" is based on the "Excess Load" being triggered, which is a combination of "Non- School Passengers + SP", SP= the number of pupils of the School on the bus at each stop (derived from the Adjusted School Patronage Date) on the Route. The "Route(s)" should be restricted to bus routes used by the students of the School as the contribution is required to mitigate the impact of the Development (ie the School) and if students of the School are not using the Route(s) then the "Combined Passenger Number" would not be achieved as you would simply be looking at a figure of the NSP only and the School should not be required to pay a contribution for an "Excess Load" triggered by the NSP only.
- In terms of the amendments to paragraph 6.3, we have made minor amendments so that it clarifies when payment is to be made when there is an error or when the calculation is correct. Please note we have deleted "save that paragraph 6.3 will not be subject to paragraph 7" from paragraph 7.3 as we assume the Council and TfL are restricting the process set out in paragraph 7 to a single attempt, which would mean if an administrative error was made in the updated Bus Services Contribution Demand, we would not have an opportunity to challenge this. We have inserted para 8 as para 7.4 as this is part of the process triggered under paragraph 7. Also, we have deleted para 8.2 as we believe requiring us to pay the Bus Services Contribution within 10 days is onerous and have extended this to 28 days from receipt of the Council's notice as set out in paragraph 6.3.3.

Given the urgency of the above, can we set up a roundtable meeting to discuss further in the next day or so?

Many thanks, Ian

Ian Runeckles MRTPI

Regional Planning Lead (South London), Planning Team, Free Schools Capital
Capital Directorate | Operations Group | Department for Education

Fifth Floor | Sanctuary Buildings | 20 Great Smith Street
Westminster | London | SW1P 3BT
E: [REDACTED]@education.gov.uk
M: [REDACTED]
Web: www.education.gov.uk



Department
for Education