

<b>Item No.</b> 16.	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 21 September 2010	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Cabinet
<b>Report title:</b>		Street Clutter Overview and Scrutiny Review 2010 - Cabinet members response to committee recommendations	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		Borough-wide	
<b>Cabinet Member:</b>		Councillor Barrie Hargrove, Environment, Transport and Recycling	

### **FOREWORD – COUNCILLOR BARRIE HARGROVE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND RECYCLING**

1. The Street Clutter Overview and Scrutiny Review produced by Scrutiny Sub-Committee B, throws a spotlight on an issue which has almost been waiting to be brought to prominence. The highway environment over the years has collected redundant signage and no longer meaningful traffic controls, which despite being detrimental to a well designed street scene, have been left in situ.
2. I welcome this report as it anticipates the long-awaited Design Manual which will comprehensively address in large part many of the issues raised here. I am particularly, in relation to recommendation 4. (paragraph 17), looking forward to the establishment of a Design Quality Board, which I as Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment & Recycling will oversee.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

3. That cabinet approve the proposals in this report resulting from overview and scrutiny committee recommendations.

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

4. On the 20 July 2010 the Cabinet agreed that the recommendations of the de-cluttering programme review undertaken by scrutiny sub-committee B be noted, and the cabinet member for environment, transport and recycling as lead cabinet member bring back a report to cabinet with a proposed response to the overview and scrutiny committee by 21 September 2010.
5. The main concern of the scrutiny and over-view committee was to understand barriers, issues and limitations impacting upon efforts to achieve reductions in the level of 'clutter' within streets and spaces. Clutter can be broadly defined as items of street furniture which create visual or physical obstructions or road markings and street surfacings that are not visually harmonious. Clutter has been criticized variously for undermining the character and distinctiveness of the public realm, creating safety and accessibility issues and promoting a 'highways dominated' environment in which motorists do not give adequate regard to other street users or the social functions of streets.

6. However, as the committee heard, whilst many items can be considered to be clutter by merit of the above definition, that is not to say that they may not serve other important purposes that could out-weigh the imperative to reduce clutter.
7. Scrutiny on this issue comes at a time when it is receiving substantial national coverage with numerous government initiatives and legislative changes underway or in development. In August 2010 the Communities Secretary, Eric Pickles, and Transport Secretary, Phillip Hammond, wrote to Local Authorities urging them to reduce street clutter. A review by the Department for Transport of secondary legislation governing the use of traffic signs and road markings (The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002) is also underway. The Mayor of London's recently adopted Transport Strategy has also identified clutter reduction as one of the priority interventions to improve street quality (along with general 'tidying') in an age of budgetary constraints when more comprehensive works may not be possible. Finally, a bill is currently going through parliament (The London Local Authorities and Transport for London Bill, No. 2) that proposes to simplify the process by which local Highway Authorities may mount necessary signs and lighting apparatus to private property. This would extend powers currently enjoyed only by the City of London and City of Westminster to other London boroughs.
8. Like other authorities, the Council has made significant efforts to date to reduce street clutter through various schemes and programmes. This includes the removal of substantial lengths of pedestrian guard-railing. In addition, reduction of street clutter has been an overall objective of larger schemes such as Walworth Road which have won national awards for their design. However, as officers explained in their submission to the scrutiny committee, the complexity caused by safety and liability concerns, as well as legal and enforcement considerations, mean that random removal of clutter is seldom possible. Some level of assessment or auditing will generally be required before removal, and for this reason clutter reduction may be better achieved through comprehensive schemes.
9. The Council is currently developing a Streetscape Design Manual (the Design Manual). This is recognised as a key opportunity to address clutter by putting in place standards to control the use of street furniture, signs, surfaces and road markings, as well as broader procedures to address attending liaison, design development, risk management and coordination issues that have historically contributed to the profusion of clutter. The potential content and scope of the Design Manual was a constant reference of the scrutiny committee and a number of it's recommendations relate to this.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

10. The following provides the cabinet members response to Cabinet on the recommendations of the scrutiny committee.

### Recommendation 1

11. The design guide for the public realm should be finalised and agreed as a cross-cutting guide for the council as a matter of urgency. The sub-committee recommends that it be added to the forward plan for approval in September 2010.

### Response

12. The date proposed in the scrutiny report has now been superseded. A draft of the Design Manual was released for comment across Council departments in August 2010. This process will end in mid-September 2010. Thereafter amendments will be made prior to release for public consultation. The manual is currently on the forward plan along with various other transport related documents for approval by cabinet for release for consultation in December 2010. Consultation would follow in January 2011. A final approval date is yet to be confirmed. This will depend on whether it is wished to approve the various transport related documents together or separately. If approved together, it is likely that statutory consultations with Transport for London related to other documents (specifically the 'Local Implementation Plan') would delay approval until the summer of 2011.

### Recommendation 2

13. The design guide should be used for the wider public realm, not only for specific streetscape issues. In particular, it should be adopted for housing land and reflected in planning policies so that new developments seek to minimise clutter.

### Response

14. It remains the intention to extend aspects of the Design Manual to other areas where appropriate. Discussions are due to take place between departments shortly as to how this can be achieved. However, it should be appreciated that not all aspects of the document and the controls it proposes may be appropriate to housing and parks given current investment frameworks and the often differing design contexts of these areas compared to the public highway.
15. It has been agreed with the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods that that the Design Manual will be referenced as a key design requirement in future negotiations and planning conditions (where relevant) where public space is intended for adoption as public highway. The Design Manual shall also be promoted as a tool to inform the design of non-adopted spaces, though it should be appreciated that this will be informal only since these areas are generally beyond the strict control of both Planning and Highway Authorities. Discussions are taking place with the Planning Authority over the course of the internal officer consultation on the Design Manual as to how best to align proposed procedures such that those controlling design of the public highway work together with those for town and country planning considerations.

### Recommendation 3

16. There should be a substantial and ongoing training programme to train council staff and consultants in the use of the design guide to ensure that the good practice it advocates is embedded across the organisation.

### Response

17. It is proposed to arrange internal training as to use of the Design Manual and related procedures in advance of and following adoption. This will be for internal officers and partner organisations.

18. It is not proposed to provide training for external consultants. Issues related to clutter are addressed within the Design Manual through a comprehensive set of design standards. The Design Manual complements these with substantive departure control, design checking and quality review procedures. As part of this it is proposed that design officers will engage positively with consultants to shape design proposals rather than simply enforcing a passive compliance regime. It is considered that this provides the most appropriate framework through which clutter can be addressed with consultants.

#### Recommendation 4

19. The design guide should be championed at the highest level by both members and officers so that it is clear the importance that the council attaches to the issue.

#### Response

20. The head of Public Realm will chair a new 'Design Quality Board' (the Board) of senior officers that it is proposed to establish as part of the general design quality control regime set out in the draft design manual. This Board will have the power to review individual design proposals and to monitor general progress across programmes against proposed strategic design indicators and other monitoring indicators related to Council priorities. These are yet to be developed. However, it is proposed that some relate to clutter. The work of the Board will be overseen by the Cabinet member Environment, Transport and Recycling hence supporting accountability for performance against these indicators.

#### Recommendation 5

21. Ward councilors should be empowered to become decision makers on highways schemes, perhaps through community councils so that those with an intimate knowledge of an area take political responsibility for decisions on such schemes.

#### Response

22. It is intended that the second stage of the Democracy Commission look at improving Community Councils (amongst other things). This is subject to the review that will take place at the end of stage 1. It is recommended that this issue is referred to the Democracy Commission for consideration as part of stage 2 of its work. This will need to consider a number of issues including: space on Community Council agendas; the balance between their functions as decision making bodies and a mechanism for community engagement in which the formality required when decisions are being taken does not apply; and resource requirements.
23. In the current financial year minor traffic schemes were delegated to Community Councils for approval through an individual member decision. This was considered to be appropriate as the schemes were generally non-strategic in nature and addressed local problems. On-going delegation of responsibility to Community Councils would require potentially time consuming changes to the constitution and likely costly officer support.

24. From a practical perspective, beyond all but the smallest public realm schemes the design of public spaces becomes extremely complex, requiring the careful balancing of many detailed technical concerns and duties to ensure a robust audit trail exists to justify decisions. This is a long and involved process that necessitates considerable liaison between officers to agree solutions which achieve an acceptable compromise between inevitable competing duties and concerns. Important considerations include the Council's strategic policy framework and risk and liability issues. The latter can be significant in relation to public realm schemes. These all need to be considered before decisions can be reached. To input into these complex issues, additional support and training for elected members is likely to be required. Further considerations would be: avoiding the risk of abortive work; and balancing local priorities with the robustness of strategic policies (including standards within the new Design Manual).
25. Whilst waiting for the Democracy Commissions review, officers will continue to actively consult with Community Councils and members of the public on larger schemes to understand their concerns and factor these into the development of design judgments. This will be built into the Community Council agenda planning process. Further procedures currently being developed as part of the Design Manual will seek to strengthen the input of local persons, including street leaders, into the design development process during early stages. For larger schemes it is also proposed to undertake public 'quality audits' to feed into officer level design review and decision making sessions.

#### Recommendation 6

26. To ensure informed decision making, training on streetscape design issues should be extended to councilors.

#### Response

27. It is felt that this would be an extremely valuable initiative that could provide insight for members into the many complex factors that must be balanced within design proposals – so helping them to support officers in the enforcement of standards by allowing them to better communicate these same complexities to members of the public.

#### Recommendation 7

28. To aid in the profile and focus given to street clutter issues, and to reflect the cross-cutting nature of its use, the design guide should be agreed by the council executive, rather than delegated to an individual member through the individual decision making process.

#### Response

29. Agreed, the SSDM has been put on the Forward Plan for Cabinet to consider in December for approval for public consultation.

#### Recommendation 8

30. Public realm officers should be involved and consulted at the design and planning stage of all projects to facilitate cross-referencing with other projects and ensure that the principles of minimum street clutter set out in the design guide are adhered to.

#### Response

31. The Design Manual includes substantive procedures that aim to ensure the engagement of 'design quality officers' in influencing project briefs and design proposals from the earliest stages. This is intended to result in a proactive 'shaping' approach, rather than a mere reactive 'compliance' approach for the Highway Authority. This work will be aided by the proposed establishment of the Board (see para20 above) of senior officers from public realm and some other departments and related requirements for their notification of all and any projects in the public realm. This information will be fed into the Council's new public realm projects database and through into 'ward prospectuses' received by members.
32. The process recognises the need for a strong, consistent, and strategic approach to design quality. It also acknowledges and embraces the need for the department to play a lead coordinating role if the individual objectives of funding departments or scheme advocates are to be successfully balanced with wider concerns – now recognised as crucial to complex issues like clutter reduction.
33. Regarding cross-referencing with other schemes, as explained elsewhere in this report the current approach to clutter reduction is to consider this as one element within wider improvement schemes. This is seen as providing a general saving as necessary administrative and procedural issues (including those related to risk and liability) can generally be addressed in one, whereas were individual spot removals of items of street furniture to take place they would likely be required for each separate location. However, this approach is limited by the scope of the broader scheme in question, the funding streams that can be accessed and the officers involved. Clutter is most effectively reduced where design can be addressed comprehensively, with issues such as street lighting, parking prohibitions and road safety considered together. Depending upon priorities for the use of funding there are a number of potential alternative strategies that might be employed more successfully. These include:
  - Creating a dedicated clutter reduction programme to address large areas (e.g. a ward) at a time, bring together officers from various teams and programmes to ensure a holistic approach can be achieved. No such current programme exists and funding would have to be rededicated for these purposes. A number of other boroughs where clutter reduction is a priority already take this approach.
  - Increasing the degree of coordination between works within a given area, effectively stacking up parking, lighting, road maintenance, transport and other environmental improvement schemes (e.g. CGS projects) to be delivered as one such that clutter can be addressed effectively without being limited by responsibilities or access to budgets. This would require a refocus of funding from a large number of small individual projects to a smaller number of wider ones. To be successful a strong lead would be required from members to ensure that different budget holders and Community Councils pooled and coordinated their funding in such areas. Whilst

management of such large projects by officers could become more challenging, this approach could result in overall cost savings. Overall project administration costs may decline as a consequence of managing fewer projects overall and this having to undertake a lesser number of related checks, audits, consultations and assessments. Implementation costs may also reduce as clauses providing percentage reductions in construction term contract rates (related to the overall value of works) were invoked and the need for individual welfare and site management provisions reduced.

#### Recommendation 9

34. Relevant stakeholders should be consulted on public realm issues wherever practicable.

#### Response

35. The Public Realm Division will continue to undertake statutory consultations with agency and public stakeholders and to meet constitutional requirements for consultation with the public. However, in addition to this, the Design Manual proposes a series of further initiatives.
36. The Design Manual will include procedures to secure the early engagement of stakeholders (including 'street leaders') during the development of project briefs. For larger projects it is also proposed to supplement normal public consultations with further stakeholder 'quality audits' that can then feed into officer deliberations over proposals.
37. The Design Manual will aim to clarify for the first time what the public can expect in terms of levels of public consultation and engagement for different types of projects. It is likely that this will need to be relatively flexible, responding to the specifics of the project yet based on a number of 'model' requirements.
38. It is also proposed to grant Southwark Living Streets an advisory seat on the proposed Board (see para20 above) of senior Public Realm officers. It is intended that this shall give greater exposure to the Council's work, facilitate a more collaborative approach to improving the public realm, allow more effective sharing of local knowledge and encourage in partner groups a more rounded, strategic understanding of why particular design decisions have been taken.
39. Members now receive 'ward prospectuses' providing regular updates on the progress of improvement projects using information held in a new 'public realm projects database'. It is proposed to investigate the further development and expansion of these 'ward prospectus' to allow access by members of the public. It is hoped that this will result in greater access to information regarding the Council's public realm investment programme and appreciation of this. Providing access to scheme consultation information through an on-line version of this is an important aspiration.
40. The Design Manual also includes proposed controls that would require the consultation of equalities target groups in relation to aspects of proposals supported or prohibited by standards that may benefit or negatively impact upon them.

41. All the above steps are seen as essential initiatives to meet the Council's general duty to consult and involve representatives of local persons.

Recommendation 10

42. The peer review process for design improvements should be formally embedded in the design and approval process to ensure a holistic approach.

Response

43. The Design Manual sets out a comprehensive process for peer checking, review and approval. Draft procedures are being reviewed as part of the current internal officer consultation with a view to further development and refinement prior to issue for public consultation.

Recommendation 11

44. Early consultation should include the issue of maintenance costs. This will reduce unforeseen liabilities for the council in terms of the cost of maintenance of the public realm.

Response

45. Again the Design Manual sets out a comprehensive process to address issues of maintenance related to materials and street furniture. Draft proposals include procedures for the approval of products for use against particular specifications set out in 'street element palettes' (e.g. a specification for the design of a bollard). The procedures are intended to ensure that asset management implications are fully understood before a product is approved for use on the public highway. Similarly, procedures for authorisation to make one-off use of products not currently approved for general use will capture asset management concerns.

Recommendation 12

46. That the selection process for the forthcoming guard rail removal scheme should engage councilors and members of the public who are likely to have views about priority areas.

Response

47. There is no existing individual funded programme of guard rail removal whilst none is currently planned. The present approach to removal of guard-railings is to assess for removal any railing found within a broader scheme area – the removal of railings just being one of the many improvements being undertaken as part of that scheme. The proposal to remove railings is consulted on as part of the broader proposals. This is opposed to a programme wherein guard-railing removal is the only improvement being undertaken.

Recommendation 13

48. The Community Councils should take a more central role in reviewing and approving highways and road safety schemes.



Response:

49. See response to recommendation 5.

Recommendation 14

50. That highway officers be encouraged to be more proactive in removing temporary and redundant signage.

Response

51. Procedures, standards and general checking, review and approval procedures proposed as part of the Design Manual seek to make the de-cluttering of streets a mainstream concern for all projects. Specific innovations include:
- the development of detailed standards governing the permitted use of particular traffic signs, road markings, surfaces and items of street furniture;
  - procedures for controlling departures from these standards to prevent informal over-use, a requirement to include 'accessibility/de-cluttering drawings with all design development packages;
  - the inclusion of a set of general design indicators for monitoring purposes (including those related to clutter reduction); and
  - substantive procedures for design review of proposals.
52. It should be appreciated however that, even where a new Design Manual standard advises against the use of particular types of street furniture, traffic signs or road markings in a situation, it does not follow that these can necessarily be removed without further thought. As a minimum, spot assessment (as currently occurs with guard railing) will be required to ensure that these have not been intentionally placed to serve some safety purpose which remains pertinent. As such, de-cluttering is likely to be achieved most economically where considered as one aspect of a broader scheme.

**Policy implications**

53. The recommendations of the scrutiny committee and this response generally support the objectives and priorities of the Sustainable Community Strategy (Southwark 2016) and the Council's Corporate Plan. The objective of reducing street clutter is also strongly supported by the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy which specifically addresses this through policy proposals. It is expected that the borough's response to the Mayoral Strategy (the 'Local Implementation Plan' – currently being drafted) will reflect this. The objective of reducing street clutter is also supportive of other internal transport strategies and documents currently being drafted. These include the Highways Asset Management Plan (HAMP) and Network Management Plan (NMP) – clutter being a drain on maintenance budgets and an obstruction to pedestrian traffic. Removal of some clutter is also supportive of the current Road Safety Strategy which specifically addresses issues like guard rail removal whilst promoting more sensitive, less traffic dominated design in town centres based on the success of schemes such as Walworth Road. Whilst not specifically addressed through the Road Safety Strategy, the removal of clutter is likely to help simplify the environment for road users, making it easier for them to identify genuine hazards which may otherwise be drowned out by unnecessary visual 'noise'.

54. Lastly, the removal of street clutter is also in principle supportive of the Council's Managing Diversity and Equal Opportunities strategy in that, by making footways more accessible and encouraging more courteous road behaviour, it will improve access to public spaces, destinations and resulting opportunities for various target groups.
55. However, this picture of mutual support needs to be qualified. As raised by officers during scrutiny review and already discussed above, whilst various items in the street scene may be considered to be clutter, that is not to say that they may not serve another important purpose that is supportive of Council policy. Some of these may relate to road safety (e.g. guard-railing and traffic signs), the encouragement of certain modes of transport (e.g. coloured bus lanes and related signage), protection of assets (e.g. bollards protecting footways from vehicle over-run) or support for equalities target groups (e.g. coloured tactile paving at crossing points or street lighting to improve perceptions of safety). The danger is that the item may be removed thoughtlessly to the detriment of the outcomes related to that policy. The need to strike a balance between the reduction of clutter and other important policies and duties must be born in mind.
56. The sheer scope and complexity of items that contribute to clutter make it unfeasible to address each in detail within this report. However, it is intended that the Design Manual sets out the Council's response to this challenge, establishing where the balance is felt to lie on individual issues through clearly reasoned standards.
57. The realisation of some opportunities to address street clutter within public spaces will be contingent on supporting provisions being made through planning policy documents – their achievement being outside the influence of the Public Realm Division as Highway Authority. Examples include securing freeholder consent for the Highway Authority to mount signs and street lighting to buildings. As such planning requirements do not currently exist these will need to be brought forward through future documents.

### **Community impact statement**

58. Household access to cars and vans throughout most of the borough is low and many residents both with and without cars rely on walking and cycling for some or all of their daily journeys. The physical improvement of access within the street scene through the removal of clutter and perceptual improvement through removal of visual confusion will assist these users in a number of ways. These include:
  - Making the walking and cycling environment more attractive;
  - Improving physical access;
  - Creating increased space for positive street furniture (e.g. seating for the elderly) and active social uses of the street scene (play or socialising); and
  - Potentially improving the behavior of other road users through reduction of the 'highways dominated' feel of streets and spaces and perceptual improvements in the visual integration between footways and carriageways.
59. Such benefits are likely to be supportive of efforts to achieve a modal shift towards walking and cycling and to promote healthy, active lifestyles.

60. In addition, evidence suggests that reducing street clutter can (in association with other general environmental improvements) support economic regeneration in town centres by attracting more residents to use such facilities.
61. However, the above must again be qualified. Whilst items within the street scene may be considered to be clutter, this is not to say that they may not serve another important purpose of benefit to the community. This issue is discussed above in section 8. In particular, the balance between the needs of equalities target groups and the wider community should be carefully weighed when considering stances on individual types of clutter.
62. Again, it is intended that the appropriate balance on individual types of clutter is established through the Design Manual. As with all documents, an EQIA will be conducted as part of its development whilst internal consultations are currently on-going with officers from various departments to attempt to achieve the widest possible understanding of issues – whatever the appropriate balance between these that is subsequently decided.

### **Resource implications**

63. Many of the recommendations of the scrutiny committee will require further resources – be that for training of officers and members or the dedication of greater officer time towards ensuring street clutter is effectively removed or reduced through improvement proposals.
64. As explained by officers during scrutiny submissions and elsewhere in this report, the removal of most instances of clutter is far more complex than may seem superficially apparent. This may require ultimately:
  - Additional liaison with other stakeholders to gain necessary consents for the removal or relocation of items;
  - The re-drafting of traffic orders;
  - The strengthening of lighting columns to accommodate signage consolidated onto them;
  - The complex design of prohibition schemes that remain effective with less signs and road markings.
  - Greater dedication of resources to checking, design review, procedural controls and liability related assessments.
65. Obtaining certain consents that would permit substantial reductions in clutter (e.g. owner permission to mount signs to walls) is currently very time consuming for officers, whilst the process and legal framework for doing so is not well understood. The dedication of legal support to clarify requirements could assist in achieving down stream resource savings and make this a more feasible option in a wider range of circumstances.
66. In particular, the two alternative programme level clutter reduction strategies proposed in the response to recommendation 8 would require further feasibility study and financial modelling before the implications of options could be confirmed with greater clarity.

### **Consultation**

67. Given the breadth and complexity of the issue, no consultation with the public on street clutter has yet been undertaken. The Design Manual will set out the Councils proposed response to dealing with individual items of the clutter and thus the balance between the concern to reduce clutter and the potential legitimate purposes of the item. This document will be consulted on with the public and will also be subject to an equalities impact assessment in compliance with the duty to involve disabled people in public life. This consultation will provide members of the public and other stakeholders with opportunity to inform the Council's position on this issue.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS**

### **Strategic Director Regeneration & Neighbourhoods – planning policy/economic development response.**

68. It is considered that elements of relevance to the directorate are addressed elsewhere in this report.

### **Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance**

69. The purpose of this report is for Cabinet to consider the Cabinet Member's responses to the 14 recommendations proposed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
70. Cabinet members are being asked to consider this report in accordance with Part 3B of the Constitution which details the Cabinet's Role and Functions. Under Policy 5 of this Part, Cabinet has the authority to determine the authority's strategy and programme in relation to the social environmental and economic needs of the area.
71. A report in respect of street clutter would satisfy that criteria.
72. Central Government has made announcements within the last month regarding it's commitment to reduce street clutter in the form of unnecessary signs, railings and bollards. The Council's Streetscape Design Manual would go some way to alleviating this problem in accordance with the other measures outlined in this report.
73. Although an item may be considered to be clutter, it may still perform a legitimate function of value and in fact may be a legal requirement or have been put in place to respond to a duty. The promotion of road safety and equality for disabled persons are two such examples. Care must be taken that compliance with these duties is balanced against the new requirements to avoid street clutter.
74. Particular care must also be taken in respect of removal of those street furniture or signs which were put in place in order to deal with a local safety concern which still remains pertinent.
75. To combat these concerns a robust audit trail must exist for scheme design proposals to demonstrate that a reasonable and balanced approach has been taken to weighing the Council's legal requirements in respect of street safety etc against design considerations as well as legal precedents in respect of parking enforcement action or any other such rulings.

## Head of Procurement

76. The response to recommendation 8 addresses several potential programme level options to take action on this issue. It should be noted that there may be procurement implications depending upon the contracting model proposed and the geographic area of the works that would be undertaken. This in turn may have implications in respect to recommendation 5 as, should the preferred approach result in what is considered to be a 'strategic procurement' then Community Council's would not be able to provide authorisation. Rather, sign-off would be required from the head of finance.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Cabinet 20 July 2010 - Agenda and minutes	160 Tooley Street, London, SE1 2TZ	Everton Roberts

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Cabinet Member</b>	Councilor Barrie Hargrove, Environment, Transport and Recycling	
<b>Lead Officer</b>	Des Waters, Head of Public Realm	
<b>Report Author</b>	David Farnham, Public Realm Design Quality Manager	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	10 September 2010	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director Regeneration & Neighbourhoods	Yes	Yes
Finance Director	Yes	No
Head of Procurement	Yes	Yes
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	Yes	Yes
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional/Community Council/Scrutiny Team</b>	10.09.2010	