

## London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee – 10 October 2019

Minutes of a meeting of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee held on Thursday 10 October at 2:30pm in the Conference Suite, London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL

### Present:

| Council                | Councillor                       |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Barking and Dagenham   | Cllr Syed Ghani                  |
| Barnet                 | <b>Apologies</b>                 |
| Bexley                 | <b>Apologies</b>                 |
| Brent                  | Cllr Krupa Sheth                 |
| Bromley                | Cllr William Huntington-Thresher |
| Camden                 |                                  |
| Croydon                | Cllr Paul Scott (Deputy)         |
| Ealing                 | Cllr Julian Bell (Chair)         |
| Enfield                |                                  |
| Greenwich              | Cllr Denise Scott-McDonald       |
| Hackney                | Cllr Jon Burke                   |
| Hammersmith and Fulham |                                  |
| Haringey               | Cllr Kirsten Hearn               |
| Harrow                 | Cllr Chloe Smith (Deputy)        |
| Havering               |                                  |
| Hillingdon             |                                  |
| Hounslow               |                                  |
| Islington              | Cllr Claudia Webbe               |
| Kensington and Chelsea |                                  |
| Kingston Upon Thames   | Cllr Hilary Gander               |
| Lambeth                | Cllr Jackie Meldrum (Deputy)     |
| Lewisham               | <b>Apologies</b>                 |
| Merton                 | Cllr Martin Whelton              |
| Newham                 | Cllr James Asser                 |
| Redbridge              | <b>Apologies</b>                 |
| Richmond Upon Thames   | Cllr Martin Elengorn (Deputy)    |
| Southwark              | Cllr Richard Livingstone         |
| Sutton                 | Cllr Manuel Abellan              |
| Tower Hamlets          | Cllr David Edgard                |
| Waltham Forest         | Cllr Clyde Loakes                |
| Wandsworth             | Cllr Richard Field               |
| City of Westminster    | Cllr Tim Mitchell                |
| City of London         | <b>Apologies</b>                 |
| Transport for London   | Alex Williams                    |

## **1. Apologies for Absence & Announcement of Deputies**

### Apologies:

Cllr Dean Cohen (LB Barnet)  
Cllr Peter Craske (LB Bexley)  
Cllr Stuart King (LB Croydon)  
Cllr Varsha Parmar (LB Harrow)  
Cllr Claire Holland (LB Lambeth)  
Cllr Brenda Dacres (LB Lewisham)  
Cllr John Howard (LB Redbridge)  
Cllr Alex Ehmann (LB Richmond)  
Alastair Moss (City of London)

### Deputies:

Cllr Paul Scott (LB Croydon)  
Cllr Chloe Smith (LB Harrow)  
Cllr Jackie Meldrum (LB Lambeth)  
Cllr Martin Elengorn (LB Richmond)

## **2. Declaration of Interests (additional to those not on the supplied sheet)**

### 60+ Oyster & Freedom Pass

It was noted that Councillor Gander was not a holder of a Freedom Pass.

Cllr Martin Elengorn (LB Richmond)  
Cllr Jackie Meldrum (LB Lambeth)

### West London Waste Authority

Cllr Jackie Meldrum (LB Lambeth)

### East London Waste Authority

Cllr James Asser (LB Newham)

### Car Club

Cllr Denise Scott-McDonald (RB Greenwich)

## **3. Environment & Traffic Adjudicators Annual Report**

The Committee received the statutory joint Annual Report by the Environment and Traffic Adjudicators for the 2018/19 reporting year.

Caroline Hamilton, Chief Adjudicator, London Tribunals, introduced the report, and said that she was present to answer any questions that members might have. Councillor Field asked why a large number of bus lane appeals were allowed (page 9 of the report). Caroline Hamilton explained that often full evidence was not supplied by the appellants until the appeal progressed to the hearing stage. She said that the appellants were not quick at putting their full case forward at an earlier stage of the process. This was especially true if the motorist was no longer the legal owner of the vehicle in question. Caroline Hamilton said that, overall, the review process was working. The Chair thanked Caroline Hamilton for the work being carried out at London Tribunals.

**Decision:** The Committee received and noted the report.

#### **4. Crossrail Update**

This agenda item had been withdrawn. The Chair said that a Crossrail update would now be presented to TEC at the meeting on 5 December 2019.

#### **5. London Waste & Recycling Board (LWARB) 2020 Strategy**

The Committee received a report that provided members with a summary update on the London Waste and Recycling Board activities. It was suggested that London Councils' TEC would receive these updates on a six-monthly basis to improve visibility of LWARB's activities.

Liz Green, Chair of LWARB, introduced the presentation, stating that LWARB is seeking views on its next business plan and wanted to report back to members about the flats recycling work that LWARB was undertaking before handing over to Antony Buchan, Head of Programme, Resource London, who made the following comments:

##### **New Business Plan**

- LWARB was established in 2008 and had four local authority members on its Board, along with two independents, and Shirley Rodrigues, the Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy.
- Significant investment in waste infrastructure had taken place over the past 10 years. Significant support was also being provided to enable London's route to a more circular economy, with a greater focus on waste reduction.
- Part of the post 2020 focus would be to help support local authorities to tackle the climate emergency and help reduce consumption-based CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and restrict global warming to 1.5C.
- There is a £7.5 million budget to help achieve the aims of LWARB. The last funding received from Central Government was in 2015, and LWARB is now securing private sector funding.
- In order to plan for the next business planning round, key London Councils' stakeholders had been consulted, along with the Chief Executives' network and the Directors of Environment network. There was recognition of LWARB as a knowledge bank.
- LWARB was focusing on waste minimisation and delivering sustained behavioral change.
- Dialogue with London Councils' officers will continue and LWARB is considering setting up a new statutory committee to enable more borough officer input as well.
- LWARB is keen to support local authorities to reduce consumption-based emissions and to continue to work with the GLA and boroughs to minimise edible food waste and to help achieve recycling targets.
- LWARB will offer local authorities the opportunity to help residents embrace circular economy principles.
- The draft LWARB Business Plan would be presented to the Board on 31 October 2019.

##### **Flats Recycling Programme**

- A two-year project was taking place to look at how to improve recycling in flats.
- It was proving difficult to improve the recycling rates in flats, and a project was taking place in partnership between the Peabody Housing Association and six inner London boroughs. A great deal of analysis had been carried out, and a minimum flats waste standard had been tested, along with five resident focused interventions across ten estates.

- Interventions included a tenant recycling pack from the landlord, more and smaller bins and in-home storage solutions. This had all helped to increase recycling rates in flats by 22%, especially in glass and plastics.
- Key learnings for recycling in flats was that a minimum standard of service and consistency of service was needed within flats.
- The maximum dry recycling rate that could ever be achieved in flats is 32% and 60% with food, but only if 100% of everything was recycled without contamination, which was not achievable in flats.
- Another limiting factor to recycling rates in flats was the proportion of 15 to 34 year olds in flats. There was also still uncertainty over what items could and could not be recycled.
- A final report would be published at the end of November 2019, along with a toolkit.

#### Q and As

Councillor Mitchell asked whether any analysis had been carried out on old and new flats when it came to improving recycling rates. Councillor Webbe felt that there appeared to be a lack of coordination between different agencies when it came to recycling. She said that the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) was carrying out work that was not linked-up to what LWARB was doing.

Councillor Meldrum felt that there were too many different messages around when it came to recycling in flats, and it was not clear what people needed to do. She said that more consistent messages were needed throughout London. Councillor Meldrum said that social media needed to be engaged more in order to reach the 15 to 34-year old members of the public when it came to encouraging the take-up of recycling.

Councillor Edgar felt that there needed to be a shift in the measuring of targets when it came to reducing edible waste. Councillor Ghani said that recycling in flats was currently not working. He asked when the £7.5million in funding would be available to the boroughs. Councillor Scott-McDonald asked if any data was available with regards to recycling rates in old and new build flats (new build flats had a 60% higher recycling rate).

Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that the borough of Bromley was number one when it came to recycling rates in all the London boroughs. He felt that LWARB needed to include work that fed into building standards when it came to waste. Councillor Burke said that he would be happy to share the data and figures that the borough of Hackney had come up with in respect of recycling in flats. Councillor Abellan asked why 15 to 34-year olds recycled less than any other age group. He also asked what work the "hit squads" carried out.

Antony Buchan said that LWARB was working with the borough of Tower Hamlets to develop an SPG to encourage developers to think about what they could do in-house to encourage recycling. Talks around planning issues and recycling were also taking place with the borough of Hackney. Antony Buchan said that a template with regards to recycling in flats would be produced for all boroughs to use. He said that residents needed to be engaged in recycling inside their homes, or they would not bother to recycle outside their flats.

Antony Buchan said that how often the outside of flats were cleaned was an important factor when it came to recycling rates. He informed members that LWARB had a team that visited areas every two weeks, and had worked with local authorities to ensure that the bin storage area were kept clean and tidy. This can be a significant factor when it comes to an increase in recycling rates in flats. Antony Buchan said that data received from studying the 12 Peabody new build estates would be passed on to local authorities.

Antony Buchan said that coordination and consistency were both very important when it

came to increasing recycling rates. He confirmed that LWARB was using social media forums like Twitter and Snapchat to get through to the 15 to 34-year old age group to help increase recycling rates among this group. Antony Buchan said that LWARB was working closely with the North London Waste Authority with regards to waste and recycling. He confirmed that Councillor Clyde Loakes was the Chair of the Resource London Partnership Board, and resources were being made available to everyone. Antony Buchan said that it was hard to tackle consumption-based emissions. He said that pure tonnage targets were not helpful.

Antony Buchan said that LWARB had been asked by the Mayor to support local authorities to develop RRP. He said that the Mayor had requested to see every RRP before being signed-off (the GLA and the Mayor were responsible for taking the decision to sign-off). LWARB was also talking to all local authorities about making any changes to the toolkit. Antony Buchan said that “hit squads” were working with four local authorities to test the hypothesis to reduce contamination. LWARB was working in partnership with LEDNet, and results would be shared with TEC when completed.

Antony Buchan said that there were problems with recycling amongst 15 to 34-year olds, due to transiency, and more insight was needed into the behaviours of this group. He said that LWARB was trying to ascertain why the 15 to 34 age group was so difficult to reach when it came to recycling. Liz Goodwin said that the Business Plan would shape what LWARB would be focusing on, and feedback on this would be very helpful.

The Chair thanked Antony Buchan and Liz Goodwin for the comprehensive presentation.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Noted that the draft LWARB Business Plan would be presented to the Board on 31 October 2019; and
- Noted that the next LWARB update would be presented to TEC on 26 March 2020.

## **6. Chair's Report**

The Committee received a report that updated members on transport and environment activity since the last TEC meeting on 13 June 2019 and provided a forward look until the next TEC meeting on 5 December 2019.

The Chair introduced the report. He said that funding for two MRN schemes had been secured from the spending round. Assurances had also been received that the 2017/18 business plan figures for LIPs would not change in this business planning round. With regards to the proposal to change the LIPs funding formula, the Chair said that there was now agreement to delay the start date of any changes until the current 3-year LIP investment cycle ended in March 2022.

Alex Williams, Director of Borough Planning, Transport for London, confirmed that there were no changes to LIP funding at present. However, there could be some changes over the next few weeks with regards to Crossrail and a no deal Brexit.

Councillor Loakes said that he was disappointed that the World Car Free day was not mentioned in the Chair's Report, which had made a big difference to pollution levels. Councillor Field asked whether any money made from the ULEZ fines would be put back into improving air quality. He also asked what TfL was doing to educate residents and businesses with regards air quality. Alex Williams said that the ULEZ was about improving air quality and not making money. A report on the impact of the ULEZ over

the 6-month period would be presented to members in two weeks' time. Alex Williams said that there was a programme underway to clean-up London's buses and make 140 of them all electric.

Councillor Scott-McDonald felt that the public should be informed on what the money raised from the ULEZ was being spent on. Alex Williams said that this would be reflected in the TfL Business Plan when published in December 2019.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Noted that any changes to the corridor formula for borough LIP funding had been deferred until 2022. There would be no changes to LIP funding until then (subject to any external funding influences like Crossrail or a no-deal Brexit); and
- Noted the Chair's Report.

## **7. Electric Vehicle Coordination Function**

The Committee considered a report that provided members with an overview of the proposed electric vehicle (EV) coordination function activities for review and feedback.

Katharina Winbeck, Strategic Lead, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure, London Councils, introduced the report and informed members that there had been a great deal of activity in the roll out of EV infrastructure this year and in order for this to continue, a form of co-ordination function was required. She said that the role of GULCS Senior Lead was paid for up to March 2020, and it would be very beneficial for this to continue beyond this date.

Katharina Winbeck said that a report would be taken to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 14 November 2019, to get support for part funding the coordination of EV activity from TEC reserve funding. A report would then be presented to the TEC Main meeting on 5 December 2019.

Katharina Winbeck said that in order for London Councils to host the coordination function, boroughs needed to sign the and send in their amendment to the LCTEC Agreement as soon as possible. The following boroughs had still not sent in their amendment: Bexley, Brent, Bromley, Greenwich, Hammersmith & Fulham, Haringey, Havering, Hillingdon, Kensington & Chelsea, Lambeth, Newham, Southwark, Sutton, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest and the City of London. The Chair said that he would be happy to send the outstanding boroughs a reminder letter.

Councillor Field said that it was important to not let the programme slip. Katharina Winbeck acknowledged that and stated that as soon as all applications for funding had been received by the deadline of 31 October 2019, officers will look at ways of speeding up the decision process to give boroughs certainty of funding more quickly.

Councillor Webbe said that the borough of Islington had signed the amendment to the TEC Agreement back in September 2018. She said that the outstanding boroughs now needed to send in their signed amendments in order for the GULCS programme to be extended beyond 2020. Councillor Webbe said that 400 charge points were needed by 2020, with lamp post charges being the most effective. She said that the GULCS Senior Lead role had been very helpful. Consistency across boroughs was required to help deliver the programme. Councillor Webbe felt that legislation needed to be introduced to ensure that residents were not at a disadvantage by moving towards EVs. Councillor Burke said that a rapid roll-out of EV charge points was needed. Katharina Winbeck said that the process now needed to be sped-up. She said that there were uncertainties

regarding future funding of EV infrastructure (beyond the current GULCS programme).

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Agreed that relevant TEC members would progress sign-off and return the proposed amendment to the LCTEC agreement for their borough by the end of 2019. This would give London Councils permission to actively participate in the delivery of the EV coordination function. (The following boroughs had not yet signed the variation to the TEC Agreement: Bexley, Brent, Bromley, Greenwich, Hammersmith & Fulham, Haringey, Havering, Hillingdon, Kensington & Chelsea, Lambeth, Newham, Southwark, Sutton, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest and the City of London).
- Agreed to bring a report to look at resourcing the EV coordination function to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 14 November 2019; and
- Reviewed and provided feedback on the proposed activities of the electric vehicle coordination function provided in Appendix B.

## **8. Climate Change Update**

The Committee received a report that outlined a programme of activities where London Councils could usefully support boroughs' individual and collective actions on climate change in the interest of value for money and efficiencies. This work area was within the functions delegated to Leaders' Committee.

Katharina Winbeck said that 25 boroughs, had now declared a climate emergency. She said that London Councils would be coordinating some work on climate change policy on behalf of the boroughs, initially focusing on getting an accurate and robust baseline. The table in paragraph 14 of the report outlines some ways in which London Councils could help support local authorities. Katharina Winbeck said that this table would need to be signed off by Leaders' Committee before the work was taken forward. Additional resources would need to be provided in order to proceed with this work, and a business case would need to be made for this.

Councillor Loakes said that the wording for climate "change" should be replaced with climate "emergency". He said that work on this needed to be progressed quickly. The Chair said that he would prefer to use the term "climate change emergency".

Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that the borough of Bromley had not declared a climate emergency, as it had not needed to. He informed members that Bromley had an action plan in place to help reduce emissions over the past 10 years and had been successfully delivering on this. Councillor Livingstone voiced concern over the carbon emissions being given off from buildings, which could be worse than emissions from vehicles. He felt that there should be a role for London Councils in this and to find some underspend to take this forward.

Councillor Burke said that the term "climate change" had been coined in the late 1980s. He felt that the term "global warming" should now be used. Councillor Burke said that a construction company in Norwich had recently won an award for producing zero emissions homes. Councillor Gander said that she welcomed the support on the climate change emergency. She said that it would be beneficial to feedback what officers were saying regarding this. Councillor Gander felt that there was very little in

the report with regards to lobbying for more funding. She said that this was important as boroughs did not have a budget for this work. Councillor Gander said that she also welcomed the change of wording to “climate change emergency”.

Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, informed members that there would be a need to look at how TEC would fund the climate change proposals, should Leaders’ Committee agree to the proposals. This could be addressed by having a recharge to TEC, from the Joint (Leaders) Committee, or by a transfer from TEC Uncommitted Reserves to the Joint Committee. Frank Smith said that discussions with legal colleagues had commenced to clarify what was permissible under the current TEC Agreement.

Katharina Winbeck said that a great deal of engagement on the climate change emergency was taking place with several officer groupings, such as Chief Executives, LEDNet, as well as Finance and Housing and London Councils was working with all these different networks. Katharina Winbeck said that she will note the Committees views on the issue of carbon emissions in construction and discuss this further with officers from each local authority.

The Chair said that it was important to include the word “emergency” when discussing climate change (because it was an emergency). He said that the pace on this also needed to be picked-up.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Noted that the climate change proposals would have to be signed off by Leaders’ Committee, prior to going back to TEC;
- Noted that if Leaders’ Committee agree to the climate change proposals, the issue of how to resource these proposals will need to be addressed, potentially either by a recharge to TEC from the Joint (Leaders) Committee, or by a transfer from TEC Uncommitted Reserves to the Joint Committee; and
- Agreed to refer to climate change as a climate change “emergency” in future wording.

## **9. Traffic Signals Budget 2020/21**

The Committee considered a report that set out the cost to boroughs of maintaining traffic signals in London in 2020/21 based on the “actual cost” model agreed in December 2018, and recommended a new four-year transitioned approach for the apportionment of the costs to each authority based on the average of controller site locations and mid-2018 Office of National Statistics population statistics.

Spencer Palmer, Director of Transport and Mobility, London Councils, introduced the report. He said that the traffic signals model now better reflected the actual cost of maintaining traffic signals. There would also be savings for boroughs in 2020 due to lower energy cost forecasts. Spencer Palmer confirmed that there would be some “winners” and some “losers” with the proposed apportionment model, but these costs would be smoothed over the next 4-years. Spencer Palmer mentioned that one authority had recently pointed out a small error in the TfL calculations and confirmed that a retrospective adjustment would be made next year to compensate for this and any other errors that were found in the meantime.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Agreed the total cost to boroughs for maintaining traffic signals in London for 2020/21, which was £11,019,852.37 as shown in Appendix 1;



- Agreed that this cost was apportioned between boroughs based on controller site locations and mid-2018 Office of National Statistics population calculations, as shown in Appendix 2;
- Agreed to a four-year transition period to help smooth the impact of resulting significant cost changes for many boroughs, as outlined in Appendix 3; and
- Noted that any borough queries about potential errors found with the TfL data and calculations would be investigated and where necessary, retrospective adjustments would be made to the following year's apportionment calculations.

## **10. Safe Speeds in London Review**

The Committee received a report that provided members with an update on the legal advice received from Counsel regarding the constraints on the ability of local authorities to enforce speeding limits in London.

Spencer Palmer introduced the report, which listed a number of options for Committee to consider. He informed members that further legal advice on what could or could not be carried out had been sought.

Spencer Palmer gave an overview of the options described in the report and explained that a steer on the options to take forward was now needed from members.

The Chair said that the steer from the Labour Group was for partial discrimination of speed enforcement (option 16b, page 4 of the report). He said that most boroughs were implementing 20mph zones but were unable to enforce them. Councillor Mitchell said that the Conservative Group had not come to a collective decision yet owing to concerns around decriminalisation. He said that the City of Westminster was also in favour of partial decriminalisation (option 16b).

Councillor Mitchell said that it was important to give the public the confidence that 20mph roads were being enforced. Councillor Webbe informed Committee that Islington was the first borough to roll-out 20mph speed limits boroughwide. She said that the 20mph limit was not being effectively enforced, and boroughs needed greater control over this. Councillor Webbe said that she also supported the partial decriminalisation of speed enforcement (option 16b). Councillor Burke said that he was also in support of option 16b, but felt that more clarity was needed when it came to who was responsible for prosecuting what offences.

Councillor Abellan said that he supported partial decriminalisation. He felt that more clarity was needed in the report on what options were mutually exclusive. Councillor Abellan said that he was concerned in the short-term and said that a parallel approach needed to be taken. He said that he also supported all of the options listed in paragraph 35 of the report regarding "supporting TfL and the MPS speed enforcement action plan." Councillor Abellan said that he was also in support of paragraph 21d – "London Councils to lobby Central Government for the new primary legislation to allow boroughs to prosecute speed offences under s.222 of the LGA Act 1972". He said that the main objective was to reduce speeding and save lives. He said that he also supported the need to the steering group to carry on its work.

The Chair said that he was in favour of all the options in paragraph 35 of the report. Spencer Palmer confirmed that he had noted the comments with regards to paragraph 35. Councillor Field emphasised the need to keep the momentum up on this in order to save lives. He said that he supported partial decriminalisation and said that the enforcement of 20mph speed limits now needed to be taken forward quickly. Councillor Field said that residents wanted to see action with regards to the enforcement of 20mph speed limits.

Councillor Whelton said that he also supported option 16b but asked whether the LGA had any views regarding wider legislation across England. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that 20mph zones in the borough of Bromley were mainly around schools. The Chair said that more work was needed on the definition of partial decriminalisation of speed enforcement. Spencer Palmer said that he was unaware of any support from the LGA or authorities for decriminalisation outside of London. He said the steering group would look into the definition of partial decriminalisation before lobbying for legislative change.

Spencer Palmer thanked the Committee for their comments and steer and confirmed the options to be progressed, as noted below.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Agreed to lobby Central Government for the new primary legislation required for partial decriminalisation to allow local authorities to enforce some (but not all) speeding offences. The steering group to look into the definition of what partial decriminalisation should include;
- Agreed to support TfL and the MPS plans for boroughs to play a more active role in where speed enforcement took place and where cameras were located;
- Agreed to explore the development of borough-led pilots of increased speed data and intelligence gathering for sharing with the police to pursue prosecutions or to inform subsequent police deployments;
- Agreed to pursue the borough provision of speed awareness courses in conjunction with the lobbying for partial decriminalisation;
- Agreed to support TfL and the MPS with regards to their speed awareness publicity campaigns;
- Agreed to continue to support TfL with the implementation of their speed enforcement action plan;
- Agreed to support TfL in delegating speed enforcement powers to Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) and for the TEC Chair to send a letter of support to the Mayor and the Met Police Commissioner outlining this support;
- Agreed to continue to support TfL in developing the revised methodology for safety cameras with boroughs on London roads;
- Agreed to support the development of TfL proposals for borough funded cameras, at locations chosen by boroughs, to help implement trials in a small number of boroughs before further roll-out is considered; and
- Agreed to support the trialling of 'moveable' camera technologies to enhance enforcement opportunities and build flexibility into the network.

## **11. Freedom Pass Progress Report**

The Committee received a report that provided members with an update on the 2019 mid-term review of the eligibility and the 2020 renewal of Freedom passes.

Stephen Boon, Chief Contracts Officer, London Councils, introduced the report. He said that members were being asked to decide on whether or not to automatically send new passes to people that had not used their passes in the last year. Councillor Huntington-Thresher felt that a one-year period of inactivity to not automatically renew a pass was too short, especially if a passholder had been in hospital for a long period of time. He said that where renewal letters were sent to those that appear to have changed address, the letter should also state that if the person no longer used their pass, then they need not reapply.

Stephen Boon informed members that between 80 to 85% of passholders did renew their passes in previous renewal exercises. He said that the automatic renewal could be

extended to everyone who had used their pass in the last two-year period, instead of a year. Spencer Palmer confirmed that for inactive pass holders, the plan would not mean a person's Freedom pass would be permanently cancelled, it would just not be renewed automatically. They would be able to reapply at any time and Stephen Boon confirmed that it normally took between 3 to 5 days to send out a new pass.

**Decision:** The Committee:

- Noted the information and advice for their authorities within the report;
- Agreed not to automatically renew passes for pass holders that had not used their Freedom pass for **two** years, and in instances where it was necessary to write to pass holders to verify that they were still eligible, to state in this letter that the pass holder need not reapply if they no longer used their pass; and
- Agreed to support their borough concessionary travel teams in respect of Disabled Persons' Freedom Pass renewals and agreed that London Councils would ask each individual authority to ensure borough resources were in place to undertake the 2020 review of disabled pass holders.

## **12. Taxicard Update**

The Committee considered a report that provided members with a progress update on the implementation of the new Taxicard contract. It highlighted savings made to date, some issues with performance and analysed the reasons, setting out the mitigating steps that were being taken to improve the situation.

Stephen Boon introduced the report. He informed members that there had been a number of positive improvements to the Taxicard service as a result of the new contract. The Chair said that City Fleet was currently developing a new app that would allow non CityFleet drivers to do Taxicard work if they undertook the required training. As a result of this, the number of drivers available for Taxicard jobs would increase. Stephen Boon said that this app might take longer than the scheduled release date of October 2019. The Chair said that improvements should continue to be made to ensure that Taxicard holders received a better service.

**Decision:** The Committee noted the Taxicard update report.

## **13. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 13 June 2019 (for agreeing)**

The minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 13 June 2019 were agreed as an accurate record.

## **14. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting held on 12 September 2019 (for noting)**

The minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting held on 12 September 2019 were noted.

*The press and public were asked to leave the room while the exempt part of the agenda was discussed.*

**The meeting finished at 16:53pm**