

## **LONDON COUNCILS' TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT EXECUTIVE SUB COMMITTEE**

Minutes of a meeting of the London Councils' Transport and Environment Executive Sub Committee held on **12 September 2019** at 10:00am, at London Councils, Meeting Room 1, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, 59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL.

### **Present:**

Councillor Julian Bell (Chair)	LB Ealing
Councillor William Huntington-Thresher	LB Bromley
Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald	RB Greenwich
Councillor Wesley Harcourt	LB Hammersmith & Fulham
Councillor Claire Holland	LB Lambeth
Councillor Zulfiqar Ali	LB Newham
Councillor Richard Livingstone	LB Southwark
Councillor Manuel Abellan	LB Sutton
Councillor Guy Humphries (Deputy)	LB Wandsworth
Councillor Tim Mitchell	City of Westminster

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Claudia Webbe (LB Islington), Councillor Richard Field (LB Wandsworth), and Alastair Moss (City of London). Councillor Guy Humphries attended as a deputy (LB Wandsworth).

### **2. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Livingstone declared an interest in being on the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee.

### **3. LEDNet & ADPH London Air Quality Position**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that provided members with the combined views of the London Environment Directors' Network (LEDNet) and the Association of Directors of Public Health – London (ADPH) on how tackling air quality could most effectively be achieved.

Dagmar Zeuner, Director of Public Health, London Borough of Merton, introduced the report and made the following comments:

- The purpose of the position statement was to have a shared narrative when it came to tackling air pollution, to lobby, and to bring together professionals in order to reach more people
- Air pollution affected the health of children, and impaired cognitive behaviour and caused problems with regards to sedentary behaviour, like obesity and mental health
- There were a number of untapped resources and supply chains that could help with tackling air pollution – the NHS has a long-term plan and was now committed to dealing with air pollution. LEDNet and ADPH were working at a London level

Dipti Patel, Vice Chair of LEDNet, made the following comments:

- Air quality was getting worse and one of the recommendations was advocating for at least 2.5% of UK annual GDP to be spent on tackling air quality and climate change in the UK
- Children needed to be protected from air pollution
- A “Healthy Streets” approach was being implemented to help deal with air pollution
- Tackling pollution “hot spots” was being looked into to help to protect vulnerable communities
- Health bodies and providers would alert people on the impacts of air pollution
- ULEZ and scrappage schemes were being supported, and the impact of air pollution in outer London boroughs was being looked at.

### Q and As

Councillor Mitchell welcomed the report and said that air pollution was a key issue in Central London and was a major concern. He said that it was important to ensure that funding was made available to implement the list of “asks”. Councillor Mitchell emphasised that this was a partnership across all levels, and not just through government. He said that the position statement was a good initial framework.

Councillor Ali said that there was a need to look at restructuring existing funding. He felt that there was a lot more that could be done with regards to air quality, and a serious financial commitment to this was needed.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that there were problems with some of the details in the position statement, especially with regards to the funding. He also felt that the 2.5% of UK annual GDP that was advocated to be spent was unrealistic. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that the issue of air quality was everyone’s responsibility. He felt that there should be a move away from domestic gas and a move towards low emission forms of heating like heat pumps for households.

Councillor Livingstone welcomed the report but said that there were areas that could be improved on. He said that infrastructure needed to be included in the position statement, along with need to see how local authorities were playing their role to improve air quality, and the GLA and TfL etc. Councillor Livingstone said that his borough of Southwark was lobbied a great deal on the issue of air quality. He said that there was a big issue around inequality, as well as issues about raising awareness.

Councillor Abellan also welcomed the report but asked for more details regarding the 2.5% of GDP to be spent on air pollution. He asked whether this was specific to the UK. Councillor Abellan said that the position statement did not include many details around car idling. He asked whether London Councils could put together some key messages for borough residents, in order to raise awareness of the problems and causes of air pollution.

Councillor Scott-McDonald said that the position statement was a good way forward. She said that a cross departmental approach to tackling air pollution was needed. Councillor Scott-McDonald felt that there was a need to find ways to accelerate the funding to prevent air pollution. She said that the Royal Borough of Greenwich

received a large number of complaints about wood burning stoves, and these types of issues needed to be emphasised.

Councillor Holland said that it was right to have a joint approach, and she felt that the issue of air quality and inequality needed to be made stronger in general. Councillor Holland said that more funding was needed, as borough officer capacity was already stretched on all fronts. She said that more information on air quality needed to be provided to the public, like notifying them when there were days of particularly high pollution.

Councillor Humphries said that the issue of funding was key when it came to tackling air pollution. He felt that other stakeholders needed to be encouraged to play their part in this as well. Councillor Harcourt said that more work was needed on dealing with tail pipe emissions, tyres and break pipes. He said that residential wood burners, along with burning items in back gardens also needed to be concentrated on. Councillor Harcourt said that a number of new developments/buildings did not achieve the required carbon targets that were set.

Councillor Livingstone said that it would be a good opportunity now to lobby the political parties to make air pollution a priority in their manifestos. Councillor Ali said that there was no mention of aviation pollution in the report, or what TfL or the Mayor were doing specifically to tackle air pollution. Councillor Huntington-Thresher felt that walking needed to be promoted more vigorously, as a means to help reduce air pollution. The Chair said that break dust and tyres were also adding to PM10 emissions.

Dagmar Zeuner said that this was the first position statement, which was ongoing and would be refined and improved. She said that aviation, and also boats on the Thames also contributed to pollution in the London boroughs. Dagmar Zeuner said that there were certain “trade offs” that boroughs could learn through joint working. She said that it was important to bring officers together, monitor and to share ideas. There was also a need to look at obtaining funding from other stakeholders and organisations, like the NHS.

Dipti Patel said that funding, and how best to utilise all the different bodies was challenging. She said that examples of what had already been carried out before (eg case studies) needed to be looked at. A consistent message from the boroughs, London Councils and the Mayor was also required. Dipti Patel said that issues regarding inequalities would be taken on board, and there was a need to speak out for the people from these communities. She said that the position statement was a “collective voice”.

The Chair said that the 2.5% of GDP proposed to be spent on tackling air pollution was an international response. He said that more work was needed to provide a link with air quality and the climate emergency. Jim Odling-Smee, Director of Communications, London Councils, said that the lobbying of Government was being led by John O’Brien, Chief Executive of London Councils, through the political groups and around London Councils’ pledges. He said that the issue of air pollution had been raised with the Secretary of State as a priority. Dagmar Zeuner said that air pollution went beyond party politics, and everybody needed to be involved in this.

The Chair asked what the plan was to take these issues on board. Kate Hand, LEDNet Programme Manager, confirmed that adjustments would be made to the joint position statement on air quality, which would then be shared with the Chair and vice

chairs of TEC. Dagmar Zeuner said that the position statement would be used as a basis for initial dialogue with Londoners.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed that adjustments would be made to the LEDNet and ADPH joint position on air quality and this would then be shared with the Chair and vice chairs of TEC; and
- Noted and commented on the report.

#### **4. Climate Change – Borough Actions So Far & Future Activity**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that provided members with an update on the work that London Councils had carried out to support local authorities to develop their climate change programmes, including an overview of and outcomes from the recent workshop for lead climate change officers.

Owain Mortimer, Principal Policy Officer, London Councils, introduced the report and made the following comments:

- The report provided a brief update since the discussions that took place on the climate emergency at the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 18 July 2019
- Engagement between London Councils and UK:100 had continued to take place.
- A workshop had taken place with borough officers to identify joint issues and solutions, and how best London Councils could provide support.
- This was the first step at bringing officers and other parties together.
- At the last TEC meeting, 16 boroughs had declared a climate emergency. Now 24 boroughs had declared a climate emergency.
- A further update on climate change would be presented to the full TEC meeting on 10 October 2019.
- A TEC/LEDNet Conference was taking place on 13 November 2019, and members were encouraged to attend.
- A “climate strike” in London was planned for 20 September 2019.

Councillor Abellan asked whether a table could be produced that outlined each boroughs’ current position climate change. Owain Mortimer confirmed that it could. Councillor Abellan felt that there was not much detail in the report, or where London Councils was going with regards to climate change. Councillor Abellan also asked if councillors would be getting more information than this at the next TEC meeting. Owain Mortimer said that a more detailed paper would be presented to TEC in October. Councillor Ali said that more information sharing needed to take place between boroughs. He said that key issues needed be addressed, and an “action plan” compiled.

Councillor Mitchell said that officers in the City of Westminster had discussed the lack of resources at a borough level. He said that there were actions that emerged when boroughs signed up for a climate emergency, and this needed to proceed in a focussed and practical manner. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that he fully supported what had come up from the boroughs with regards to climate. He felt, however, that TEC/London Councils did not need to lead on these issues as the boroughs would set out their own agendas (e.g. on emissions etc), with regards to

climate change. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that best practice needed to be facilitated between the boroughs.

Councillor Scott-McDonald asked for more details about the “climate strike”. Owain Mortimer said that this was a global strike being and was a joint response by a broad coalition of Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), including Greenpeace, national unions and social movements. Councillor Holland said that TEC should be focussing and providing leadership on the climate emergency. She said the boroughs were in a major need of a toolkit to help with this. Councillor Holland said that climate change affected everybody, and boroughs needed to come up with a way forward together. Councillor Livingstone said that London Councils had a role in cross borough working on climate change, and TEC had a real role in this. Owain Mortimer said that he noted the points raised by members on climate change and would cover these in a more detail report to TEC in October.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed to provide members with details relating to borough positions on the climate emergency; and
- Agreed that a more detailed report on climate change would be presented to members at the full TEC meeting on 10 October 2019

## **5. The Final Report of the Task & Finish Group on Car Clubs**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that informed members of the Task and Finish Group that was brought together by London Councils’ officers to provide an in-depth analysis of the current state of Car Clubs in London, and to identify ways in which car sharing could contribute in responding to environmental, population growth and congestion challenges.

Paulius Mackela, Principal Policy and Projects Officer, London Councils, introduced the report, and made the following comments:

- This was the first milestone for the future mobility agenda
- A previous update on the Task and Finish Group on Car Clubs was presented to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 18 July 2019
- The recommendations came from the Task and Finish Group, and not London Councils
- There were 6 categories on each recommendation. They were as follows:

### Understanding Car Sharing

Not all officers understood what the principal of car sharing was, and London Councils proposed a briefing on this. There was a proposal for a separate page on car sharing on the London Councils’ website (over the past 10 years). Promote code of conduct and accreditation.

### Data & Evidence Base

Looking at where car sharing works best. Come up with a list of data/metrix table. Not enough evidence to have a clear policy line.

### Operational Arrangements

Some boroughs had need for a guidance document. Include BVRLA and CoMoUKs accreditation schemes with operators.

#### Low Emission Zones, EVs & Car Sharing

Have discussions with the GLA with regards to ULEZ

#### Coordinating London's Car Sharing Policy

A new part-time policy officer role to produce a guidance document for boroughs, and to ensure the work started by the Task and Finish Group continues.

#### On-going Engagement between Car Clubs and Government

Part-time officer to support on-going engagement, and to coordinate meetings and training events.

Paulius Mackela said that members were being asked to support, in principle, having a part-time officer role to take forward the recommendations outlined by the Task and Finish Group on car clubs. He said that a decision on this could be made at the Main TEC meeting on 10 October 2019. Potential funding proposals for this officer role could then be presented to TEC on 5 December 2019. Other organisations were also being asked to assist with the funding of this officer role.

Councillor Mitchell said that there was a need to see some justification for having a part-time officer role to take car clubs forward. He said that electric vehicles were becoming far more sophisticated, like the launch of the new Mini, and would hopefully ween families off from having multiple cars in their households.

Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, apologised to the Committee as he was unaware of the request for resources for the new part-time officer role to take car sharing forward. He said that the current proposed timescale for funding the new officer was at odds with the TEC budgetary timeline, and a decision on this funding would need to be made at the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 14 November 2019. Councillor Ali said that external sources of funding should be looked into to pay for the part-time officer, along with looking at the role that IT could play to make things more efficient.

The Chair said that the main comments had been noted, along with making a funding decision with regards to the part-time officer role at the TEC Executive meeting on 14 November 2019. Frank Smith informed members that TEC did have a "special projects" budget that could go towards funding this role. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that clarity was needed as to whether the new officer role was a "one off", or whether the role would be "ongoing", and this needed to be clear as part of the budget negotiations. Paulius Mackela said that the role would be funded by the public sector for two years, after which the role would be self-sustained from industry. The Chair said that the car clubs needed to be made aware of this "ask" of them. Paulius Mackela said that he would report back to TEC on this.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed that any decisions made regarding the funding of a part-time officer be taken to the TEC Executive on 14 November 2019;
- Agreed that the car club companies be made aware of any "asks" made of them, with regards to the future funding of a part-time officer role;
- Noted that external sources of funding should be looked into, as well as the role of IT in order to make things more efficient; and

- Agreed the final recommendations put forward by the Task and Finish Group on Car Clubs.

## **6. Future Mobility Agenda: Task & Finish Group on Smart Mobility & MaaS**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a paper that informed members of the significant positive impacts on the efficiency, environmental performance and safety of the transport network. TEC was well placed to play a stronger role in understanding the potential of Smart Mobility and Mobility as a Service (MaaS) platforms in the capital and it was proposed that a Task and Finish Group be set-up to look to help shape this policy agenda going forward.

Paulius Mackela introduced the “Future Mobility Agenda” report, which was the next focus of the Task and Finish Group. He said that the structure of the report would be the same as the car clubs and would comprise of up to 15 members and identify the role of the London boroughs and local government going forward. Paulius Mackela said that the GLA and TfL would also be attending the Group as regular members, and the DfT would join one of the meetings. Paulius Mackela said that the Group was only expected to come up with a few recommendations. The final report from this Task and Finish Group would be presented to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 6 February 2010.

Councillor Mitchell said that he welcomed this report and said that a lot of work would need to be carried out on this. He said that it would be useful for boroughs to analyse the data on this. Councillor Mitchell said that he would also like to see Google Maps promoting healthy walking options. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that it would be beneficial if the TEC Executive could receive further guidance with regards to MaaS, before receiving the final report. Spencer Palmer said that a more detailed programme would be presented to the TEC Executive at the meeting on 14 November 2019.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Agreed to bring a more detailed programme on the Task and Finish Group on Smart Mobility and MaaS to the TEC Executive on 14 November 2019; and
- Agreed the purpose, topics, size, composition and timescales of the proposed Task and Finish Group on Smart Mobility and MaaS.

## **7. Transport and Mobility Services Performance Information**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that detailed the London Councils’ Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Quarter 1 in 2019/20.

Spencer Palmer, Director of Transport and Mobility, London Councils, introduced the report which provided the performance information for Quarter 1 for 2019/20.

Spencer Palmer said that although customer satisfaction remained very high, targets were still struggling to be met in Freedom Pass section of the report, resulting in the three “red” ratings. He said that measures had been put in place to rectify this but pointed out that customer service standards were set quite high compared to other local authority services. He said that he would be reviewing these standards in the future. The two “red” ratings for the Taxicard section of the report were still mainly the

result of the new contract changes, especially the move to a fixed price structure as requested by customers. Spencer Palmer explained that the agreed Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) had remained in place and progress was being made. to help improve these targets. Spencer Palmer said that a new pricing structure had now been implemented that ensured customers still enjoyed the price guarantee, but drivers would get paid based on the metered fare. This was proving more popular with the contractor taxi drivers. Improvements were continuing to be monitored with the contractor.

Spencer Palmer said that the “red” rating for the London Lorry Control Scheme was due to the relatively low number of appeals received, which caused the performance against these targets to fluctuate. Councillor Livingstone asked whether the Taxicard targets were expected to improve in Quarter 2. Spencer Palmer said that a sustained improvement to the targets was currently taking place.

Councillor Livingstone asked what the change to drivers’ pricing structure meant. Spencer Palmer explained that, before the retendering exercise took place, Taxicard members had been consulted and had said that they wanted a degree of cost certainty when it came to pricing. The successful tenderer rolled out a fixed price module, however, this was affecting performance and Taxicard drivers were not happy about the new fixed pricing. Spencer Palmer said that, since then, it had been agreed that drivers would now get a percentage of the meter price. Spencer Palmer informed members that there were also issues around more taxi drivers leaving the industry. He said that CityFleet was introducing an app that would open the circuit to a bigger pool of drivers.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the report.

## **8. Month 3 Revenue Forecast 2019/20**

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that outlined actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of June 2019 for TEC and provided a forecast of the outturn position for 2019/20.

Frank Smith introduced the report and informed members that, at this early stage, there was currently a budget surplus forecast of £299,000. He said that there were projected surpluses from the Committee’s trading activities, as well as from the London Lorry Control Scheme PCN income and income from replacement Freedom passes. Frank Smith said that £96,000 in revenue had been collected in respect of members losing their Freedom passes for August alone, and the income levels showed no sign of reducing.

Frank Smith informed Committee that London Councils was currently moving towards agile working and a pilot had taken place on the third floor of the building. This would cut down on overall desk space and potentially allow London Councils to generate greater rental income.

Frank Smith said that the TEC budget was in a healthy position. The TEC reserves continued to breach the agreed 15% upper benchmark, and the decrease in costs for the 2020 Freedom Pass re-issue exercise (£3 million down to £1 million) had contributed further to this position.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher asked whether the £3.125 million “overspend” referred to in paragraph 3 (page 2) of the report was meant to be referred to as an



“underspend”. Frank Smith confirmed that this was the case and apologised for this typographical error.

**Decision:** The TEC Executive Sub Committee:

- Noted that the gross expenditure budgets by £3.125 million was an underspend, and not an overspend (paragraph 3, page 2 – Variance from Budget);
- Noted the projected surplus of £299,000 for the year, and the forecast net underspend of £3.505 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in the report, and
- Noted the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraph 5 of the report, and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee included in paragraphs 6 to 8.

**9. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 18 July 2019 (for agreeing)**

It was noted that the TEC Executive meeting on 18 July 2019 finished at 12.07 pm and not 16.50pm, and this should be amended.

Subject to the above minor amendment, the minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee meeting held on 18 July 2019 were agreed as an accurate record.

**The meeting finished at 11:35am**