

Community Safety, Environment and Residents Services Policy and Accountability Committee Minutes

Wednesday 18 November 2015

PRESENT

Committee members: Councillors Larry Culhane (Chair), Iain Cassidy, Sharon Holder, Charlie Dewhirst and Steve Hamilton

Other Councillors: Ben Coleman and Wesley Harcourt

Officers: Nick Boyle, Graham Burrell, Milan Ognjenovic, Chris Bainbridge, Patrick Crowley, Richard Duffill, David Page, Claire Rai and Valerie Simpson

20. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Minute 15: Future Waste and Street Cleansing Services – Involving the Citizen

Councillor Dewhirst asked why the consultation on Waste, Street Cleansing and Street Scene had not kept to the dates originally advertised. Councillor Harcourt, Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Residents' Services, explained that he would have to look at whether the consultation had started on the correct date, as he did not have the information to hand. He explained that it had finished early as some local politicians had misinformed residents about the purpose of the consultation, meaning that it ceased to be a useful engagement exercise. He said that the administration would be retaining weekly bin collections, and also continuing to engage with residents.

21. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

23. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Chair invited members of the public present to make any comments in relation to issues on the agenda as part of that item.

24. BOROUGHWIDE 20MPH SPEED LIMIT - CONSULTATION RESULTS

Councillor Culhane explained that on 9 June the Community Safety, Environment and Residents' Services Policy and Accountability Committee had launched the consultation on a borough-wide 20mph speed limit with a lively debate. The Consultation ran until 31 July, with more than five thousand responses being received. The Committee now needed to consider the responses to the consultation and what the Council ought to do next. He explained that all comments made would be recorded and passed on to the Cabinet, should members choose to pass the report on.

Councillor Harcourt, Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Residents' Services, explained that introducing a 20mph zone into residential streets was a manifesto commitment. He also said that the administration was committed to working with residents, and that the consultation, which TfL had funded, was part of this second commitment. He was pleased that 5,200 responses had been received, which was a very large turnout for this type of consultation. Councillor Harcourt stressed that no decision about what would happen next had been taken and encouraged those present to give their views.

Nick Ruxton-Boyle, Chief Transport Planner, said that about 30% of roads in the borough were already in one of seventeen 'home zones' and therefore already had a 20mph speed limit. He explained that the first consultation he had undertaken upon joining the council had been the introduction of the 'home zone' in Wormholt. There had been 25 casualties in the five years before the zone was introduced, but only 17 in the last five years, a reduction of 30%.

The council had decided to consult residents on a borough-wide 20mph speed limit for six main reasons. These were:

- To address a real danger
- To reduce deaths and injuries
- To reduce accidents
- To make our children and all of us healthier
- To cut delays on the road
- To make our neighbourhoods more pleasant.

Mr Ruxton-Boyle explained that the 20mph proposal was only one of many projects designed to improve road safety in the borough, with engineering works and education programmes also planned.

The first question in the consultation had been 'Do you support a borough-wide 20mph speed limit on roads managed by Hammersmith and Fulham Council?' 45% of respondents had been in favour of the limit being applied to all council managed roads, with a further 26% being in favour of the limit on most roads (they were asked to state which ones they wanted to be exempt). 29% of respondents were against the proposal. Most of those who were in favour of the limit, but not for all roads, wanted to retain the 30mph speed limit on main roads. He noted however that the majority of casualties occurred on the main road network. Nick Ruxton-Boyle explained that there had been substantial opposition to the inclusion of Fulham Palace Road in a 20mph zone, but noted that there were high casualty figures as the road passed north of Lillie Road. He also said that the most popular traffic calming feature had been more speed humps, although he noted that lots more people had been against humps than for them. Mr Ruxton-Boyle explained that many London Boroughs had already implemented borough-wide 20mph speed limits, and more were being considered. He explained that recently taken speed surveys could be repeated to assess the impact of any changes.

Councillor Dewhurst noted that Fulham Palace Road tended to have more accidents when traffic was moving slowly, and felt that a 20mph limit would not solve all of the problems on the borough's roads.

Councillor Hamilton was unhappy that additional information had been included in the presentation, which had not been in the report. He also felt that statistics had been presented in a misleading way, as 26% of respondents who had supported only some roads being included in a 20mph zone had been included in the 71% quoted on the Council's website as supporting a 20mph speed limit. Officers explained that there was a majority in support of every single road in the borough being included in a 20mph limit. This majority was made up of the 45% of people who supported the limit in every road, and those of the 26% who supported a 20mph limit but had not mentioned either the individual road or type of road.

David Millar, a resident, said that it was wrong for the council to be adding the results of open questions to those of closed questions to show majority support for a 20mph limit on any individual road. He wanted to discuss his concerns about the use of statistics with officers outside of the meeting. Mr Millar also felt that the idea of a 20mph limit was flawed as drivers paid attention to the road conditions rather than speed limits.

Councillor Hamilton said that he had raised concerns about the consultation documents when the issue was discussed at the committee, but this had been too late for his concerns to be acted upon as the survey had already been printed. He thought that yes but not primary roads and yes but not primary or secondary roads ought to have been included as options for the public. The Chair said that there was a fine balance to be struck when writing a consultation, as open questions both shortened the length of a

questionnaire and allowed residents more freedom to express their views, but were more difficult to interpret than a simple closed question. He also noted the very high response rate which he felt might make up for some of the issues being raised about the consultation.

Councillor Hamilton said that he would be interested to see the number of yes responses overlaid onto a map of the existing 20mph zones, the locations of accidents overlaid against existing traffic speed data, and whether those who were unhappy with the inclusion of Fulham Palace Road in the proposed limit lived near to the road.

A resident said that only 3,718 of the borough's 180,000 residents had voted for the proposals, and felt that the press releases had been misleading. He also felt that some of the information the Council had presented as fact was more like assumption. Louise Raisey explained that whilst she agreed that the headline did not say that it was 71% of those residents who had responded who supported the limit, this was due to the importance of brevity. She explained that the full article on the website made the number of people in favour clear; she also noted that all residents had had the opportunity to participate in the consultation.

Rosemary Petit, a resident, explained that she felt the consultation had been misleading, and that this might have discouraged residents from responding. She also felt that residents ought to have been given a choice of measures available to reduce speed limits rather than being asked to suggest what they wanted.

Lisa Freeman, a representative of students studying in the borough, said that she supported the 20mph limit, and that she was pleased that the council was looking to improve road safety. She thought that improving pedestrian and cycle routes was also important.

Philip Barton, a resident, stated that the open questions used in the consultation had not been helpful. He asked whether there was any evidence of the impacts of 20mph limits in other boroughs, although he noted that there was a significant reduction in the likelihood of death or serious injury if a car were to hit someone at 20mph rather than 30mph. Nick Ruxton-Boyle explained that most other borough-wide 20mph zones were too recent to provide any meaningful evidence. He also noted that the other road safety and air quality measures used in other boroughs would make it difficult to disaggregate the impact of a borough-wide 20mph zone in Hammersmith and Fulham.

A resident said that he had carried out his own research which indicated that most accidents took place at under 20mph; he thought that low speeds might make people complacent. He suggested that different speed limits could be applied during the day and at night, when traffic volumes were lower. He opposed a blanket 20mph policy, but supported targeted 20mph zones, and was concerned that the council had initially spoken about a limit for residential roads, and that this had been extended to all roads in the borough by the time the proposal had been consulted upon. He also raised concerns that not all

residents had received a copy of the consultation. The Chair said that it would be useful if the resident could share his research with officers.

Councillor Cassidy said that in his view 20mph zones had a wider impact than just reducing speed limits; the areas with 20mph zones also felt more homely and in this way encouraged people to use the roads more sensibly. He noted that almost all roads in the borough had people living on them and were as such residential; he would be interested to see what residents of those larger, wider roads thought about their inclusion in a 20mph zone.

Jeremy Leach, a representative of the campaign group 20's Plenty for Us, said that where speed limits were reduced to 20mph the number of casualties reduced significantly. He said that main roads were also people's streets, and that a fairer balance between motorists and other road users needed to be struck. Mr Leach also explained that police were now happy with 20mph limits being introduced without physical traffic calming measures.

A resident said that a 20mph limit would not be obeyed by all drivers, and that this could be more dangerous, possibly causing more reckless driving as people tried to overtake or tailgate to encourage other drivers to break the speed limit. Councillor Cassidy felt that leaving some roads with higher speed limits might also encourage residents to think of these as fast roads, and therefore drive less cautiously along them. John Griffiths, a local resident, noted that many drivers already drove poorly, citing a recent accident as an example; he felt that the possibility of this continuing ought not to prevent a 20mph limit being introduced. He noted that Community Roadwatch schemes could help to enforce speed limits and also thought that some drivers obeying the speed limit would encourage others to do so. Chris Bainbridge, Head of Transport Policy and Network Management explained that drivers were indeed likely to exceed the speed limit, and predicted average speeds of between 20-25mph; he noted however that drivers currently exceeded 30mph speed limits by a similar amount.

Councillor Coleman, Cabinet Member for Commercial Revenue and Resident Satisfaction, said that the statistics about the likelihood of a casualty dying as a result of a road accident at different speeds were a persuasive argument for lowering speed limits to 20mph; at 40mph the chance was 30%, at 30mph the chance was less than 10% and at 20mph the chance of a death was about 2%. He felt that problems with enforcement could be dealt with in innovative ways, for example, engaging with companies carrying out home deliveries. Councillor Coleman also noted that the response to the consultation had been very high and this ought not to be ignored.

Lynne Seveke, Chair of H&F Cyclists, explained that 20mph zones were nicer places to live and had significant benefits for children and the elderly. Warrington Borough Council had introduced a 20mph limit and the scheme had paid for itself in a short period of time as the number of accidents had reduced drastically. She fully supported a borough-wide 20mph speed limit.

Melanie Whitlock, a resident, said that she supported a reduction in the speed limit as it would reduce the number of more serious accidents, but noted that education of road users was also very important.

Councillor Harcourt said that he was grateful for the discussion which had given him plenty to think about. He said that the points made about the likelihood of death at different speeds had been powerful, and that the success of existing zones also added weight to the argument for more of the borough's roads having a 20mph speed limit. He noted the concerns people had raised about enforcement and whether a borough-wide 20mph speed limit was proportionate, although he noted that hotspots for accidents tended to be where main roads passed through town centres.

It was

RESOLVED

That the committee request that the Cabinet consider the outcome of the consultation, noting the discussion which had been held at the meeting.

Councillors Culhane, Cassidy and Holder voted in favour of the motion whilst Councillors Dewhurst and Hamilton voted against it.

25. CYCLING UPDATE

Richard Duffill explained that he felt the borough had shown a real commitment to cycling. This was he thought exemplified by the adoption of the new cycling strategy, his employment as cycling officer and the appointment of Councillor Cassidy as Cycling Champion. Now that the Cycling Strategy had been launched he explained that he intended to bring a report on progress back to the committee annually.

Richard Duffill noted that Hammersmith and Fulham had one of the highest numbers of cycle journeys in London, and that the target to increase the share of journeys from 5 to 8 percent was therefore quite a challenging one. The infrastructure for cycling in the borough was on the whole quite good, but major junctions were quite intimidating and so these were key areas to improve. Hammersmith Gyratory had been identified by Transport for London as particularly bad and had been included in TfL's better junction's project. Richard Duffill also noted that there was limited funding available for infrastructure improvements and felt that this needed to be communicated better to residents. A network of quietways was being developed to encourage less confident cyclists to use their bikes, and to reduce the number of cyclists using more dangerous routes. The borough also ran cycle training courses and 173 adults had been trained in 2014/15 and further opportunities would be offered over the coming year. Bicycle maintenance classes had also been run for over 100 people over the past year, whilst about 600 children had been trained to level 2 of the bikeability scheme, meaning that they could ride safely on a quiet street.

The Chair asked what was being done to improve the availability of bicycle parking in the borough. Richard Duffill explained that there were about 2,000

spaces in the borough with 100 having been installed in the last year. There were also 100 requests for more parking or new locations which he was dealing with. He felt that some of the borough's cycle parking was not located where it was needed, and also hoped to install secure cycle units, especially on council estates.

Councillor Dewhirst asked about difficulties in cyclists and pedestrians trying to use the Thames Path and asked what was being done. Richard Duffill explained that the cycle route along the path avoided pinch points as far as possible by using diversions. He hoped to improve signage of these and encourage their use as they were generally faster than trying to ride through narrower sections of the path.

Councillor Dewhirst asked whether there were plans to increase the number of cycle hire docking stations in the borough. Chris Bainbridge explained that the borough was pressing TfL to install more docking stations in the borough, but that they were not currently keen on expanding the network. Where larger developments were taking place the borough sought to have docking stations installed as part of these.

Councillor Holder asked what additional cycle training for children took place beyond level two of the Bikeability Scheme. Richard Duffill explained that no further training was currently offered, noting that this was a problem across the country, not just in Hammersmith and Fulham. He felt that training teenagers was a good opportunity to promote responsible cycling and agreed to raise the matter with TfL. Lynne Seveke, Chair of H&F Cyclists said that she would ensure that some of their led rides were targeted at teenagers.

David Millar said that Cyclists riding on pavements had been raised as a concern at a Safer Neighbourhoods Board meeting. Councillor Harcourt explained that tackling illegality was a part of the borough's cycling strategy.

John Griffiths explained that he had recently met with Andrew Gilligan, the Mayor of London's Cycling Commissioner, and that he was concerned about cycle links between Hammersmith Gyratory and Hammersmith Bridge. Richard Duffill explained that the issue had been raised with the TfL team looking at the gyratory, and that they were aware of the high volume of cyclists using the route.

It was

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

26. REVISED STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY

Patrick Crowley explained that this was the fifth time the Statement of Licensing Policy had been updated since the 2003 Licensing Act. Only minor changes were proposed to reflect new legislation and guidance, to enhance the recognition of Child Sexual Exploitation in the document and to show that cumulative impact zones had been reviewed.

Councillor Culhane asked whether the public consultation was sufficient as only a very limited number of responses had been submitted. Patrick Crowley explained that there had been extensive public consultation but as the changes proposed would have limited impact and were generally technical he did not think that greater public involvement was required. Councillor Holder suggested that Safer Neighbourhood Ward meetings would be a good forum through which officers could get feedback on such proposals.

It was

RESOLVED

That the committee recommend that Council approve and adopt the revised Statement of Licensing Policy.

27. COMMUNITY SAFETY STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT 2015-16

Dave Page introduced the report, explaining that there were 7 priorities which were:

1. Adult and Youth Reoffending
2. Violent Crime. Focus on Violence Against a Person and Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG)
3. Motor Vehicle Crime
4. Environmental Crime: Focusing on Flytipping
5. Anti-Social Behaviour: Focusing on Noise Nuisance
6. Victims; including Child Sexual Exploitation
7. Problem locations: Focusing on Town Centres

Officers explained that the Safer Neighbourhood Board had been consulted on these priorities, and it was officers intention to consult the Community Safety, Environment and Residents Services Policy and Accountability Committee at an earlier stage in 2016.

Councillor Culhane asked whether there was more that the council could do to help achieve the priorities. Chief Inspector Simon Causer said that the council already contributed greatly to the work, especially by funding additional officers.

Councillor Hamilton referred to a map on page 9 and said that he was concerned by the high number of assaults in parts of Sands End. Officers explained that this was likely to be because of higher populations in the affected Lower Layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) as a result of new developments. The boundaries of the LSOAs hadn't been redrawn since 2011.

Councillor Hamilton also raised concern about the significant rise in domestic violence incidents in Sands End. Dave Page explained that this was likely to be due to better reporting, noting that the council had recently signed a new Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) strategy.

Councillor Dewhirst noted that there was no CCTV on King Street West of the Premier Inn. Dave Page explained that the Council invested heavily in CCTV and the quality of the CCTV had been recognised by the Metropolitan Police.

It was hoped to increase coverage using S. 106 funding. Claire Rai noted that the council had invested in more mobile CCTV cameras.

It was

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

28. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS AND WORK PROGRAMMING

Councillor Hamilton asked whether the report on Emissions Linked Parking Permits would be brought to the PAC. Councillor Harcourt explained that the Commission on Air Quality would be considering the proposal before councillors would consider it.

It was

RESOLVED

- 1) That the proposed work programme be noted.**
- 2) That the next meeting would be held on 18th January 2016.**

Meeting started: 7.00 pm

Meeting ended: 9.30 pm

Chairman

Contact officer: Ainsley Gilbert
Committee Co-ordinator
Governance and Scrutiny
☎: 020 8753 2088
E-mail: ainsley.gilbert@lbhf.gov.uk