



### **ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SUPPORT SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE**

MINUTES of the meeting of the ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SUPPORT SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE held on WEDNESDAY 6 OCTOBER 2004 at 7.00 PM at the Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

---

#### **PRESENT:**

Councillor Barrie Hargrove (Chair)  
Councillor Lisa Rajan (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Beverley Bassom  
Councillor David Bradbury  
Councillor Mark Glover  
Councillor David Hubber  
Councillor Dominic Thorncroft

#### **OFFICERS:**

Gill Davies – Director of Environment & Leisure  
Angela D'Urso – Corporate Strategy  
Jane Dyer – Principal Enforcement Officer  
Tim England – Environmental Health & Trading Standards Manager  
Stuart Hoggan – Head of Policy & Performance  
Lyn Meadows – Assistant Borough Solicitor  
Peter Roberts – Scrutiny Team

#### **ALSO PRESENT:**

Bob Bennet, Musicians' Union

#### **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

#### **NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMED URGENT**

The Chair indicated that the Closed report, Briefing on the Work of Southwark Anti-Social Behaviour Unit, had been withdrawn from the agenda as it had not been circulated to all members of the Sub-Committee.

#### **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS**

There were no disclosures of interests or dispensations.

## **RECORDING OF MEMBERS' VOTES**

Council Procedure Rule 1.17(5) allows a Member to record her/his vote in respect of any motions and amendments. Such requests are detailed in the following Minutes. Should a Member's vote be recorded in respect of an amendment, a copy of the amendment may be found in the Minute file and is available for public inspection.

The Sub-Committee considered the items set out on the agenda, a copy of which has been incorporated in the Minute File. Each of the following paragraphs relates to the item bearing the same number on the agenda.

## **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 14 July 2004 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

### **1. COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS – EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT**

- 1.1 *What performance targets and parameters are in place to improve stewardship of the Rotherhithe waterways now that Carolcraft have been replaced?*
- 1.2 The Director of Environment & Leisure explained that Southwark Cleaning was now responsible for cleaning and wardens were responsible for fishing, safety on water and stewardship. She clarified that cleaning took place every day.
- 1.3 *Please provide a full progress report on implementation of Park Wardens.*
- 1.4 Councillor Thomas indicated that the full compliment of staff was one manager, three supervisors and 17 park wardens. Currently, 1 manager, 1 supervisor and 5 wardens were in post. The recruitment process was underway, including police checks of applicants. It was anticipated that full staffing would be achieved by December.
- 1.5 *Please provide evidence of correspondence between Southwark and other boroughs, showing that partnership working in respect of a Waste Management site was actually explored.*
- 1.6 Councillor Thomas indicated that there was a lot of contact with other London Authorities at Officer level, but most of these were already signed up to contracts for waste disposal. Key councils had been invited to the bidders conference. The Director of Environment & Leisure stated that the intention was to end up with no excess capacity for waste disposal, although some capacity might exist in the first and second years of operating. She offered to circulate a formal letter to other boroughs setting out Southwark's proposals.
- 1.7 *Please provide a comparison between Southwark and the national average for recycling, say for the past 5 years, in percentage terms and how do you see progress towards improving our performance?*

- 1.8 Councillor Thomas provided a comparison of figures for the past 5 years showing progress against the national average. He saw progress continuing and was particularly interested in long-term targets, taking account of the Old Kent Road proposals for waste disposal. Councillor Thomas also reported that from November cardboard would be added to door-to-door collection and consideration was being given to the inclusion of plastics and extending the green waste collection all year round.
- 1.9 *Are new targets being set to further increase the amount of recycling that Southwark does and what approaches are being taken to ensure we reach these targets?*
- 1.10 Councillor Thomas indicated that targets were set for 2010/11. Methods to achieve targets included bring site plastic disposal and the building of a new waste-recycling site at Copeland Road.
- 1.11 *Is the 'Blue box' scheme still producing the same/increased amounts of recycling as it did in its first year? What gaps have been identified in collection rates and uptake and how are these being addressed?*
- 1.12 Councillor Thomas reported that collection had increased from 193 tonnes, during the period April to September 2003, to 350 tonnes for a similar period this year. Some of this was due to the addition of glass and cans to the service and possibly the knock-one effect that, if more items were collected, more people would think it worthwhile to use the service.
- 1.13 *Does the Council offer incentives or "carrot and stick" approaches to encourage business and commercial units within Southwark to increase the amount of waste they recycle? What moves have been taken to implement a strategy to encourage this?*
- 1.14 Councillor Thomas responded that the Council offered businesses a recycling service at 60% of cost. Monitoring figures for recycling could only be provided for those businesses using Southwark's service. He clarified that, in terms of trade waste, businesses required a licence and a contract. Business Awards were to be piloted in Bankside.
- 1.15 Members of the Sub-Committee stressed the importance of informing users of any changes to collection times and days.
- 1.16 *Please provide an honest appraisal of the current state of the Transport Group and risks to the future management of transport in Southwark.*
- 1.17 Councillor Thomas clarified that the service was being reorganised and that by December it would be transferred. Long-term problems would then be addressed, including the employment of permanent staff. Councillor Thomas confirmed that spend under the Borough Spending Plan had been delivered in time last year and was on course to be delivered this year.
- 1.18 *What plans do you have for improving how the traffic consultations are carried out?*

- 1.19 Councillor Thomas replied that Officers would be bringing forward proposals for a clear protocol on traffic consultations. An initial meeting had been held with the Transport Forum in the previous week.
- 1.20 *To what extent has the road maintenance budget been expanded to cope with the poor state of the borough's roads?*
- 1.21 Councillor Thomas explained that there were three aspects to the roads budget – principle roads, a reactive pothole budget and a non-principle roads maintenance budget. Principle roads were funded by Transport for London. The Council had allocated £7.5m to non-principle road budget over the next three years. This allowed 2% of the borough's roads to be brought up to standard but 20% of roads needed to be addressed each year.
- 1.22 *Do you have any plans to improve working relationships with London Buses e.g. to avoid repeat of the problems with consultation over the proposed introduction of bendy buses onto route 12?*
- 1.23 Councillor Thomas considered that consultation with London Buses was not satisfactory and that the Council would be asking for a proper formula for consultation on bus routes, allowing sufficient time and giving a range of options for comment.
- 1.24 *How would you set about implementing a blanket 20 mph zone and enforcing it in the many streets in the borough that are not calmed?*
- 1.25 Councillor Thomas hoped that Southwark would be in a position in around 5 years whereby 20mph would be the default speed limit in the borough. A methodology needed to be developed to determine roads where this might be inappropriate. A range of methods of enforcement would also have to be introduced, including road humps, cameras and speed signs. Councillor Thomas indicated that bids would be made to Transport for London (TFL) for funding but that TFL would not provide funding for e.g. new signage where road calming measures were already in place.

**2. QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT – QUARTER 1: QUARTER ENDING 30 JUNE 2004** [see pages 1 - 15]

- 2.1 In response to Members' questions, the Director of Environment & Leisure clarified figures relating to bin collection and parking charge notices.
- 2.2 Members were concerned that the quarterly report should provide clear information and sufficient context to the figures presented.

**RESOLVED:** That future quarterly reports ensure that appropriate units are used and adequate descriptions presented.

**3. FORWARD PLAN** [see pages 16 - 20]

- 3.1 The Sub-Committee noted the Forward Plan.

**4. WORK PROGRAMME 2004/2005**

- 4.1 The Sub-Committee noted the Work Programme.

**5. LICENSING ACT 2003 – CONSULTATION ON THE LICENSING STATEMENT OF POLICY**

- 5.1 The Environmental Health & Trading Standards Manager introduced the report.

- 5.2 Bob Bennet, a representative of the national musicians' union, outlined the concerns of musicians who depended for their livelihood on the performance of live music in licensed premises. He complimented Southwark's draft statement but drew attention to the omission of any reference to the guidance in Section 182 of the 2003 Act which required that proper account be taken of the need to promote live music. He urged the Council to include this in its final policy statement. Officers indicated that the guidance could be reflected in the statement.

- 5.3 In response to questions from Members, Officers outlined the consultation undertaken in respect of the draft statement. Members stressed that the database being used should be updated, particularly in terms of tenants' and residents' organisations. The Environmental Health & Trading Standards Manager indicated that no representations had been received as to saturated areas. Once the impact of the new Act became clear, the Council could consider the introduction of such areas at any time. Officers also reported that strong evidence would be necessary in order to introduce any form of zoning.

- 5.4 Members of the Sub-Committee expressed concerns as to how future applications would be advertised. Concern was also raised that each application was to be judged on its own merit in respect of e.g. adequate late night transport being available. Members also emphasised the problem of enforcement, particularly in terms of addressing low-level anti-social behaviour such as littering.

- 5.5 Members asked whose role it was to keep ward councillors informed about issues relating to particular premises within their wards, e.g. about use of firearms in licensed premises. Members also emphasised that the role of ward councillors as advocates of the community should be clearly acknowledged.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the policy statement explicitly sets out the authority's support for live music and include appropriate wording drawn from the guidance under Section 182 of the 2003 Act;
2. That the authority confirm that at present it sees no need to introduce a saturation policy but that it reserves the right to review this at short notice should the need arise;
3. That weapons be included in Section 5 of the Statement, Prevention of Crime and Disorder, as a matter to be addressed by applicants;

4. That the role of ward members be enhanced within the statement in order to emphasise involvement and access to information and acknowledge their role as advocates for the local community;
5. That Officers be asked to review the consultation database.

The meeting finished at 10.15 pm.

**CHAIR:**

**DATE:**