

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

Wednesday 21 September 2016

PRESENT

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

Other Councillors: Michael Cartwright, Sue Fennimore and Wesley Harcourt

11. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

12. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Iain Cassidy who was attending another Council meeting.

13. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

14. **ENDING GANG VIOLENCE AND EXPLOITATION STRATEGY**

Claire Rai, Head of Community Safety, explained that the Ending Gang Violence and Exploitation Strategy had been written in response to a change in focus from the Home Office. There was now more interest in tackling exploitation and the Hammersmith and Fulham strategy included that. The

strategy was intended to last for 5 years but would be reviewed annually by members of the partnership to ensure that it was working well.

The trend in Hammersmith and Fulham over recent years had been for a significant reduction in youth violence, although the past three years had shown slight increases. Hammersmith and Fulham had an average level of youth crime for a London borough, whilst public perception of youth crime being a significant problem was low.

The strategy had six priorities which were: Prevention, Diversion and Early Intervention; Engagement; Enforcement; Gangs Exit and Resettlement; CSE, Girls and Gangs, and; Information Sharing, Governance and Partnership Working.

Claire Rai explained that the committee's views on the strategy were welcomed and that after these had been considered and incorporated the Ending Gang Violence and Exploitation Partnership would put the plan into action.

The Chair asked whether the strategy was aligned with the Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy, as the two seemed likely to have significant crossover. Claire Rai said that they did overlap in many ways and appropriate links had been included in the strategies.

The Chair asked whether the council worked with other authorities to provide housing for those fleeing gangs. Jody Grogan, Metropolitan Police, explained that the London Gang Exit Service now provided housing as part of its package.

Councillor Holder felt that the strategy needed to emphasise the positive role of the police more noting that police officers were often the first officials gang members and their families experienced and so it was important that that this was a good one and that the strategy recognised this. Claire Rai agreed to add more information about the role of the police to the strategy; she explained that the four new council funded safer schools officers would be working with Secondary Schools and Pupil Referral Units to try to engage young people likely to be engaged with crime. Jody Grogan explained that the police also worked hard to engage and reassure victims of gang crime.

Councillor Dewhirst asked officers and the police whether the level of gang violence seemed to have risen or fallen over the past few months. Jody Grogan said that there had been a problem with gangs from neighbouring boroughs operating in Hammersmith and Fulham since the early part of 2016; this was continuing to be dealt with by police, for example, by using more high visibility patrols in areas where gangs operated.

The Chair asked whether officers in the safer schools team had a good knowledge of the borough. Jody Grogan said that some of the officers in the team had worked in the borough for many years and so had very good local knowledge and experience. Councillor Fennimore explained that the

recruitment process for the additional members of the team funded by the council had been rigorous.

A resident asked what age members of gangs tended to be and whether their parents were given support. Alison Saberoche, Manager of the Youth Offending Service, said that gang members were typically between 10-17 years old and that parents were given support and advice. It was common to have more than one gang member in a family so often the service worked with the whole family. The Chair asked whether children became gang members as a result of poor transitions from primary to secondary school. Alison Saberoche said that there were issues with transitions and that schools could do more to support those who might become gang members.

Councillor Fennimore said that the work which would be done to implement the strategy was a very important part of the council's commitment to young people and families. She thought that the strategy was very impressive and hoped that the youth offending service could now deliver a more complete service and intervene earlier. She praised the work of Queen's Park Rangers Football Club in helping to tackle gang s and felt that the partnership would help to reduce gang violence and exploitation.

Councillor Cartwright highlighted the importance of Hammersmith Youth Court to ensuring that justice could be delivered in the community. He was concerned that residents might have to travel as far as Hendon or Highbury if it were closed, as was the government's current proposal. There would also be delays to cases being heard. This would impact on the strategy. Claire Rai noted that the proposal was currently being consulted on and that officers were drafting a response to object to the closure.

15. DRAFT REPORT OF THE HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM AIR QUALITY COMMISSION

Rosemary Petit, Chair of the Air Quality Commission, explained that the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Cowan, had asked her to lead a group of residents to make recommendations on how to improve the borough's air quality. Other commissioners had been sought and a great team had been assembled. She paid tribute to the hard work of her fellow commissioners: Kate Forbes, David Chamberlain, Andrew Pendleton, Professor Derek Clements-Croome and Natalie Lindsay and explained that many long nights of reading and evidence gathering had been required to build up enough knowledge to make recommendations on the issue. She also thanked Chris Bainbridge, Elisabeth Fonseca and especially Peter Smith who had supported the commission.

Rosemary Petit explained that nearly one in four deaths in Hammersmith and Fulham could be attributed to air pollution. Two hundred and three residents died early each year as a result of poor air quality. The diseases and health problems caused and exacerbated by air pollution were numerous, and scientific research was regularly identifying more conditions caused by air pollution. The commission had decided that it was necessary to drastically improve air quality and looked at a wide range of ways this could be done,

receiving briefings from officers, evidence from experts, reading a mass of reports, and also considering over 40 submissions made by residents and experts in response to the commission's call for evidence.

The commission had decided not to limit its recommendations, but to give everyone from the government right down to individual residents something to do to improve air quality.

The key recommendations for government were: to ban the sale of new, and importation of all, diesel cars and to take measures to encourage drivers to scrap existing diesels; to introduce nitrogen oxides (NOx) and particulate matter (PM10) testing as part of the MOT, and; to introduce no drive days in major cities during episodes of very high pollution.

The commission recommended that the GLA and Mayor of London: review the London Plan to prioritise air quality; give Hammersmith and Fulham a low emission neighbourhood; replace diesel and petrol buses with electric ones; launch an anti-idling campaign; hold car free days in inner London; smooth traffic flows; monitor grass, hedge and tree cover across London; and amend the Climate Change and Energy Strategy to stop promoting combined heat and power installations above air quality neutral technology.

The council had a very large number of recommendations and the commission felt that it could, by implementing them, lead by example. The recommendations included:

- The Local Plan and other planning policy documents to be amended to: require developments to be assessed for their impact on air quality; include Walkability, and; strengthen and increase the prominence of greening and arboricultural policies.
- The WELL being standard to be adopted for new developments and prefabrication of buildings encouraged.
- A freight consolidation scheme for West London.
- To work towards using only low emission vehicles, and make sure contractors met low emissions targets.
- The development of an Urban Ecology Plan with an increase in tree, hedge and grass planting on council land and staggered pruning of trees.
- The promotion of air quality alerts and forecasts and the development of awareness raising and education schemes.
- An increase parking permit charges for diesel vehicles.
- Encourage 'Blue Green' schemes in homes and offices.
- Improve pedestrian and cycle routes.
- Increase the number of electric vehicle charging points in the borough.
- Wash down streets to reduce resuspension of pollution.
- Replace boilers with models which emitted less nitrogen oxides.

Finally the commission had recommendations for residents, businesses and community groups. These were for employers and community groups to promote low carbon and air pollution behaviours such as car sharing, and replace high polluting equipment, for schools to engage pupils in tackling poor air quality and in greening initiatives, and for residents to walk more,

especially to schools with children, to cycle more, to become Citizen Scientists and monitor air quality, and to replace ageing boilers where this was affordable.

Rosemary Petit said that there was much to be done, but that if everyone played their part it was possible to make Hammersmith and Fulham the greenest borough in London.

The Chair thanked the members of the air quality commission for their hard work.

Councillor Cartwright asked whether lorries and buses were responsible for most of the nitrogen oxide in the borough. Rosemary Petit said that it was certainly true that larger vehicles created more pollution but that buses and lorries were relatively low polluters now, with mobile machinery such as cranes emitting eight times the amount of pollution of the average bus. Buses were now often hybrids which cut the level of pollution. Elisabeth Fonseca, Environmental Quality Manager, explained that lorries made up about 12% of nitrogen oxide emissions in the borough whilst London Transport buses made up 22%. Diesel cars made up 21% of the emissions with petrol cars a further emitting 13% of NOx pollution. Coaches were responsible for 7% of emissions which, considering how few coaches travelled on the borough's roads, showed that there was much work to be done with coach operators.

Councillor Dewhirst noted that a ban on sales of diesel cars might seriously weaken the UK motor manufacturing industry, and that he felt a more phased approach would be of benefit. He noted that many buses were hybrids, with diesel engines as back up to the electric engine. He was impressed with many of the recommendations to the council, and pleased that the commission had identified that the council's contractors needed to use low emission vehicles as well. Councillor Hamilton said that he was concerned that the scrappage scheme, a surcharge on diesel fuel and an increase in parking permit prices for diesel cars might have a significant effect on poorer residents. Rosemary Petit agreed that there was a balance to be struck but felt that a modest increase was an important way to encourage people to stop driving high emission vehicles. Councillor Holder felt that motor manufacturers needed to do more to help resolve the problem of air pollution, especially in light of many companies having been lying about the emissions of their vehicles. Andrew Pendleton said that the inclusion of NOx emissions in the MOT test would help inform drivers and make some companies clean up their act.

The Chair asked where particulates settled. Elisabeth Fonseca said that the vast majority of particulate matter settled on and, was re-suspended from, the main carriageway of roads. She added that more particulate pollution (PM10) was re-suspended (17%) than produced by the exhausts of all vehicles on the roads (11%). The Chair asked whether any local authorities already washed down roads. Elisabeth Fonseca said that it wasn't yet done on a large scale, but that the council was carrying out trials around scrubs lane and that data on the success of this trial should be available in a few months.

A resident asked how far from roads air pollution spread. Elisabeth Fonseca explained that pollution dropped quite quickly, but that in Hammersmith and Fulham, safe levels were exceeded a long way from main roads as a result of the concentration in the area. Rosemary Petit noted that green walls were a potential way to prevent pollution from spreading too far. Councillor Dewhirst asked whether stationary traffic produced particularly large amounts of pollution. Elisabeth Fonseca said that where traffic wasn't moving there was a significant concentration of vehicles, but that because engines were idling each car was actually emitting a lot less than if it were moving quickly. Start/Stop technology was helping to reduce the level of pollution caused by cars in traffic jams.

A resident asked whether the face masks occasionally worn by cyclists had any benefit. Elisabeth Fonseca replied that whilst there were masks which could filter out pollution the majority of those she had seen were not likely to make a significant difference to the level of pollution in the air the wearer was breathing.

Councillor Dewhirst asked whether there had been any further plans presented by TfL for the redevelopment of Hammersmith Bus Station. The Leader explained that there had been no plans presented by TfL since 2014 when a plan with a 30 storey tower-block and no flyunder had been brought to the council. He explained that a residents working party had been set up to develop plans of what residents wanted to see but that this was only just beginning its work.

Councillor Harcourt thanked the commission for the incredible amount of work they had put into the report. He said that the administration was committed to becoming the greenest borough in London, and noted that there were some hard decisions to take to achieve this but that he also felt it was important to include residents in the plans, as their behaviour and support was key to improving air quality.

The Leader of the Council thanked Rosemary Petit for having chaired the commission and made it such a success. He remembered that in his youth everyone had assumed that the 21st century would be clean and cities free of pollution; now he felt, was the time to make that idea a reality and he felt that the commission's report gave Hammersmith and Fulham a chance to lead that work.

It was resolved-

That the report be noted and passed to the Cabinet for their consideration.

16. ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY

Matt Butler, Head of Policy & Spatial Planning, explained that the purpose of the report was to highlight the ways in which planning policy promoted the council's aim to become the greenest borough.

In 2014 the new administration had asked officers to review the local plan to place more of a focus on green issues. The local plan was the main planning

policy document which the council used to control development and reduce its negative impacts. A new policy on air quality had been introduced as well as a strengthening policies around carbon dioxide emissions, flood prevention and SUDS, cycle parking, and car free developments. The revised local plan was being consulted on from Friday 16 September 2016 to Friday 28 October 2016.

As well as improving policies officers had tried to engage developers at an earlier stage to allow officers to influence their plans and encourage them to think about the environmental impact of their proposals from the outset. Once the application had been submitted officers would assess proposals against policies and residents could have their say on the scheme. If planning permission was granted appropriate conditions would be added to make sure developers fully implemented the environmental aspects of their schemes. Officers would then monitor progress to ensure that these were met.

The council was working with Imperial College to get funding for a scheme to test how effective various green measures were. This information could then be used to persuade developers of the benefits of such measures and also to shape planning policies.

Residents were also now more able to engage in the planning process, having been given speaking rights at planning meetings, being represented on design review panels which gave advice to developers, and being included in policy formation.

The Chair asked whether planning policy sufficiently addressed particulate matter pollution. Matt Butler explained that Policy CC10 – Air Quality was a new policy and that it had been drafted to ensure that developers assessed the impact of their developments on air quality and conversely the impact of air pollution on their developments. The policy required developers to implement mitigation measures to deal with either of these eventualities. Many of the other environmental policies, for example, those affecting transport and controlling industrial uses also addressed particulate matter pollution. Paul Baker, Lead Environmental Policy Officer, noted that combined heat and power systems could cause air pollution, although they were promoted by the London Plan. In respect of carbon reduction, the policies in the new local plan would force developers to assess the impact of such systems. Matt Butler added that where carbon reduction policy targets could not be met, 'lieu-payments' from developers to the council should be made to spend on CO2 reduction measures in the borough.

Councillor Hamilton felt that parking permit free developments were difficult for some residents, saying that there were many residents who did not use their cars for driving in London but needed them for longer journeys. Matt Butler explained that car free developments were a long established idea and that they generally worked well. Where there were exceptional cases of need, s106 agreements could be drafted to allow a degree of flexibility in respect of switching the allocation of on-site parking. Councillor Hamilton referred to paragraph 6.266 and said that water was not an increasingly scarce resource, but agreed that it needed careful management. Paul Baker agreed and

explained that whilst there was plenty of water, London's projected drinking water supply needed to improve sufficiently to keep up with the rise in population; there was therefore less water available to be wasted.

Morag Carmichael, Chair of Hammersmith and Fulham Friends of the Earth, asked what the borough's policies were on the removal of trees, as there were issues with the health of some in the Bloom development close to Wormholt Park. Matt Butler explained that the policy was for trees to be replaced at least one for one. He said that developers were generally happy to plant trees as they improved the setting of their developments. Councillor Harcourt noted that the policy also required the trees to be kept in a healthy condition.

The Chair thanked officers for preparing an interesting and useful report and residents for contributing to the discussion.

17. WORK PROGRAMME AND DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Councillor Hamilton asked whether the changes to Controlled Parking Zone D would be brought to the PAC. Councillor Culhane explained that the committee did not generally hold meetings about changes to individual parking zones and so the report was not on the work programme.

Members noted the work programme and that the next meeting would be held on 16 November 2016.

Meeting started: 7.00 pm
Meeting ended: 8.45 pm

Chair

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