

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

# **The Economy, Arts, Sports, and Public Realm Policy and Accountability Committee**

## **Minutes**



**Monday 21 July 2025**

### **PRESENT**

**Committee members:** Councillors Rory Vaughan (Chair), Adam Peter Lang, Ashok Patel and Amanda Lloyd-Harris

**Other Councillors:**

Councillor Florian Chevoppe-Verdier (Cabinet Member for Public Realm)

**Officers:**

Bram Kainth, Executive Director - Place

Mark Raisbeck, Director of Public Realm

Val Birchall, Assistant Director, Culture Tourism & Sport

Daniel Waller, Libraries and Archives Service Manager

Ian Hawthorn, Assistant Director Highways and Parks

Ryan Alexander, Service Manager, Highways Works Coordinator

Annie Baker, Assistant Director Street Environmental Services

Valerie Simpson, Assistant Director, Environmental Health and Regulatory Services

Charles Francis, Committee Coordinator

Before the start of formal business, the Chair thanked Councillor Jackie Borland for her many years on the committee and welcomed Councillor Amanda Lloyd-Harris as a new committee member to her first meeting. The Chair also acknowledged the hard work by Councillor Sharon holder as the outgoing Cabinet Member for Public Realm and welcomed Councillor Florian Chevoppe-Verdier to his first meeting as her successor.

## **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Liz Collins, Andrew Jones (Cabinet Member for the Economy) and Zarar Qayyum (Cabinet Member for Enterprise and Skills). Apologies for lateness were provided by Councillor Ashok Patel.

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **3. MINUTES**

The minutes of the Economy, Arts, Sports and Public Realm Policy and Accountability Committee meeting held on 29 April 2025 were agreed.

## **4. BLACK HISTORY PROJECT UPDATE**

Val Birchall, Assistant Director, Culture Tourism and Sport introduced the item which provided an update on the work in progress on the community collecting and engagement project being co-produced with residents to generate black history content for exhibition, conservation and education purposes.

Daniel Waller, Libraries and Archives Service Manager provided a presentation which covered the following points:

- Information explaining how the Black History Project would be implemented.
- Details on the interactive family history event held at West London College.
- The Wendell Park Primary interactive workshop, the outcomes and how this made the students feel.
- Information on the Island Records Blue Plaque celebration.
- Information on The Black History Month Launch event held in Lyric Square.
- Details of the Windrush 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebrations held in Shepherd's Bush Green and at Riverside Studios.
- The Phase 1 – activities currently under way in Fulham and plans for the Phase 2 And 3 Activities of the Community Collecting and Engagement work planned for Shepherds Bush and Hammersmith, taking place between October 2025 and October 2026.
- in the intention for a celebratory culmination event and the creation of a resource for the whole community.

Councillor Adam Peter Lang commented he was pleased with the work which had been conducted and cited it as a good example of co-production. He highlighted that he had attended several Black History events which had been excellent. He referred to Bob Marley who recorded in the borough and the Mercury Prize Winner, Arlo Parks who came from Hammersmith and Fulham which illustrated there was a rich history of culture within the borough. He echoed the Chair in thanking Councillor Sharon Holder for her work in the area and the need to continue it and develop it further. He asked where some of the Black History collections might be placed, so

that the artefacts became a permanent resource for the London community, as well as for people from further afield. In response, Val Birchall explained the current thinking was that some elements of the collection would be exhibited in local communities as this would be a way of building an understanding of what had been happening there. In the longer term, it was hoped there would be an exhibition of materials which might take place in a library or the new civic campus. Currently, officers are working with local communities to try and establish the most appropriate location for materials, depending on what the content was. Councillor Adam Peter Lang agreed that using the civic campus for some of the materials was a good idea.

Councillor Chevoppe-Verdier agreed that the civic campus would be used but he also wished to ensure that the materials were available to residents across the borough. So, the use of roving collections was a possibility. The Authority also remained mindful of the cost implications of hosting a collection in the long term.

Councillor Amanda Lloyd-Harris thanked officers for the report and noted the progress which had been made. She noted that a major player in the borough, rich in histories, had not been involved and that was the BBC. In response, Daniel Waller confirmed the Council contacted the BBC when the Cultural Compact was being established but officers had not fully explored BBC participation and officers would follow up this suggestion. Val Birchall highlighted that Riverside Studios had the Black Theatre Archive which was another important resource to incorporate into the project.

Councillor Amanda Lloyd-Harris commented the Council had some artefacts in the archives at Fulham Palace. She asked if these were going to be included, where the Council held them. In response, Daniel Waller confirmed that existing collections from the Council and Fulham Palace would be used and incorporated.

In terms of the location of the collection, Councillor Amanada Lloyd-Harris understood there were leanings to potentially house this in the north of the borough. She felt it was important the collection was located centrally so everyone had access to it, and it was not difficult to view. In response, Val Birchall confirmed that a final destination for the collection had not been agreed, but the intention was for all residents to be able to access it.

Councillor Ashok Patel commented that the definition of black in paragraph 5 of the report, was a wider picture than simply the Windrush Generation and so he felt that officers needed to look at this further. And in relation to the Working Group, whether this was reflected in this definition and if there was full participation as far as diversity was concerned within the Working Group. In response, Val Birchall confirmed that the Working Group was constituted before the community had an opportunity to consider what the term black meant and how they wished to define it, and it was acknowledged that there needed to be a wider representation on the Working Group as a result. In relation to the Windrush aspect, Val Birchall explained that currently with the Fulham phase of the project, the aim was to focus on the larger population groups in that area. However, there was scope to look at pockets or particular communities that were more prevalent as the project progressed.

The Chair, Councillor Vaughan commented there was a trove of evidence being discovered and several events were being put on. In terms of the timing of the project, he asked whether there would be an overlap between the Fulham phase and Black History month in October. Daniel Waller confirmed that the timing of events and activities had been discussed by the Steering Group, and it was making plans to ensure connections were made with different people locally.

The Chair asked how the cultural thread would be taken forwards, such as The Bush Theatre, which was a large supporter and promoter of black culture (and a considerable amount of new writing was supported there), the Blue plaques celebrating Fanny Eaton the first black supermodel and whether the play that was written about this and shown at the Sands Ends Arts and Community Centre in Fulham could be reshowed during Black History month. The Chair also mentioned Island Records and Peckings Records in Askew Road and asked if some of this local scene could be explored.

The Chair also asked what publicity and support officers had for the events and whether they had considered the intergenerational aspects of the events. In response, Daniel Waller confirmed the play concerning Fanny Eaton had been successfully shown at Sands End Community Arts Centre, Riverside Studios and the borough's three main libraries (which meant it was seen by a new audience of persons that were not theatre goers) and this would be reshowed. In relation to the music element, Daniel Waller confirmed that the Cultural Team had been working on this aspect and Emma Jerrard in the Events Team was looking to draw on the rich musical heritage into future events. In relation to publicity, as the Council was working with partners such as Fulham Palace, it was a case of using their publicity channels in conjunction with the Council's. And with regards to the intergenerational element, Daniel Waller confirmed that as part of the Steering Group, the Council had good contacts with schools, Nubian Life and the Libraries and Archives Service also had a Heritage Officer who also had a strong list of contacts. Looking ahead to the conclusion of the project in 12 months' time, Daniel Waller stated that it required a significant amount of development if it was going to encompass all the resources in the borough and it would be a huge project.

Concluding the item, the Chair explained there was a wealth of interesting events on the horizon to develop the project further, and the committee would welcome a further update in due course. Reiterating some of the discussions, the project needed to be brought to local communities, the BBC needed to be consulted and engaged, and no final destination had been agreed for the collection. Further points included the need for wider representation on the Team bringing the Project forward. It was also important that the thread of music, theatre and Black culture was pulled together as had played an important part in the life of the borough, as well as capturing and documenting memories from previous large-scale events, such as the Windrush event.

## **RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee review and comment on the report.

## **5. HIGHWAY ROADWORKS MANAGEMENT AND CO-ORDINATION**

Ian Hawthorn, Assistant Director Highways and Parks provided a presentation which outlined how roadworks were currently managed and coordinated in the borough using the LBHF permit scheme. It described the proposed enhancements to the London Permit Scheme, known as the Lane Rental Scheme, which provides additional protection for fifty of the borough's key roads.

The following points were noted:

- Background on roadworks and their management in H&F.
- Details on the multiple assets which make up the Highway network.
- Communication / collaboration and the co-ordination of works. To ensure effective works planning and minimised disruption.
- Details on the process by which works permits are issued and the conditions surrounding these.
- Information on penalties and fines for non-compliance / delayed works.
- Details on H&F future co-ordination, and the Lane Rental Scheme.
- The benefits of the Lane Rental Scheme including:
  1. Less roadworks on the busiest roads.
  2. Utilities contribute to highway maintenance funding.
  3. Reducing the days roadworks occupy key roads.
  4. Improved air quality.
  5. Reduced negative economic impact on local businesses.
  6. Improved contractor practices across the industry to work smarter.
  7. Improved bus journey times.

In relation to the Lane Rental Scheme, Councillor Ashok Patel asked what discretion Cadent Gas or Thames Water would have when carrying out works on the fifty roads cited in Appendix 1 of the report. In response, Ian Hawthorn confirmed it was a challenge for both these organisations, as a considerable amount of their main assets sat in those roads (such as large water mains, gas mains, sewers, electrical and telecoms infrastructure) as they had the most capacity for these services. And due to the way the organisations worked, it was very difficult for them not to be impacted by lane rental scheme. As a result, the implications of lane rental would drive both organisations to pre-plan their works and deliver maintenance and repairs in a very different way than today. Ian Hawthorn provided details of the current permit fees and explained the implications of moving to a daily charge under lane rental which would lead to different organisational behaviours.

Councillor Ashok Patel noted the consultation was planned for August to September when lots of people would be away and asked about its timing. In response, Ian Hawthorn explained the Council was on prescribed government timetable and if the Council wished to be included in the second phase, the consultation needed to be undertaken in these months so a submission could be made in October.

In relation to the graphics in the presentation, Councillor Amanada Lloyd-Harris noted that the first arm of the five major roads that caused congestion were on the boundary or in her ward. She asked whether these statistics had arisen due to the closure of Hammersmith Bridge and what the impact of this had been. She asked

what percentage of road works and utilities works were conducted at night and given the congestion, asked if there was scope for works on the major roads to be conducted at night.

With regards to penalties and fines, Councillor Amanda Lloyd-Harris asked where possible (with major works) if the Council ensured inspections were conducted before works were signed off, so that there were no major surprises. And finally, she asked how many other boroughs had introduced the Lane Rental Charge. In response, Ian Hawthorn confirmed that Transport for London had a Lane Rental Charge, as did Surrey, West Sussex and Kent. Currently, London Boroughs did not have Lane Rental charges. The thinking was that several London Boroughs would apply to have Lane Rental and the first four were: Camden, Lambeth, Enfield and Merton with a number of other boroughs forming elements of the second and third tranches of the scheme.

In relation to signing off roadworks before the works were completed, Ian Hawthorn provided a detailed explanation of how this was done and why, as well as the issues arising from reinstatement work that needed to be checked after it had time to settle. With regards to Hammersmith Bridge, he explained this was having an ongoing effect on traffic flows. However, as Hammersmith and Fulham was a very busy borough, the number of works correlated with how much development was taking place as these needed services and telecommunications to be installed. And finally in relation to night works, Ian Hawthorn confirmed that Highways work was conducted at night but not many utilities were. He highlighted the Lane Rental charges applied from 7am to 7pm, so if works were conducted at night, Lane Rental would not be charged.

Adding further comments, Mark Raisbeck, Director of Public Realm, acknowledged working at night caused noise and disruption to residents. And there was always a trade-off between the work being completed sooner and the number of complaints received. And as a general comment about pan-London traffic levels, there was a degree of evidence to suggest this was reducing overall. Since Hammersmith Bridge had closed, traffic levels over surrounding bridges, such as Wandsworth Bridge had declined. However, there were several other factors such a cycle or bus policies that could alter and have an impact on traffic flows and congestion rates.

Councillor Adam Peter Lang thanked officers for the clear presentation and for flagging the benefits of the Lane Rental Scheme. He commented there was a good opportunity during the consultation to highlight these benefits to residents. In terms of the consultation timeframe, he thought this was very tight, but understood why this was the case. He asked officers for further details about the consultation phase. In response, Ian Hawthorn explained it was a government set, statutory consultation which would outline the scheme, and this would be available on the Council's website. It would require the Council to engage with utilities (Thames Water, BT etc), other boroughs and Camden, Lambeth, Enfield and Merton had also been through the same process.

The Chair, Councillor Rory Vaughan asked how the Council checked what utilities were doing with their permits and also how letter drops by utilities worked. The Chair

provided anecdotal evidence about how Thames Water had operated close to his home and asked how the permits were issued if they had to cover multiple visits.

In response, Ryan Alexander, Service Manager, Highways Works Coordinator explained that the Council did try and monitor each set of works but there was an element of trust when an application (for works) was received. If officers noticed that only limited progress had been made, then this would be flagged with the utility company. Ryan Alexander provided information on what action would be taken in a number of different scenarios including the imposition of fines if works were not completed on time. And confirmed that when a utility company returned to a site on multiple occasions, a permit would be required each time.

In relation to forthcoming works on the Uxbridge Road, the Chair noted that a number of residents had lobbied for more trees to be planted. However, he appreciated the complexity of adding trees to the highways network. Ian Hawthorn confirmed that trees needed a considerable amount of space, and the Council insisted that utilities dug around trees by hand to minimise potential damage to the tree.

The Chair asked for further details to be provided on site checks and enforcement. In response, Ryan Alexander explained that any works involving an excavation or on traffic sensitive streets would be inspected the day after the estimated end date for two reasons, one for the reinstatement check and secondly for over running works check which might lead to a fine. He confirmed that officers aimed to inspect all reinstatements that had been carried out. Further details were provided on sample checks, quotas, long term inspections after 2 or 3 years and the use of lists of routine inspections to check reinstatements after a 3-month period.

Ian Hawthorn also provided information on over-run charges which were charged by the day. About 10 years ago the Council charged utility companies about £750k per annum. Today, it was noted this was £250k, so it showed that performance had improved, but he underlined as this was also an avoidable charge, which illustrated this behaviour still required further work.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr MacDonald-Brown, local resident addressed the committee on the impact of the closure of Hammersmith Bridge to motorised traffic. He endorsed the comments made by Mark Raisbeck, namely that traffic had not increased over neighbouring bridges as shown by TfL's traffic counts taken on all of London's bridges. He stated it would be good if Councillors and the Borough's local MPs quoted that data rather than relying on anecdotal evidence. He commented that the closure of Hammersmith Bridge had been a very effective traffic reduction project and hoped it remained closed.

Mark Raisbeck commented that the data was not based on physical counts at those particular points (the bridges) but it was extrapolated data. He provided details on the Council's counts, as well as data supplied by TfL but concluded that overall, there had been a reduction in traffic levels.

Councillor Florian Chevoppe-Verdier, Cabinet Member for Public Realm, commented on the Lane Rental Scheme and explained his primary focus was to

reduce nuisance to residents. He reiterated that the Council was aiming to join the scheme in the autumn, and it would be good to update the committee on this, as well as some conclusions from the early adopters

Concluding the item, the Chair thanked officers for their work and confirmed the committee's support for the Lane Rental Scheme. He was keen that officers planted more trees on the Uxbridge Road and highlighted the co-ordination between the Council and Utilities was beneficial to residents. He hoped officers would continue to encourage Utilities to complete their works within a specified timescale and to ensure these were reinstated properly. He looked forward to a further update in due course.

## **RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee review the report and provide comments.

## **6. UPDATE ON WASTE AND RECYCLING SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS**

Annie Baker, Assistant Director, Street Environmental Services provided a presentation on the progress made in Hammersmith and Fulham's waste and recycling services through the on-going roll-out of food waste recycling, the introduction of wheeled bins and garden waste recycling and other service developments.

The following points were highlighted:

- The context of where Hammersmith and Fulham stood for waste minimisation and recycling in comparison to other London Boroughs.
- The benefits of a wheeled bin and food collection service.
- Details of the service roll out, the community engagement work which had been conducted and flexibility of the service.
- A sample of the feedback the service had received from residents.
- Details on the garden waste recycling service.
- Details on the food waste recycling service, including its uptake by residents.
- Performance metrics – Noting household recycling rate was up 5 percentage points, due to increased food and dry mixed recycling.
- Details on the social value implications of the service and how this had benefited communities.

Councillor Amanda Lloyd-Harris welcomed the proposal about small electrical goods as outlined in the report. She explained there was an issue with a number of bins not being returned on to the property which highlighted (to potential burglars) that the householder was absent. She asked if this issue could be passed to the collection teams as a security concern. In addition, she asked about the cost of the garden waste collection service, as in her view, this was an additional service charge for a pre-existing service within a Council Tax bill. She asked how she should reply to residents about the additional charge for a service that was already included in their Council Tax.

In relation to the bins, Annie Baker, Assistant Director Street Environmental Services asked Councillors to report any instances of bin misplacement so this could be



communicated to the crews. The best place for bins was as close to a householders' gate as possible within the boundary of the property. However, all bins should be returned to where they were presented.

With regards to the garden waste collection service, Annie Baker confirmed that the service was a new service for recycling the garden waste, whereas previously it was collected as refuse. As a next step she explained officers would be looking at instances where garden waste was combined with refuse to ensure this was managed. Councillor Amanda Lloyd-Harris confirmed that her garden waste was still being collected as part of her refuse collection, although she was still paying for the optional garden waste collection service. She felt refuse and garden waste collection services were not consistent. Annie Baker confirmed that this needed to be looked at to ensure garden waste was not collected as general refuse. She acknowledged that behavioural change took time, but garden waste recycling collection was for subscribers only.

Bram Kainth, Executive Director – Place commented that previously all waste was being presented in black bags. The Council was actively taking steps to improve its recycling and minimise its waste disposal / waste disposal costs and so the appropriate food waste and garden waste service collections should be used by residents.

Councillor Ashtok Patel welcomed the news that Hammersmith and Fulham was the best performing inner London Borough for dry waste recycling. However, he reiterated the issue of bins not being returned to where they were stored as a growing problem. He also raised the issue of social value and the £1.7 million cited in the report. And asked how this was calculated. In response, Annie Baker provided a detailed explanation of how this worked and offered to provide further figures on this outside the meeting.

The Chair asked if the wages of those persons the Council employed were also added to the Social Value calculation. In response, Annie Baker confirmed that this did not equate to wages, but there was a value assigned to employing a local person under the Social Value element of the contract. In terms of the return of bins, Annie Baker confirmed that the Council did not solely rely on the contractor and officers did go out and monitor collections. She reiterated her request that those instances of bins not being returned to their collection point should be reported to the Department.

Councillor Adam Peter Lang commented that the Waste Service was a good news story, and many residents had provided him with positive feedback about how the Council had been engaging with the community. He noted that only half of Councils provided a food waste recycling service and so the Council's achievements should be celebrated. He asked how much longer the Veolia contract would last. In response, Annie Baker confirmed that food waste recycling services should be provided to all residents by March 2026 and she also provided details on how food waste collection services would operate in communal areas for both flats and housing estates. She also highlighted that when residents started to separate their food waste from their general waste, then food waste levels tended to decrease as shopping habits changed.

Councillor Adam Peter Lang commented that the food waste collection service was saving both the Council and residents money but was also an environmentally sound initiative. He asked about the food waste recycling rollout, the communications undertaken and the learnings so far. In response, Annie Baker confirmed that officers had incorporate the learning from the street-based rollout and would then build on this by providing bespoke information related to where they lived.

In relation to the food waste recycling, the Chair explained he had noticed that not all residents where he lived had adopted the service and so asked how the Council was encouraging residents to do more of this. He also highlighted the issue of pests; food waste being scattered on pavements and what actions could be taken to reduce this.

Annie Baker provided details of how the food caddies were designed to minimise spillage, however these were knocked over occasionally. Overall, it was noted that cleaning issues have reduced since the caddies had been introduced as less food waste is presented in black sacks. However, if residents were experiencing persistent problems with pests, they were encouraged to contact the Waste Services Team.

The Chair asked what strategies were in place to make more residents use the caddies and what the uptake levels were. In response, Annie Baker confirmed that the tonnage was building month on month and officers would be looking at new ways to engage with people and also remind them the service was well established on their street. Behavioural change meant that as residents saw what their neighbours were doing, then uptake would improve. Further ideas included the use of stickers on refuse bins explaining not to put food waste in them and also working with residents' groups and schools / school children to highlight the service and environmental improvements recycling brought.

The Chair reiterated the point about bins being returned to their collection point and proposed that this might be happening as residents had moved the bins onto the pavement to assist the collection teams. Annie Baker confirmed that where repeated instances of this were reported, the council would write to residents to ask them to locate their bins slightly differently.

With regards to soft plastic recycling target of 2027, the Chair asked if anything could be done to bring this forward. In response, Annie Baker confirmed the soft plastics category was a wide range of different materials and so recycling sites would need to extract this range of materials from the mix and then use a re-processor who could take the mixed plastic wrap and turn this into a product. The Council's role was to collect the recycling and separate this, but then to pass in onto the industry where it would be recycled. At the moment, there were outlets for some types of plastic wraps but not all (as the industry was still being developed). The hope was that in future; producers might choose to streamline the different types of plastic wraps that were currently available.

The Chair commented he was pleased the garden waste service was starting to be successful and the social value which had been created was extremely encouraging.

It was also good that overall recycling rates had improved and overall waste levels per head of population had also decreased.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr MacDonald-Brown, local resident addressed the committee and confirmed he was a garden waste collection subscriber. He felt that people with gardens should pay for the service. However, he thought the £90 cost per annum was too high and if this was reduced then there might be more subscribers. In relation to the recycling of soft plastics, he commented if Tesco's could provide it, why couldn't the Council. And in his view, if soft plastics recycling was implemented successfully then weekly refuse collections might no longer be necessary.

In relation to the garden waste collection service Councillor Chevoppe-Verdier commented that this was a user pays model, which at £1.70 per week was not overly expensive. The Council was trying to roll out the scheme to more and more people and at some point in the future the charge might be reduced. With regards to the availability of soft plastics recycling, the Council used Western Riverside Waste Authority which was shared with several other boroughs and the key issue here was space, and the capacity of a shared recycling provider to provide this service to several boroughs concurrently.

Concluding the item, the Chair thanked the officers for all their work, noting that recycling rates had increased and there was scope to improve them further (through communal collections, schools and other venues). He encouraged more recycling, especially for food waste. The Committee welcomed that residents were subscribing to the garden waste collection service and in terms of soft plastics the Committee encouraged the introduction of this as soon as possible. And on operational points, he asked that officers check where residents were asked to present their bins from the outset and he encouraged Councillors to report instances where bins were being left on the pavement outside individual properties.

## **RESOLVED**

That the committee note the report and the contents of the accompanying presentation.

### **7. REPORT ON THE DRAFT MARKETS AND STREET TRADING LICENSING POLICY 2025- 2030 AND UPDATED PRESCRIBED STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR STREET TRADING LICENCES**

Valerie Simpson, Assistant Director Environmental Health and Regulatory Services provided a report which provided the details and rationale for having a new H&F Markets & Street Trading Licensing Policy. This also provided an update to the prescribed standard conditions and the list of commodities. The presentation covered the following points:

- Key Functions and the remit of the Markets and Street Trading Team.
- The Council's five priorities and aspirations:
  1. Attracting and retaining new traders.
  2. Addressing the economic challenges of the market.

3. Demonstrating the wider value of markets.
4. Professionalising Market management.
5. Improving relationships with Traders.

The key benefits for adopting a Markets and Street Trading Licensing Policy.

- Key updates to the standard conditions for Street Trading Licenses.
- Details on the revised commodities list.
- Information on the following:
  1. Shop front licences.
  2. The declaration of Market Rights.
  3. Designating the whole borough for regulated street trading activities
  4. Details on the Market and Street Trading consultation proposals and the revised timetable for formal adoption.
  5. Details on the Enforcement Policy and speaking to Traders.

Councillor Adam Peter Lang noted the points in the report concerning protecting the environment, protecting traders and the importance of aesthetics for traders (pitches and coverings). He asked who would monitor the policy and enforce it when it was implemented. In response, Valerie Simpson, Assistant Director, Environmental Health and Regulatory Services confirmed the Enforcement Team was very small and so it would need to work in conjunction with the Law Enforcement Team (LET), Street Trading, Public Protection and Highways (concerning shopfronts) and be a collective approach. And when the policy was rolled out it would initially be to those areas in the borough which were most visible or most problematic first as it was unrealistic to assume all issues could be solved immediately.

In terms of the shop fronts and people using the pavements, the Chair asked if the LET could assist, as the use of the pavement was usually one metre from a premises and so they could speak to the shop owners. In response, Valerie Simpson explained the main requirement was to clearly set out what the expectations were, and what non-compliance looked like because of anomalies such as private forecourts. So, when the expectations were clear, a pan-council approach could be taken to enforcement. The Chair agreed that the rules and regulations need to be clear to all concerned so there was better compliance.

Councillor Amanda Lloyd-Harris welcomed the presentation and commented that in her view, the introduction of a Markets and Street Trading Licensing policy was long overdue. She felt enforcement was paramount but did not see how the LET could be involved with their myriad of other roles and responsibilities. In relation to long term absences mentioned in paragraph 16.3 of the report (of absences of more than 4 weeks, the Council would intervene to ensure the pitch was managed), she asked why the Council would have a role to play under these circumstances when traders were self-employed. In response, Valerie Simpson confirmed the Council did not want traders to have a licence and then not be trading (due illness or personal circumstances) so they could have several registered assistants so the business could continue to operate. It was a case of being compassionate and considering traders needs but also ensuring that a thriving market environment was created and supported.

Councillor Amanda Lloyd-Harris thanked officers for their comments but felt ensuring substitutes could operate pitches was overstepping the Council's role as officers would be busy with a number of other duties and concerns. In relation to paragraph 3.5 of the report, she asked whether there was a limit to the number of 6-month temporary trading licences a trader could have before it became a permanent pitch without actually applying for a permanent one. In response, Valerie Simpson commented the issue of temporary and permanent licences had been raised even before the consultation began. Currently, the conditions were somewhat restrictive and in instances of a trader retiring, there needed to be a workable mechanism so that pitches could be passed onto other family members. Moving forwards, it was suggested there could be a 6 or 12-month period to assess compliance before pitches became permanent. She also highlighted the administrative burden of temporary licences as these needed to be reissued every 6 months. Councillor Amanda Lloyd-Harris agreed a temporary to permanent transition made sense, so long as the process was clear and could be easily monitored.

Councillor Ashok Patel commented that a Markets and Street Trading Licensing was a good idea and a way of assessing how things had progressed post Covid. He appreciated the idea was encourage rather than stifle trade. Looking at the consultation process (page 107), he noted the Council could object to competing markets being set up within 6 and a quarter mile from any Council run market. And the requirement for shop owners to have eye catching displays was very subjective. He highlighted that traders wished to avoid fixed costs and if regulations were too prescriptive it could stifle trade. He agreed with Councillor Lang that further consultation with the Trade bodies was required to ensure this was the right approach.

Councillor Ashok Patel commented it was a shame that the consultation was taking place over the summer period and perhaps a longer period would be better. He also highlighted the Risk Management section and the implications for legal action, fines and risk of Judicial Review. He asked how many of these actions had taken place.

In response, Valerie Simpson confirmed there had not been any instances of Judicial Review in Hammersmith and Fulham but this might have occurred elsewhere. The section regarding risk management had been inserted to provide clarity and transparency for everyone. She explained the distance of 6 and a quarter miles was a regulation under Market Rights to protect specific markets and was an option the Council could consider. And there would be a long, separate consultation process which would need to be followed. Valerie Simpson confirmed enforcement was very important, as were the need for Trader meetings in person to ascertain their feedback and establish whether they had concerns about compliance. In terms of conditions, most Traders were adhering to these, but it was a case of making these more robust.

Valerie Simpson stated there was scope to extend the consultation as there was no set deadline, but it was important there was good engagement. Officers would continue to monitor responses and make a judgement as the consultation progressed.

In relation to the consultation document, Councillor Amanda Lloyd-Harris felt this was far too long at 10 pages and could be condensed to include the salient points. She agreed holding face to face meetings with Traders was an excellent idea but also (to bridge the digital divide) Council noticeboards should be used extensively to encourage Traders to submit comments in writing rather than solely online, so a comprehensive response was received.

In response, Valerie Simpson confirmed that Environmental Health / Regulatory Services would speak to Estates Management about using noticeboards as a resource. And she confirmed that having taken on early feedback, the consultation document had already been reduced in length.

The Chair echoed the points which had previously been made about the consultation process and asked what mechanisms were available to enforce against illegal street trading. In response, Valerie Simpson explained the Council used Trading Standards to issue fixed penalty notices and or pursue prosecutions for more serious offences. Residents were encouraged to report instances of illegal street trading to the Street Trading Team or Trading Standards. The Chair asked if there was scope for LET to become involved in enforcement activities and Valerie Simpson confirmed she would make enquiries.

In relation to Market Rights, the Chair commented it was odd that you could object to a market halfway across greater London. Valerie Simpson confirmed it was a very technical area and Hammersmith and Fulham currently licensed markets under the London Local Authorities Act but if the Council declared Market Rights this would be considered under the Food Safety Act. The Chair commented about the expectation on Traders and risk management, given that the policy had not been set out clearly for some time and how old it was. In general terms, Valerie Simpson commented that the vast majority of what was within the Markets & Street Trading Licensing Policy was what was already being done on a daily basis and the Council was looking to ratify these practices and the conditions in mitigation.

Concluding the item, the Chair confirmed he was very keen for officers to take the consultation forward subject to their being the right engagement by September, and if not, the consultation might be extended if officers felt the right people had not responded (in person). Valerie Simpson commented that a significant proportion of what would be codified was largely current practice. The committee were keen there were clearer rules around shop fronts and how these were used. The Chair reiterated that the enforcement element of the policy was crucial for it to work appropriately. He also welcomed the social inclusion and co-production elements of the policy.

## **RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee note and comment on the Prescribed Standard Conditions for Street Trading Licences, at Appendix 1.
2. That the Committee note and comment on the updated Regulation of Commodities for Street Trading Licences 2025, at Appendix 2.

3. That the Committee note and comment on the draft recommended Markets & Street Trading Licensing Policy 2025 – 2030, at Appendix 3.
4. That the Committee note and comment on the Inclusive and Accessible Markets and Street Trading Guidance at Appendix 4, that has been co-produced with the Inclusive Environment Disabled Residents Team.
5. That the Committee note and comment on the consultation proposals for the council to declare market rights and to designate the whole borough or more streets for regulated street trading activities.

Meeting started: 7.00 pm  
Meeting ended: 9.45 pm

Chair .....

Contact officer: Charles Francis  
Committee Co-ordinator  
Governance and Scrutiny  
☎: 07776 672945  
E-mail: Charles.Francis@lbhf.gov.uk