



ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SUPPORT SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting of the ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SUPPORT SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE held on WEDNESDAY 9 FEBRUARY 2005 at 7.00 PM at the Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

PRESENT: Councillor Barrie Hargrove (Chair)
Councillor Beverley Bassom
Councillor David Bradbury
Councillor Mark Glover
Councillor David Hubber

OFFICERS: Stephen Chorley – Transport Consultant
Nick Costin – Parking Manager
Gill Davies – Strategic Director of Environment & Leisure
Des Waters – Head of Street Scene & Public Protection
Peter Roberts – Scrutiny Team

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lisa Rajan.

NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMED URGENT

There were no urgent items.

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 15 December 2004 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

1. COUNCILLOR GAVIN O'BRIEN – EXECUTIVE MEMBER, HOUSING & COMMUNITY SAFETY

1.1 The Sub-Committee noted that Councillor O'Brien had resigned his position as Executive Member. Once a new Member was appointed to the position, they would be invited to attend the Sub-Committee.

2. COUNCILLOR RICHARD THOMAS – EXECUTIVE MEMBER, ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT

2.1 *What are your priorities for the forthcoming budget and where are you looking to find the resources to meet those priorities?*

2.2 Councillor Thomas outlined the priorities agreed by Members, the first of which was the Waste Management Private Finance Initiative (PFI). Investment in parks and improving recycling were two other priorities. In response to Members' questions, Councillor Thomas clarified that the commitment already made to parks made further investment necessary, but that recycling also had to be addressed in order to meet Government targets.

2.3 *Members of the main planning committee have been encouraged to ask developers quite searching questions about sustainability, including energy saving, recycling and so on. However, I'm not sure that this has permeated through to planning meetings of Community Councils. Would you consider - perhaps as a joint initiative with the Executive member for regeneration - ways in which we might raise member and officer awareness in this regard?*

2.4 Councillor Thomas indicated that he was keen for training to be rolled out to all Members and that he would ask Officers to promote the availability of training. Members of the Sub-Committee supported strategies to develop expertise and the awareness of issues particular to planning.

2.5 *What progress has been made on the formation of a Potters Field Trust?*

2.6 Councillor Thomas reported that a working group had been formed which included Southwark Officers, representatives of the Pool of London Partnership and Tooley Street residents. The group was drafting a protocol for events and would be reporting proposals to the Executive for the formation of the Trust.

2.7 *Have you any ideas as to how we might persuade Transport for London to be more ready to listen and less ready to be dogmatic and rigid, especially with reference to such matters as bus lanes and traffic schemes?*

- 2.8 Councillor Thomas expressed the opinion that Transport for London (TfL) was improving and was currently inviting views on a bus consultation strategy. He commented that in the past TfL had responded to concerns raised about some of the routes in Southwark, although concerns raised about the number 12 bus route did not seem to have had much impact. In response to Members, Councillor Thomas indicated that he would ask Officers to circulate the draft bus consultation strategy.
- 2.9 *Could you give an authoritative and detailed update on the progress of the Walworth Road project? Are you confident the project will be successfully completed on time?*
- 2.10 Councillor Thomas explained that funding came from different sources. He was confident that the part of the project funded by the Department for Transport (DfT) would be completed on time. Not all the funding from TfL had been used but it was hoped that this would be provided again for expenditure next year. Councillor Thomas stated that the consultants had made radical proposals for the Walworth Road and that TfL had to model the impact of these proposals to ensure that there was no knock-on effect on bus and other traffic movement. The modelling process had taken longer than originally had been hoped.
- 2.11 *Why have so many street properties in Walworth and Camberwell areas had missed doorstep recycling services in the last 6 months?*
- 2.12 Councillor Thomas explained that there had been a problem in these areas. Temporary workers had been replaced by permanent employees and now the number of missed collections had reduced. Figures for missed collections were based on customer complaints and crews reporting if they had been unable to make collections. The Strategic Director of Environment & Leisure commented that problems partly reflected the success of the scheme and the increased level of take-up, which had made the employment of additional crews and agency staff necessary.
- 2.13 *Southwark's recycling rates are now being seen to be steadily improving, how much does he believe that Central Government have had a hand in this?*
- 2.14 Councillor Thomas commented that Central Government had a role in setting and promoting targets and had provided some funding. However, most of the funding was purely for starting up projects and continuing revenue funding had to be found by the Council. The increasing costs of waste management were not reflected in the Revenue Support Grant. In response to questions, Councillor Thomas was of the view that the Council took every opportunity to bid for appropriate funding and was currently working with community recycling projects to secure European Union funds. He indicated that funding to meet the first phase of the electrical waste directive was allocated within the budget.
- 2.15 *What Powers does the Council have to tackle graffiti that is on property not in Southwark's ownership?*

- 2.16 Councillor Thomas explained that London Boroughs were currently seeking to use powers under the London Local Authorities Act and were waiting for guidance and a code of practice from the Association of London Government (ALG). Members of the Sub-Committee queried whether the London Borough of Ealing was already making use of such powers and Councillor Thomas stated that he would ask Officers to look into this.
- 2.17 *Can you tell us how many Transport Group projects are: (a) outstanding, (b) on target, or (c) missing their target date?*
- 2.18 Councillor Thomas indicated that the reorganisation would achieve a more integrated delivery. He commented that this had been a major reorganisation but it was now moving apace. Members would be kept up to date with developments and the timetable for the new structure going live. In general terms, Councillor Thomas was confident that projects were on target and spend would be made in this financial year. Some problems had been encountered, including late consultation and delayed input from the TfL traffic signals team, but Officers were working to get all projects back on track.

3. PARKING ENFORCEMENT PLAN [see pages 1 - 41]

- 3.1 The Transport Consultant introduced the draft Parking Enforcement Plan (PEP). The review provided the opportunity to reassess how resources could be deployed operationally in order to achieve the Council's objectives. For instance, the purpose and type of regime of controlled parking zones in particular areas could be reviewed to determine what was required and whether the objectives were being met.
- 3.2 Members of the Sub-Committee highlighted that in parts of the borough it would be important to look at the availability of public transport and the impact of parking restrictions in terms of access to e.g. shops and other facilities. Members also noted that there was a range of users who had different requirements in terms of parking.
- 3.3 The Sub-Committee also stressed that it would be important to financially model the effect of different schemes and to look at the relationship with parking on housing estates.

- RESOLVED:**
1. That the final version of the consultation paper be brought to the next meeting (23 March 2005).
 2. That the following be identified as specific areas for further scrutiny:
 - Hierarchy of regimes
 - Hierarchy of users
 - Financial modelling
 - Relationship with parking on housing estates

4. **FORWARD PLAN** [see pages 42 - 49]

4.1 The Sub-Committee noted the Forward Plan.

5. **WORK PROGRAMME** [see page 50]

5.1 The Sub-Committee noted its work programme and agreed to look for an alternative date for its May meeting in the event of a General Election being called.

The meeting finished at 8.50 pm.

CHAIR:

DATE: