

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

Wednesday 1 March 2017

## **PRESENT**

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

**Other Councillors:** Daryl Brown, Sue Fennimore and Wesley Harcourt

**Officers:** Mahmood Siddiqi, Ian Ross, Richard Duffill, Ullash Karia, Dave Page and Sarah Fox

## **External Organisations**

**Spacehive** – Niraj Dattani

**Transport for London** – Ed Boatman, Andrew Rogers and David Korzenoiwski

## 31. **MINUTES**

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## 32. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Sharon Holder.

## 33. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **34. SPACEHIVE - CIVIC CROWDFUNDING PLATFORM**

Niraj Dattani, Spacehive, explained that Spacehive was a crowdfunding platform specifically for projects which would benefit the local community. The funding of community projects and assets by large numbers of citizens was an old idea, with the plinth for the statue of liberty in New York having been funded through a newspaper led campaign. Spacehive aimed to make access to crowdfunding easier for anyone who had a good community project. Spacehive also allowed projects to access money from organisations and philanthropists; typically the enthusiasm created through small donations from lots of people would encourage those with significant amounts of money to donate it to a project. Using crowdfunding also created social capital for projects as funders would feel ownership of the scheme; there were many examples of funders offering projects far more than just financial support. Spacehive had had 266 successful projects, with 53% of projects getting the funding they needed; this compared well to the international average of 23% of crowdfunded projects being successful.

Mr Dattani explained that Hammersmith and Fulham Council had partnered with Spacehive and would be making £100,000 available to help fund proposals.

A resident asked what the Council had done to publicise the opportunity. Mr Dattani explained that the opportunities available to residents had only recently been agreed and so there had been little publicity to date. There would however be significant publicity over the Spring and early Summer.

A resident noted that crowdfunding through Spacehive included a verification stage. Mr Dattani explained that this was done by Locality, a national network of community organisations; the only things which were checked was would the project benefit the community and was it viable, although advice might well be offered. Project creators would then have to convince potential funders that their idea was a good one.

A resident noted that Spacehive charged a fee for hosting the project on its website. Niraj Dattani explained that the fee was 5% on top of the project cost and would only be charged if the project was successful. The fee paid for Spacehive's website, staff etc. and no project had not received funding because it hadn't managed to get the additional money to pay for the fee.

#### **35. CYCLING IN THE BOROUGH - 2017 UPDATE**

Richard Duffill, Cycling Officer, explained that the Council had in October 2015 adopted a cycling strategy. The report updated members on progress made in each area of the strategy. Key developments were:

- The introduction of further 20mph zones which made cycling much safer and more comfortable.
- Significant progress made towards build an upgraded cycle path along the A315, which would be designated as Cycle Superhighway 9.
- An increased number of cycle training opportunities.

- A programme to install hundreds of new cycle parking spaces across the borough, based on resident suggestions.
- Significant progress on the East Acton to Kensington Quietway, construction of which was expected to start in the near future.
- Plans to develop new Quietways from Putney Bridge to Hammersmith Bridge and from Shepherds Bush Green to Hammersmith Broadway. There would also be a new Quietway from Twickenham to Hammersmith which, whilst mostly in other boroughs, would be of significant benefit to residents.

A resident asked whether the new cycle path on the A315 would be bi-directional as King Street was one way from the Gyrotory to Bridge Avenue. Richard Duffill said that it would be bi-directional and would not use Beadon or Glenthorne Roads. It was intended that the existing road layout on King Street would not be changed too much with wasted space being used to make room for the cycle path. Designs were still to be drawn up and there would be a full consultation on the proposals, probably starting in the Summer. A resident asked what the likely capacity and usage rate of Cycle Superhighway 9 would be. Richard Duffill said that because of poor connections and facilities the route was currently very lightly used. The new path would be between 3-4 metres wide and that would attract many more cyclists, although it was hard to put a figure to what the usage would be. The theoretical capacity of the route would be around 1,000 bicycles per hour in each direction.

A resident felt that it would be unsafe to have a bi-directional cycle path on the A315 as there were lots of side roads from which vehicles would have to emerge, crossing the cycle path and not necessarily looking both ways. Richard Duffill explained that the route had been designed to cross as few side roads as possible; Transport for London's design team would be reviewing the plans and checking that they were safe.

A resident noted that the route along the A315 was initially designated as a Quietway and asked why it was now a Cycle Superhighway; she was concerned that a Cycle Superhighway would be less accessible to those who were less confident on their bicycles. Richard Duffill explained that the initially planned route along the A315 had been reviewed by TfL and they had decided that it met Cycle Superhighway design standards. By designating the route as a Cycle Superhighway, more funding would be available to make the route even safer. Mr Duffill explained that the perception of a Cycle Superhighway as being intimidating for less confident cyclists was unwarranted in almost all instances, with any exceptions being in central London at peak times; he did not expect the route along the A315 to be difficult for any cyclist to use.

A resident asked whether it was realistic to increase the number of journeys made by bicycle to 8% of all journeys by 2031. Richard Duffill said that at the moment around 530,000 trips were made by bike in the borough each year. This was about 5% of all journeys and he felt the additional 3% was an ambitious but achievable target.

A resident asked whether there were any plans to promote electric bicycles in the borough. Richard Duffill noted that these were very popular in some parts of Europe, and indeed in hilly areas in the UK, however, their promotion was not a priority for the council as journeys in the borough could be made by the vast majority of people on an ordinary bike. He understood that TfL were considering adding electric bicycles to the Santander Cycles scheme, although this project was in its very early stages.

A resident asked where the Parklet would be in the Brackenbury area. Richard Duffill said that it would probably be near to the Deli, subject to the results of a consultation which was about to be launched. Councillor Hamilton said that he would have welcomed the opportunity to consider the consultation on the parklet at the PAC before it was launched; it was explained that the scheme was of local importance only and that such schemes would not usually be brought to a PAC.

A resident said that secure cycle storage was important for those living in flats. She asked whether she could dare to hope that there would be a bike hangar in every street in the borough. Richard Duffill said that data on where bike hangars were needed was being collated and some would be installed within a month or two. He didn't think that there would be one in every street, but he hoped that a significant number could be installed. Councillor Harcourt noted that the introduction of bike hangars often meant the loss of a parking bay, which residents needed to be consulted about. A resident asked whether surplus space at Santander Docking Stations could be used to accommodate bike hangars. Richard Duffill replied that it could, however, demand was often from areas where there was little off street space. All of the borough's docking stations were fairly well used and it would damage the usability of the system if docking stations were removed.

A resident said that changes to Goldhawk Road had made it more difficult to use; she felt that it would discourage people from cycling. Another resident said that getting to Westfield from the South was difficult, and asked what plans existed for a route from Hammersmith to Shepherds Bush. Richard Duffill explained that a new Quietway from Hammersmith to Shepherds Bush was planned, and approaches to Westfield would be considered as part of that.

John Griffiths, Chair of H&F Cyclists, asked whether the Twickenham to Hammersmith Quietway would travel over Hammersmith Bridge. Richard Duffill explained that it would not; the route was expected to join the A315 just to the East of Goldhawk Road having crossed the Thames further to the West.

John Griffiths was concerned that the Westbound cycle lane on Du Cane Road was too narrow and close to other vehicles. Richard Duffill explained that the new Quietway would run to the North of Hammersmith Hospital, allowing those who were not comfortable using Du Cane Road a convenient alternative.

A resident was concerned that there was insufficient provision for cyclists along the New Kings Road; the route was heavily used by commuting cyclists and the lack of space made it an intimidating route for less confident riders. Richard Duffill said that the issue was one he was aware of, although it would not be an easy one to resolve. There were plans to improve facilities in 2017-18 although these were still in the very early stages of planning.

Councillor Cassidy asked whether further Santander docking stations could be installed in the borough. Richard Duffill explained that more docking stations were planned for significant developments such as Old Oak.

Councillor Steve Hamilton asked why the WestTrans Freight Strategy had been appended to the report. Richard Duffill explained that the strategy had been developed during the year, and aimed to reduce the number of lorries using the borough's roads, thereby making them safer for cyclists

A resident asked whether there were plans to improve cycling facilities on Fulham Broadway as part of the Chelsea FC stadium redevelopment. Richard Duffill said that it was hoped that there would be many improvements but that it was still too early to say what this could mean for Fulham Broadway.

A resident asked whether there were still plans for a 'flyunder' in Hammersmith. Richard Duffill explained that a masterplan for Hammersmith Town Centre was currently being drafted as a Supplementary Planning Document; residents were helping to suggest what changes were needed and he understood that a flyunder proposal would be included in the document.

### **36. BETTER JUNCTIONS - FINAL CONSULTATION REPORT FROM TRANSPORT FOR LONDON**

Ed Boatman, Transport for London, explained that 780 responses had been received to the recent consultations on the Better Junctions scheme at Hammersmith Gyratory. 73 percent of respondents either supported or partially supported the proposals. Transport for London therefore proposed to proceed with the scheme which had been consulted on with some amendments in response to the views of residents. The pedestrian crossing from Shepherds Bush Road to the Broadway Centre would now be retained.

A resident noted that there was a difference between the proportion of people who TfL had claimed supported the scheme and the proportion who had made positive comments. Mahmood Siddiqi explained that the 73% figure was based on respondents ticking a box to indicate their support, whereas the figures the resident was referring to had only considered the comments which had been made. Many of those who had left negative comments might well have criticised a particular aspect of the scheme, but still selected the Support or Partially Support tick box. A resident explained that they had indeed been very critical of the removal of the crossing from Shepherds Bush Road to the Broadway Centre, but had selected the Partially Support tick box as they were otherwise in favour of the scheme.

A resident said that the phasing of traffic lights needed to be planned carefully to ensure that cyclists were not delayed excessively. Ed Boatman said that it was intended that progression around the gyratory would be good. A resident was concerned that pedestrians might walk into cycle lanes. Ed Boatman explained that marshals would be employed when the new layout was introduced; this would encourage all users to be responsible.

A resident felt too few people had responded to the consultation for it to be useful. Ed Boatman explained that the consultation had been heavily publicised, including a second consultation phase when errors in the first consultation were pointed out to Transport for London by Hammersmith and Fulham Council. He believed that everybody who might have wanted to respond had been given the opportunity to do so; the results were therefore an accurate portrayal of those who felt strongly enough to answer the consultation. If residents had concerns about the consultation process which they had not already raised they could contact transport for London via their website [www.tfl.gov.uk/help-and-contact](http://www.tfl.gov.uk/help-and-contact) or on 0343 222 1234.

A resident was concerned that there would be a significant traffic impact on smaller roads around the gyratory. Councillor Dewhirst shared these concerns noting that in their previous report there had been suggestion of delays to the south of the gyratory. Ed Boatman explained that modelling had been done which suggested that there would be some minor delay, but that there were not expected to be delays which would have a significant impact on the local road network. Unfortunately Mr Boatman did not have the figures with him to illustrate this although he explained that had there been unacceptable increases in journey times the scheme would not have been progressed. A resident asked that the modelling data for the scheme be shared with him; Ed Boatman explained that this was available on the TfL Consultation website (<https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/hammersmith-gyratory-1/>). The Chair suggested that if residents had specific concerns they could contact Transport for London after the meeting.

Councillor Harcourt explained that Hammersmith Grove had been expected to face some delays as a result of the scheme. The Leader of the Council and Mahmood Siddiqi had therefore worked with residents to create a scheme to mitigate the impact of this. Mahmood Siddiqi explained that as a result of conversations with residents the proposed bus lane on Beadon Road would not be installed; this would reduce the impact of the scheme. A resident asked that details of the scheme on Hammersmith Grove be made available on the council's website. Mr Siddiqi added that modelling was not an exact science, but did identify where there were likely to be significant impacts; if the Gyratory scheme did have unexpected consequences the Council, Transport for London and residents could work together to mitigate these.

A resident said that they felt that the scheme's benefits for sustainable transport users outweighed any delays to drivers; she said that the delays might even increase the number of people cycling as they chose not to queue in traffic. The resident also suggested that if there were concerns that local roads might be used as 'rat runs' they could have access to them restricted. Another resident said that they felt that there was a need to reduce the

number of motor vehicles on the roads and give better facilities to other modes of transport in order to create a less congested, cleaner future.

A resident asked whether Transport for London's modelling looked at people per hour or at vehicles, as they suspected the improvements might lead to more people being able to cross the gyratory. Ed Boatman explained that modelling was mostly based on motor vehicles, cyclists being quite hard to model, however, he agreed that the works would certainly lead to more cyclists using the gyratory.

Councillor Hamilton said that he remained concerned that only those cycling around the gyratory would have a faster journey whilst buses, cars and pedestrians would all be delayed to achieve this. Ed Boatman explained that since the reintroduction of the pedestrian crossing from Shepherds Bush Road to the Broadway Centre pedestrians would now no longer be delayed. Councillor Hamilton suggested that it would be useful if Transport for London could provide updated figures on delays following the change to the design.

John Griffiths explained that he had submitted a new proposed layout for Beadon Road. Ed Boatman explained that this had been forwarded to him and that its potential impacts would be considered.

A resident asked that the relationship between Transport for London and Hammersmith and Fulham Council be clarified. Mahmood Siddiqi explained that the Mayor of London drew up the Mayor's Transport Plan. Councils across London then bid for money to improve their boroughs and meet the goals of this plan through their own Local Implementation Plans. He added that Hammersmith and Fulham preferred to do all improvement work on roads in the borough and so were made a contractor by Transport for London for large schemes they might have built themselves in other boroughs.

A resident suggested that the plans ought to be delayed in order to take into account the Hammersmith Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document. Councillor Dewhirst agreed that postponing the scheme's implementation would be a good idea. Councillor Cassidy said that a good reason for inaction could always be found; he felt that the plans ought to be pressed ahead with so as to bring the benefits of the scheme to residents as soon as possible.

Councillor Hamilton asked why the taxi rank on Blacks Road had been relocated as this caused difficulties for shops trying to load and unload delivery vehicles. Ed Boatman explained that it had been moved to allow the first taxi to see the rear of the main rank outside the Broadway centre. Councillor Harcourt also noted that residents had complained about the delivery vehicles.

A resident suggested that underpasses could be used to allow pedestrians to cross the gyratory. Councillor Harcourt said that underpasses had previously been very unpopular as they needed lots of maintenance and attracted anti-social behaviour; he did not think that they should be reinstated.

A resident asked what the next steps in the process would be. The Chair explained that officers would take residents comments on board, finalise the design, and then a report would be taken to the council's Cabinet.

At 9.05 the meeting adjourned for 15 minutes to allow those who were only interested in the cycling items to leave.

### **37. UPDATE ON CEMETERIES**

Ullash Karia explained that the cemeteries service was successful, thanks largely to the hard work of officers and staff. New Cemetery Regulations had been drafted to replace the old ones which were quite outdated. Ian Ross said that the Council owned 4 cemeteries, two within the borough and two outside the borough. These contained enough space for around 10 years of burials. Councillors would need to consider options for additional space and changes to management of graves in the next few years. The service was delivered by Quadron idverde whilst expenditure and income were fairly even.

Councillor Dewhirst asked whether headstones were still layed flat if they were considered to be unsafe. Ian Ross explained that if a headstone was found to be unsafe it would either be layed flat or supported with a stake and a band.

Councillor Cassidy asked what the difference between a Standard and a Premium grave was. Ian Ross explained that standard graves were those in Mortlake and North Sheen Cemeteries whilst premium graves were those in Margravine and Fulham Cemeteries.

Councillor Cassidy asked whether there was a friends group for Fulham cemetery. Ian Ross said that there was not, although officers would support one if there was sufficient interest.

The chair asked whether there were any trends in income. Ian Ross explained that it had been expected that the number of cremation plots sold would rise but in fact they had remained relatively static.

It was clarified that the costs of a pauper's grave were borne by Adult Social Care.

Comments on the draft cemeteries regulations were invited by email after the meeting.

### **38. UPDATE ON REGISTRATION SERVICES**

Dave Page explained that a new Superintendent Registrar had been appointed around 18 months ago. The service had been restructured to make it more efficient and resident focussed. A new charging structure had also been introduced. Weddings were now offered in the Marble Gallery, whilst Birth Registration was offered at the Masbro Children's Centre. Options to offer a complete wedding package were being explored. Dave Page explained that income for the service had increased significantly in most



areas, but the Nationality Checking Service, which had been very successful until a few years ago, had been affected by changes at the Home Office. Income would be affected when the Town Hall was being refurbished and so officers were looking to licence other venues.

The Chair asked whether the service sought feedback from residents. Dave Page said that it did and agreed to provide more information on this outside of the meeting.

Councillor Cassidy asked what links the service had with the Senior Coroner for West London. Dave Page explained that a properly functioning Coroners Court was important to the Registration Service. All Registration Services across West London had been experiencing difficulties with the Coroner's Court, and lots of work had been done to improve its service. The Police and JCIO continued to investigate the Senior Coroner.

### **39. WORK PROGRAMME AND DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

The committee's work programme was noted.

Meeting started: 7.00 pm  
Meeting ended: 9.40 pm

Chair .....

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