



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

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

Tuesday 3 February 2015

PRESENT

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

Other Councillors: Councillors Michael Cartwright, Stephen Cowan and Wesley Harcourt

Officers: Chris Bainbridge (Head of Transport Policy and Network Management), Craig Bowdery (Scrutiny Manager), Pat Cox (Head of Policy & Spatial Planning), David Gawthorpe (Policy & Projects Officer), Sue Harris (Bi-Borough Director for Cleaner Greener & Cultural Services) and Kathy May (Acting Director and Bi-borough Head of Waste and Street Enforcement)

41. MINUTES

RESOLVED –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13th January 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

42. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

43. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

44. 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.

45. CYCLING IN THE BOROUGH

The Committee received a report from the Head of Transport Policy & Network Management outlining the developments in cycling in the borough since the Committee last considered the issue at its meeting in July 2014. Officers explained that the Council's draft Cycling Strategy had been consulted upon and gave a verbal report on the initial results. The Council had received approximately 80 responses, around 70 of which supported the aims of the Strategy. Roughly 70% of respondents described themselves as regular cyclists and they gave broad support for the challenges and opportunities identified in the Strategy. Some of the comments received had been more critical, ranging from anti-cycling sentiment to a desire for the Strategy to go further and do more to promote cycling. There was also a general feeling that there should be increased segregation between cyclists and other forms of transport.

The Chair welcomed John Griffiths, chair of hfcyclists and part of the London Cycling Campaign, to the meeting. Mr Griffiths explained that he would have liked to have seen more progress made improving the Hammersmith Broadway gyratory and Hammersmith Bridge for cyclists, arguing that until measures were taken to improve safety people would be too scared to cycle across them. It was the view of hfcyclists that there should be signage across the bridge to either give cyclists priority or to prevent overtaking at the pinch points. Mr Griffiths invited Council officers and members to attend a site visit at the bridge with their families so that the risks to cyclists could be experienced first-hand. It was also highlighted that no overtaking signs were used effectively when there were roadworks which restricted the width of the road and that the draft Strategy advocated similar signs and a 20mph speed limit when carriageways were less than 3.2m wide, which the bridge was in places.

A member of the public also expressed concern at the poor road surface on the bridge, which added another hazard that cyclists needed to be aware of. It also made it difficult for a cyclist to safely look behind them when they approached the pinch points. It was also argued that the accident statistics did not include the many 'near misses' which occurred daily or take into account the 'fear factor' which dissuaded potential cyclists from using the route.

Officers explained that the Council was not necessarily opposed to signage on the bridge, but that it needed to be wary of over-cluttering with too many signs which would reduce their effectiveness and confuse drivers. In order to establish a 20mph zone across the bridge, the Council was required to

consult and make legal orders, which it was currently prioritising over signage. Officers also acknowledged the concerns regarding the road surface on the bridge and reported that there were plans to reconstruct the surface. The timescale of this work was dependent upon TfL funds and would require the bridge to be closed for several weeks. It was confirmed that the Council owned the bridge and would carry out any works needed, but using funds from TfL and that as part of the strategic road network, no work could be carried out without TfL's consent.

Members asked if the number of bikes being stolen was decreasing. Mr Griffiths and members of the public present explained that this remained a significant issue and theft rates were as high as ever. Bicycle theft used to be priority for the Police, but this no longer seemed to be the case. Hfcyclists would welcome any assistance raising this issue with the Police locally.

The Committee also discussed the expansion of the 'Boris bike' cycle hire scheme. Officers reported that the Council had agreed to contribute £2million of s106 developer contributions and that there were plans to install more docking stations and bikes in the borough, but these would be dependent on the funds from developments materialising. TfL was seeking to expand the scheme by whole networks rather than in piecemeal, isolated locations that were too far away from the existing network. The Committee agreed that the Council should continue working with TfL to expand the scheme across as much of the borough as possible.

A member of the public raised concern at the cycle route at Talgarth Road/Shortlands where westbound cyclists had to cross the road to reach a segregated cycle track, but sightlines were impeded by vegetation. Officers explained that the Council had proposals to redesign the area to bring the cycle path away from the road and segregated with a green partition, however this would be dependent on securing the necessary funding. In the meantime, officers undertook to explore whether the shrubs and vegetation could be cut back to make it easier to pass.

Mr Griffiths described his disappointment that the redesign of Hammersmith Gyatory had been developing over some time now but it was still not clear what would be done. Officers explained that the project was being led by TfL and that it was looking at options such as peninsularisation or pedestrianisation, but without detailed transport modelling these remained ideas only. Before any firms plans could be developed, the modelling would be required so that the wider impacts could be fully understood. If, for example, the modelling suggested that changes to make the junction safer for cyclists led to increased bus journey times, then it would be a political decision to decide which would be prioritised.

A member of the public raised the issue of cycle racks being installed outside of people's homes, with some residents supporting their installation while others opposed it. It was asked therefore whether the Council could consult residents prior to installation. Officers explained that the Council did not consult on such installations as they were not felt to be harmful or detrimental to homeowners in any way as they were very minimalist and didn't obstruct

views or restrict movement. Cllr Harcourt stated that in his experience residents were sometimes split between opposition and wholehearted support and offered to attend any local meetings with residents to discuss the cycle racks. He also argued that installation of the racks were necessary to help increase cycling in the borough and that without them, people were more likely to lock their bikes to railings or fences that were then obstructive. Some members argued that they felt that most people wouldn't object, but that the Council should still consult residents before installing racks outside of private homes. Officers explained that the Council had a 'blank canvass' consultation that could be used to collect views on features such as trees and cycle racks, which could then be fed back to local members.

Mr Griffiths voiced concern regarding the air quality in the borough, particularly around Shepherds Bush Green and the Holland Park roundabout, which would likely be exacerbated by the coming developments at Old Oak Common. He argued that the borough should be included in the central London Ultra Low Emission Zone which would charge higher polluting vehicles. Officers explained that such decisions were outside of the Council's remit, but that the Council had made the same argument when it responded to TfL's consultation.

Members of the Committee supported the Strategy, but felt it placed too much emphasis on improving provision for existing cyclists rather than encouraging new cyclists. It was asked how the quality of the modal shift could be assessed, rather than just the quantity. It was also argued that rather than seeking to 'improve' interactions between cyclists and other road users, the Strategy should aim reduce interactions through segregation similar to the approach used in Holland. Officers responded that encouraging new cyclists was a key aim of the Strategy and undertook to explore how this could be made more evident in the final document. It was also explained that the Quietways across the borough would feature minimal interactions.

The Chair thanked officers and members of the public for their contributions and requested that a further update be brought before the Committee in the autumn.

RESOLVED –

That the report be noted.

46. DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

The Committee received a report from the Head of Policy & Spatial Planning on the Council's draft Local Plan, which combined the existing Core Strategy and Development Management Local Plan.

Noting the proposed policy regarding betting and pay day loan shops, it was asked what weight this would have. Officers explained that the current rules meant that under permitted development rights, shops could convert to betting or pay day loan shops without seeking planning permission. The proposed Local Plan would allow the Council to consider the wider impact on

an area, particularly in terms of the concentration of such shops. The Committee was also informed that the Government had announced its intention to revise the change of use rules and remove the permitted development rights to control the increase in betting and pay day loan shops. Without a change in national policy, the Council could explore the use of an Article 4 direction to remove the permitted development rights, and the inclusion of the policy in the draft Local Plan would give more weight to such a direction.

A member of the public asked if the draft plan included a policy on double-storey basements. Officers explained that the policies monitoring subterranean basements had been included in the Plan as despite there being very few in the borough so far, the Council was keen to prevent them becoming an issue. RBKC had a similar policy which was only just coming into effect and had set a precedent by the Planning Inspectorate so officers were confident that LBHF's policy would be judged sound. This was key because the only evidence supporting the policy was the potential disruption caused by construction traffic, as structural stability was not a relevant consideration in planning policy.

Some members questioned the length of the draft Local Plan, arguing that at 296 pages it could be off-putting for residents and highlighting that the National Planning Policy Framework was just 50 pages long. Officers explained that the draft Local Plan was an amalgamation of two documents and that the total page number had been decreased. It was also a reflection of the nature of the document that it needed to be sufficiently robust to be a useful tool in development management, and so the detail was necessary. Pages such as the local context and descriptions of the area were important as they framed the policies contained in the Plan and were necessary if the document was to be considered sound. The Committee also asked about public consultation and officers explained that a wide range of activity had been undertaken, including press releases, the Council news site, direct mailings to 1,200 interested people and organisations and workshops for Housing Associations and the Youth Council.

Members asked about the draft Local Plan's definition of affordable housing as being for households earning up to £60,000 and how this figure had been arrived at. Officers explained that this figure complied with Government guidance and the income limit was in line with that set by the Mayor of London in the London Plan, with which the borough's Local Plans had to conform.

Concern was expressed regarding the relatively weak policies regarding air quality in the draft Local Plan. Officers explained that as a key priority, air quality was covered in more detail in supplementary guidance which sat below the Local Plan and had around 30 pages of requirements and objectives.

Members argued that residents needed to be involved in the design of developments at an earlier stage. Officers explained that such policies were beyond the scope of the draft Local Plan and were a matter for the

Development Management policy. The Leader reported that the administration was of the view that residents were excluded too early on in the process and would be reviewing the Design Review Panel to increase its influence and power with new independent members.

RESOLVED –

That the report be noted.

47. STREET CLEANSING

The Committee received a report from the Head of Waste Management & Street Enforcement presenting the Council's current and proposed street cleansing initiatives. Officers highlighted that generally there was a disparity between the perception of street cleanliness and the measured performance of the service.

Members sought confirmation from the Cabinet Member whether he still conducted regular walkabouts with Serco, the service provider. Cllr Harcourt confirmed that these still took place regularly, the most recent being less than two weeks ago. He also followed up complaints received by visiting affected himself.

Some members of the Committee expressed concern that the Council appeared to consider littering a lower priority than previously, with the issuing of Fixed Penalty Notices dropping from around 100 a month to almost zero. It was also noted that the income from these fines was important in so much as it funded further enforcement activity. Cllr Harcourt explained that generally the amount of littering taking place was decreasing, and so it was natural that the number of fines being issued would also drop. He also emphasised that officers had been diverted from other roles to focus on enforcement to help ensure the borough's streets were clean. Officers added that initiatives such as the focus on cigarette butts had been so effective that it had become known that the Council fined all offences, so people had learned not to drop their butts. The focus was now on tackling domestic littering rather than on the issuing of fines. Officers confirmed that the Council did not have targets for the number of fines issued, but were instructed to address specific issues identified by residents.

A member of the public highlighted an ongoing problem he was experiencing on the Lakeside estate with rubbish persistently being dumped illegally. CCTV cameras had now been installed, but these had taken nine months to arrive. Cllr Harcourt reported that he had recently visited the estate and had seen it as its worst and he acknowledged the problem. He felt there were a number of contributory issues, such as where the bins were stored, which made it difficult for residents to access them. He undertook to instruct officers to make contact with the landlords to explore resolving the issues. The Committee was informed that the public bins in the road acted as a magnet for illegal dumping and that the designation of the area as hotspot had not appeared to help. Officers stated that the cycle of dumping needed to be broken with publicised prosecutions. The area had now been put onto Serco's daily rounds to

monitor and the information gathered by the member of the public would help the Council prosecute offenders. It was also noted that the communication with landlords needed to improve and that officers were working with colleagues in the Housing department to address this. This was particularly important given the high turnover of tenants in the area.

Members of the public argued that the Council should explore a different approach to domestic rubbish storage, such as underground storage or shared bins at the end of each road, which seemed to work well in Europe. Officers explained that in many countries in Europe, the local council had complete control over all aspects of waste collection and disposal, so it didn't matter who put their rubbish in the bins. However using such an approach here could allow businesses to dispose of their waste illegally, so such factors needed to be taken into account. It was noted that a similar approach had been used in cities such as Brighton & Hove with mixed results, but the Council could explore the feasibility of a small trial.

Members of the public highlighted that London was a global city with many languages spoken, and as such many residents might not understand the term 'flytipping'. Officers recognised this and explained that wherever possible Council communications used generic terms such as 'rubbish', but that the term 'flytipping' could sometimes not be avoided.

RESOLVED –

That the report be noted.

48. RECYCLING UPDATE

The Committee received a report from the Head of Waste & Street Enforcement updating the Committee on a number of issues following the Committee's consideration of recycling at its November 2014 meeting. Members welcomed the progress made, especially the Council's application to be a pilot for a recycling incentivisation scheme.

RESOLVED –

That the report be noted.

49. WORK PROGRAMMING

RESOLVED –

That the proposed work programme for the remainder of the municipal year be agreed.

50. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The date of the next meeting was agreed as Tuesday 21st April 2015.

Meeting started: 7.00 pm
Meeting ended: 9.18 pm

Chairman

Contact officer: Craig Bowdery
Scrutiny Manager
Governance and Scrutiny
☎: 020 8753 2278
E-mail: craig.bowdery@lbhf.gov.uk

COMMUNITY SAFETY, ENVIRONMENT & RESIDENTS SERVICES POLICY
& ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE - 3 FEBRUARY 2015

Submission by John Griffiths, Chair hfcyclists, London Cycling Campaign.
john@truefeelings.com

CYCLING IN THE BOROUGH

HAMMERSMITH BRIDGE

One of the five headline subjects the July 2014 PAC recommended to be assessed and reported back to the Committee is

- Safety improvements for cyclists on Hammersmith Bridge

At 4.2 iii} this report states

We are currently working on several improvements in the Hammersmith Bridge area, including a contra-flow cycle lane on Bridge Avenue and a 20mph speed limit on the bridge.

It is very good that this report is considering a 20mph speed limit on Hammersmith Bridge. However it does not mention any other consideration to improve the feeling of security for cyclists, or any measure that would encourage cyclists who at present are far too intimidated to venture onto the roadway of the bridge.

I suggest that the double yellow lines are returned to their original position next to the kerb. We do not mind vehicles overtaking cyclists where there is room, and at present the double yellow lines are only on the short spans, not on the long central span. Some cyclists found them useful as a guide as to how far out from the kerb the next pinch point would be, and there could be a dotted white line indicating this all the way across the bridge.

At the July 2014 PAC meeting I submitted a discussion on our survey of the bridge, and recommendations that signs indicating "Narrow lanes, do not overtake cyclists" or road markings indicating "Cyclist Priority" be installed on the bridge. It appears that no notice has been taken of this at all.



The responsibility must not be put upon cyclists to be courageous and merge with faster moving traffic. Drivers must be told that cyclists have priority at the pinch points.

The latest Draft London Cycling Design Standards, Appendix – Cyclists at Roadworks, gives at Page iii

If a 4m lane width cannot be achieved then, according to advice given in [TAL 15/99 Cyclists at Roadworks](#) (1999), a 'narrow' lane width of up to 3.25m to 3.50m will enable car drivers to overtake comfortably and will generally deter drivers of larger vehicles from trying to pass at all. If even 3.25m cannot be provided, then a 'narrow' lane width of up to 3.25m and a speed limit of 20mph should be considered with signs stating 'narrow lane(s): do not overtake cyclists'.

At the pinch points on the bridge the lane is only 3.0m wide, and this occurs four times as you cross the bridge. Although the advice above is in a roadworks section of the LCDS, the geometry of the bridge is as if there were roadworks, and it is a terrible section of roadway for cyclists.

CYCLE RIDE WITH COUNCILLORS

We wish to invite Councillors interested in the bridge to a ride across it. We hope this can be arranged during the coming consultation period on the bridge. Anyone who is able to cycle down a backstreet ought to be able to cycle on the bridge. And we hope you might bring your family too.

Should you find this disturbing, then please do something about the bridge.

HAMMERSMITH GYRATORY

Another of the five headline subjects the July 2014 PAC recommended to be assessed and reported back to the Committee is

- Cycle safety on the Hammersmith gyratory

This report states at 4.3

Transport for London are leading on work to improve safety for cyclists, and other road users, on the Hammersmith gyratory. Technical studies have started, and the indicative timescale is for consultation to take place in the Autumn of 2015 and construction to start in the summer of 2016. Options include "peninsularisation", where one leg of the gyratory could be pedestrian and cyclist only. The effects of this would be studied with or without the flyover being replaced by a tunnel .

This is great if the design is going to be prioritised for the safety and convenience of cyclists. In our experience, however, maintaining motorised traffic flows is always the primary concern of traffic planners.

The Council's Draft Cycling Strategy does not appear to be too committed to the idea of an East – West route through the gyratory for cyclists.

At 5.2.1, when discussing the Gyratory, it includes

Provide a cycling route from Hammersmith Road to King Street and improve the "sense of arrival" for cyclists on Broadway. **An alternative east/west route will be provided if an acceptable solution cannot be found**

The design of the gyratory must provide safe routes for cyclists from all origins and to all destinations. It must be a gyratory that cyclists feel confident to use, not just the most confident. This Better Junction review is not just a patch.

HOLLAND PARK ROUNDABOUT/ SHEPHERDS BUSH GREEN GYRATORY

This report states at 4.4

TfL are also studying options for one of the other major barriers to cycling in the borough, Holland Park Roundabout / Shepherds Bush gyratory. One option would be a "cycling hamburger", with a pedestrian/cycle route through the middle of the roundabout.

Again the design must be prioritised for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. There are indications from the White City Opportunity area that they intend to squeeze in another northbound lane at the Uxbridge rd / Wood Lane junction. There would be two lanes northbound at the entrance to Wood Lane and the cycle lane would be removed.

With Old Oak Common on the horizon a last ditch stand must be made for non polluting modes and for human breathing life over the dominance of polluting motor traffic.

POLLUTION LEVELS

The level found for 2013 at the Hammersmith Broadway NO2 diffusion tube site was 89.5 microgram / cubic metre. Levels above 60µg/m³ could lead to a potential exceedence of the NO2 hourly mean Air Quality Strategy objective.

This is an important consideration that traffic planners must take into account when deciding whether to give space to pedestrians and cyclists or to motor traffic.

OUR POLLUTION TESTS

Our group, hfcyclists, in collaboration with Andrea Lee of Client Earth, are going to place NO₂ diffusion tubes at sites around Hammersmith gyratory and Shepherds Bush Green starting on 4 February 2015. About 30 tubes will be used in February, and they will be replaced by a further 30 tubes in March. Several tubes will be used at each site, so there are not 30 separate sites. We are looking at places where there are a lot of people crowded together with a lot of traffic. The local geometry and prevailing winds can concentrate the pollution in certain areas.

Because of the potential for interference when tubes are placed at a lower height LBHF only place tubes at a height of 3m. Pollution levels lower down and closer to the source are expected to be higher, but we do not know by how much. We will be measuring at two heights, 3.5m and 2.5m at the same location. We hope that by extrapolating, this will give us an indication of the NO₂ levels at 1.5m, approximately breathing height.

At a couple of places where we do not expect any interference to the tubes we will be measuring at heights of 3.5m, 2.5m, 1.5m and 0.5m. This may give us an indication as to whether children in pushchairs are exposed to greater levels of pollution, and by how much.

It should be pointed out that NO₂ diffusion tubes are not considered a very exact method, and measuring for only two months out of a year will not lead to very robust results, and they may be described as “indicative”.

We will use statistics on our results to see how much reliance can be placed upon them. However we do hope to extract useful information from these tests that may be used to inform people making traffic [and health] decisions.

Elizabeth Fonseca and Davene Chatter-Singh, LBHF/RBKC, have both been very helpful and constructive in our project.


DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

BOROUGH-WIDE POLICY CC9 / AIR QUALITY

This should also include reassignment of road space in favour of non-polluting modes such as walking and cycling. The Borough should be pressing to be included in the Ultra-Low Emission Zone.

BOROUGH-WIDE POLICY T1 / TRANSPORT

This should also include reassignment of road space in favour of non-polluting modes such as walking and cycling. It should advocate removing the obstacles for cyclists at the two super gyratories, at Hammersmith and at Shepherds Bush Green / Holland Park roundabout.

	<p style="text-align: center;">London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham</p> <p style="text-align: center;">COMMUNITY SAFETY, ENVIRONMENT & RESIDENTS SERVICES POLICY & ADVISORY COMMITTEE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3 FEBRUARY 2015</p>
<p>STREET CLEANLINESS</p>	
<p>Report of the Divisional Director</p>	
<p>Open Report</p>	
<p>Classification - For Information</p> <p>Key Decision: No</p>	
<p>Wards Affected: All</p>	
<p>Accountable Executive Director: Lyn Carpenter, Executive Director for Environment, Leisure, and Residents' Services</p>	
<p>Report Author: Kathy May, Acting Director, and bi-borough Head of Waste and Street Enforcement</p>	<p>Contact Details: Tel: 020 (7341 5616) E-mail: kathy.may@rbkc.gov.uk</p>

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 Street Cleanliness is considered an important service area for the Council, and the administration committed to reducing flytipping and tackling littering and dog fouling in its manifesto.
- 1.2 A disparity currently exists between perception of street cleanliness standards (littering and rubbish dumping/flytipping), and measured performance results. In terms of perception, there has been a rise in correspondence to the Cabinet Member about littering and dumping over the latter part of 2014. However, in terms of monitoring and performance scores (both internal and independent surveys), results are good. Officers are working with Serco and other colleagues to refine street cleanliness methods in those areas where perceptions have changed.
- 1.3 This paper outlines the current activity and further actions that are being examined to address the above.

Conclusions and recommendations

- 1.4 Perception, and some recent high profile complaints regarding littering and rubbish dumping, do not match independent survey results. There is, nonetheless, Member concern and pockets of residential concern about litter "hotspots". Officers have listened to these issues and taken action with Serco and other teams, as described in Section 4 below.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. This report is for the Committee's information.

3. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 3.1 A downturn in general perception of cleanliness has occurred in some areas of the borough. Officers have taken on board recent feedback from Members and the public in considering actions on how to address these concerns.

Current level of litter and dumping queries

- 3.2 With regards to dumping and litter, increased reporting does not necessarily mean there has been a decrease in standards – it could be that awareness is raised and reporting routes are more accessible, which is good in terms of customer engagement, but negative in terms of the interpretation regarding any increase in reports. As outlined in Table 1 below, there has been a reduction in the number of litter and dumping reports, but an increase in the number of complaints through the formal H&F iCasework reporting process. Furthermore, issues reported are not always directly related to the Serco service provision: sometimes they are Housing or Highways matters (although of course this is of no importance to the customer who simply wants a solution). A walkabout with the Cabinet Member on 25 November 2014, concluded that the streets visited were mainly clean, and officers are reviewing the cleansing methods in locations that experience repeated problems. Officers already issue Section 46 and 47 Notices under the Environmental Protection Act. These notices specify how, where, and when waste should be presented for collection, (Section 46 Notices relate to domestic properties, and Section 47s to businesses). Officers are increasing the use of these notices as necessary in order to try to deter rubbish dumping.

Reported through Confirm	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Tot
Litter Enquiries 2013-14	23	31	31	51	38	39	24	21	21	23	18	16	336
Litter Enquiries 2014-15	22	22	44	33	15	39	35	24	21	23	18	16	312
Dumping Enquiries 2013-14	647	586	642	1018	812	847	732	753	566	575	454	467	8099
Dumping Enquiries 2014-15	483	459	690	600	633	646	622	828	566	575	454	467	7023

	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Tot
2013/14 iCasework complaints – Street Cleansing	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	5
2014/15 iCasework complaints – Street Cleansing	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	5
2013/14 icasework Enquiries	3	0	0	9	5	4	2	5	6	1	7	4	46
2014/15 icasework Enquiries	7	4	12	8	5	4	2	5	6	1	7	4	65

Table 1 – Litter and Dumping reports and Complaints (Nb: figures highlighted in yellow are estimated, based on the previous year).

Littering

- 3.3 2014/15 figures for LBHF indicate there has been an improvement in street cleanliness (low percentages are good). Surveys are independently carried out by WYG (White Young Green) every 4 months (3 tranches in a year), in accordance with the previous NI195 guidance. In-house surveys are undertaken monthly. Recent scores are below:

Year/Tranche	WYG Score		In house Survey	
	Litter	Detritus	Litter	Detritus
2013-2014 T1	2.14%	3.29%	1.94%	0.37%
2013-2014 T2	5.10%	3.63%	2.07%	0.62%
2013-2014 T3	5.45%	3.77%	2.56%	0.98%
Total	4.23%	3.57%	2.19%	0.66%
2014-2015 T1	1.64%	1.44%	1.34%	1.46%
2014-2015 T2	1.65%	4.56%	1.70%	0.86%

Table 2 - Litter and Detritus scores based on the former NI195 methodology

- 3.4 As outlined above in 3.2, the number of litter enquiries has fallen despite more portals through which to report.
- 3.5 For litter, resident satisfaction scores have increased in recent years, from 68% in 2010/11 to 76% in 2013/14. This compares extremely well with the London average of 56%.

Dumping

- 3.6 Trends show a reduction in reported dumping through the Contact Centre when compared to the same period last year (April to October), ie a 21.7% decrease. From April – October 2013 there were 755 fly tips reported via Cleaner Greener and H&F Report It, and from April – October 2014 there were 590. This bucks the national trend which indicates a 20% increase in dumping. However, there have been more complaints and enquiries through the formal process to H&F Intouch.

Customer Satisfaction

- 3.7 The resident satisfaction ratings in refuse and recycling collection have remained static in recent years at around 81% and 75% respectively. Again, this compares extremely well with London average figures of 72% for refuse and 71% for recycling collections.

Reporting methods and robustness

- 3.8 A recent internal audit of the Report It system in the third quarter of 2014/15, testing samples from April to June this year, confirmed that it is working well.
- 3.9 Some reports are sent direct to officers by residents and Members, rather than through the official channels of the Cleaner Greener hotline or Report It. Reporting through the official channels ensures that the issue/complaint is forwarded to the appropriate person for action. This also increases the chances of establishing a precise location, enables the customer to follow up through a reference number, and facilitates subsequent reporting and data analysis. As part of this drive, and with agreement of the Cabinet Member, officers recently reminded Members of the relevant reporting routes for different issues.
- 3.10 Officers and Serco are evaluating the sweeping frequencies and rectification levels with a view to adjusting them up or down as necessary. This review will ensure resource is directed at the right hotspots/high frequency areas.

Publicity and communications

- 3.11 Ongoing communications are recommended in order to influence behaviour change.

Current legislation

- 3.12 The new Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 came into force on 20 October 2014, bringing together a range of ASB-type offences under one umbrella legislation, enabling a generic notice to be served irrespective of the type of ASB offences committed. In relation to rubbish dumping and management of waste, officers are still able to issue Notices under Section 46 and 47 of the Environmental Protection Act. These stipulate how residents and businesses must present their waste for collection. They will also still be able to use Sections 33/34/46/47 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 for fly tipping and illegal waste presentation. The new powers are not expected to be operational before March 2015 with regards to Community Protection Notices.

4. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES

Key action points regarding street cleanliness are given below:

- i. Members have been asked for further feedback by providing specific locations of any further litter hotspots they are aware of.
- ii. Officers will continue to review hotspot areas with Serco with a view to re-prioritising cleansing and monitoring regimes in agreement with the Cabinet Member.

- iii. Newly-purchased small capacity Hako sweepers were deployed on double shifts between Christmas and New Year to take advantage of fewer parked cars in the borough, and to improve the detritus scores. Officers will review this approach to consider longer term changes to the street cleansing operations.
- iv. Officers will consider the Performance Mechanism in the contract jointly with Serco to consider whether a rebalancing of the financial reward and penalty mechanism would act as a better incentive.
- v. Officers are in discussion with LB Brent to agree a way forward for cleansing and enforcement activities for borough boundary areas (eg Harrow Road)
- vi. Officers will work with colleagues to resolve littering and rubbish dumps that appear on private land that is open to the public and can create unjustified poor perception of Serco standard of service delivery as well as the Council in general
- vii. Officers will pursue a communications campaign to raise awareness of the issues and the action the Council is taking, and to encourage behaviour change, particularly in relation to residents dumping small amounts of rubbish in carrier bags on the highway. The term "flytipping" will not be used as it can be misleading to residents, who do not associate small levels of dumping as a "flytip".
- viii. Officers will review the outcome of the refocused and intense enforcement approach on dumping and littering in Spring 2015.

5. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

- 5.1. Options for maintaining street cleanliness levels have been discussed throughout this report.