

Minutes

RESIDENTS, EDUCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

4 September 2019

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Wayne Bridges (Chairman), Michael Markham (Vice-Chairman), Allan Kauffman, Heena Makwana, Devi Radia, Stuart Mathers, Jan Sweeting, Steve Tuckwell and Nicola Brightman (In place of Paula Rodrigues)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Steve Austin (Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel Team Manager), Cathy Knubley (Head of Waste Services), Nathan Welch (ASB and Environment Manager), and Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
22.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Rodrigues, with Councillor Brightman present as her substitute.</p>
23.	<p>DECLARATION OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
24.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT ALL ITEMS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT ANY ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be considered in public.</p>
25.	<p>TO AGREE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Members asked that the additional information requested from officers at the previous meeting be forwarded as soon as possible. This information included detail on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Emergency Centres Plan;• The Major Incidences exercises planned for October;• Schools reporting difficulties with accommodation of SEN children;• Detail on secondary intake for September due to late applications;• Revised projections for school places. <p>It was agreed that the clerk would liaise with the relevant officers regarding the above, before feeding back to the Committee.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>1. That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2019 be approved as a</p>

- correct record; and
2. That the clerk would liaise with officers regarding outstanding actions from the previous meeting.

26. **ROAD SAFETY AROUND SCHOOLS** (*Agenda Item 5*)

Steven Austin, Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel Team Manager, introduced a report detailing the work of the Council's School Travel and Road Safety (STARS) Team to foster a positive road safety climate, attitude and environment at the Borough's schools.

The officer highlighted a number of key points, including that, according to an analysis of 2018 Collision data collated by the Department of Transport, Hillingdon's roads were the safest in London. The data recorded 48 incidents for every hundred miles driven, compared to the London average of 166 incidents per 100 miles, which showed that Hillingdon roads were approximately 71% safer than the average London borough. This was testament to the work of the Council in supporting the Road Safety and Highways teams, with Hillingdon often cited as a benchmark for road safety by other local authorities. The team's work had been recognized in both national transport and London transport awards, and Councillor Teji Barnes was the chairman of the London Road Safety Council, which was further evidence of the Council's commitment to keeping Hillingdon roads safe for residents.

Members asked a number of questions, including:

Could the officer provide further detail on the number of serious accidents recorded in recent years?

For 2018, the number of police recorded incidents in Hillingdon was 918, which was down 8% on the previous year, in comparison to a London total of over 30,000. These figures covered all roads in Hillingdon, including the A40. Statistics showed that certain accidents, such as pedestrian, car and motorcycle accidents, were declining, though cycle collisions had increased. There were no emerging patterns regarding the collision data (e.g. hotspots, etc.), though the team could undertake further analysis.

Could Ward Councillors help encourage schools to engage more with the Council and take up the initiatives offered?

A list of schools that were not currently engaging could be provided to Members outside of the meeting, and officers would welcome any help available. The team could also look into putting together literature to aid Councillors when approaching schools.

Air quality in the Borough was a very important issue. Was it possible to put notices outside schools mandating 'no idling', and specifying fines, as seen at councils such as Kensington and Chelsea?

Colleagues in the corporate communications team were working with air quality and health officers on designing schemes to address air quality, especially around schools.

How did the team contact schools, and how were schools prioritised for contact?

Every school was contacted at the start of each school year, and offered a variety of initiatives and opportunities to work with the Council. This included the formation of a travel plan, which could result in a host of events that the school could run, including engineering measures, bikeability courses, pedestrian training, and mini and junior

road safety officers. This work was then recognised through the Stars program, and the schools were then accredited by Transport for London. Unfortunately, some schools chose not to respond. Officers also worked with other groups, such as Brownies, Guides, Scouts, etc.

Did the school 'keep clear' scheme occur at all schools, or was it offered upon request?

The CCTV enforcement of school 'keep clear' markings was rolled out to every school that had markings. Since then, changes to school layouts following school expansion programs had meant that some entrances had changed, so the team was now in the process of reviewing the markings to ensure they were fit for purpose. All school keep clear markings were enforced by CCTV.

Was bikeability and pedestrian training available to children who live in Hillingdon but do not attend Hillingdon schools?

Yes, the Council runs bikeability courses during the school holidays, which Hillingdon residents and children of Hillingdon residents are free to attend. These courses included opportunities for families to learn together. However, pedestrian training was school-specific, and included working with the school in question to make the routes to the school safer.

How many parents had signed up to the Parent Pledge?

This information could be provided following the meeting.

How were school crossing sites assessed for suitability?

Criteria was varied, and included a review of the number of people using the site, integration with the existing school travel plan, visibility, traffic flow etc. Further detail on the criteria for assessment could be provided following the meeting.

What powers does the Council have to address parking around schools?

Issues with parking tended to be raised by residents of the local area. If an issue was highlighted, then officers would engage with the schools by way of the consultation process, which the Council must follow when introducing any parking restrictions. This often included an informal consultation with the school, local residents, and local businesses, and if there was support for managed parking then officers would progress to a formal consultation process, where schools were invited to comment before any action was taken.

Is there capacity to look ahead at potential issues that might affect schools, pupils and parents, for example parking and access issues around forthcoming new building developments?

Inevitably, most of the problems that residents who lived near schools faced were due to school traffic, which is why officers encouraged schools to work with the Council on identifying measures to address such issues. These could include introducing a walking bus, improvements to footways, new zebra crossings close to the school, etc.

Some Councillors have seen people, dressed similarly to school crossing patrol officers, who managed traffic flow and who prevented traffic using through-roads in order to safeguard pedestrians. Was this a Council or school led initiative?

It is likely that this was a school led initiative, though if the Councillor could provide further detail, this could be looked into. Separately, the Council was hoping to trial the option of having school streets closed to all traffic at certain times, via a barrier, which would be supported by a legal traffic order, and would enable prosecution of those who did not abide by the road closure.

The Hillingdon Association of Residents is particularly interested in air quality initiatives. Could officers provide more information concerning the school air quality projects that are listed on page 15 of the report that could be cascaded out to that association?

This would need to be referred to colleagues in the air quality team.

Regarding the mini and Junior Road Safety officers, the report mentioned that the Council encourages pupils of ages 5 to 11 and 11 to 18 to work on campaigns and projects. Could the officer provide some examples of these projects?

Before CCTV cameras were in place at school keep clear markings, mini and junior road safety officers would be out on the road, putting pressure on those motorists that ignored the parking restrictions and keep clear markings. This proved to be very effective in encouraging motorists to think about the safety of young people outside schools. In addition, pupils created banners to be displayed outside the school, and recently, pupils from St. Helen's School took part in a junior road safety watch where they stood on Long Lane with colleagues in the police force, conducting speed monitoring using handheld speed radar guns. As a result, some drivers were stopped by the police and spoken to.

Other areas of London have timed crossing displays at junctions, which display how long pedestrians have to cross the road. Were these available in Hillingdon?

Hillingdon does have several sites where countdown signals are installed, though if there were any additional sites that Members would like to see timers installed at, these could be put forward to Transport for London for review.

It was agreed that officers would draft a letter of thanks to the Council's long standing and hardworking school crossing patrol officers on behalf of the Committee, thanking them for their efforts and years of service.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the report be noted;**
- 2. That a list of schools that were not currently engaging with Council initiatives be provided to Members;**
- 3. That the transport team design and distribute literature to aid Councillors when approaching schools;**
- 4. That detail on the number of parents signed up to the Parent Pledge be forwarded to Members;**
- 5. That the criteria for assessment of potential school crossing sites could be forwarded to Members;**
- 6. That colleagues in the Council's Air Quality team be requested to provide information concerning the school air quality projects to the Committee; and**
- 7. That officers draft a letter of thanks to the Council's school crossing patrol**

officers on behalf of the Committee.

27. **PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEMES** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Steven Austin, Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel Team Manager, introduced a report detailing the Councils extensive Parking Management Schemes.

The Council's Parking Management Schemes were set into context, and the Committee was informed that, as per data captured from the London Travel demand survey 2011/2012, Hillingdon had the third highest household car access rates in London at 73%, only beaten by Richmond upon Thames at 75% and Bexley at 74%. Several major housing developments are under construction in Hillingdon, and so the demand for kerbside space was significantly increasing, together with the demand for parking schemes. In 2018, the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling had 64 petitions submitted to the Council that fell within his portfolio and of these, 41 (64%) were parking related.

Last year, the Transport and Projects team consulted over 11,500 households on possible parking options in their roads, and currently the existing program had over 51 schemes of various sizes that were being managed. This did not include the further 5 petitions that the Cabinet Member will be hearing in the coming months.

Members asked a number of questions, including:

Some residents are concerned at the time being taken to resolve requests for parking management schemes. Is this due a lack of team resources, and what can be done to relieve the pressure in what is going to continue to be a demanding area to manage?

Recently, a new member of staff had been seconded into the team on a six month placement, to try and help clear the backlog. However, it was important to point out that the delay in resolving requests was not wholly due to volume vs. resource, but also due to the requirement to adhere to process and legal obligations before any actions could be taken, which is often a lengthy process.

How often were parking management schemes reviewed, and what more can be done in regards to educating residents on what their options are?

Officers were always happy to review what communication is being sent to residents, and all consultation forms included an officer's name, telephone number and email address should residents wish to contact the department. While officers were always happy to take on board suggestions for ways to improve correspondence and communication with residents, recent consultations had achieved very positive response rates.

In instances where proposed schemes cover part of a road or area, was there a way for officers to engage with the other road section to fully explain how they will be affected by the scheme? Often, the only course of action available to these residents is to engage with the Council's petition scheme, which can be a lengthy process.

The extent of the demand was such that officers were comfortable that the petition scheme and subsequent consultation process was the most appropriate way for residents to make their views known. By signing a petition in sufficient numbers, the Cabinet Member was assured that there is a consensus among residents for some kind

of action.

Regarding new housing developments, some large scale developments were being approved without sufficient resident and visitor parking spaces, which cascaded parking issues out into neighbouring areas. Was there any way that the transport team could work more closely with planning officers to avoid such issues?

While it would be inappropriate to comment on planning processes, the team did work closely with colleagues in planning. In certain circumstances, parking issues could be regulated through the use of parking permits.

What were the plans to review those roads across the Borough where parking enforcement is suspended?

The Borough has approximately 380 legacy roads where enforcement has been suspended, though only a small subset of those roads ever report parking issues. When notified by residents of such issues, the Council will often consult with residents on a formal scheme, (likely parking bays with appropriate signage) however, this inevitably leads to an overall loss of parking for residents. Officers can make a list of these legacy roads available to the Committee outside of the meeting.

The Stop and Shop scheme set out in the report was intended to encourage residents to use their local high street. However, the reality is that parking spaces are often being taken up by the owners of local shops. What could the Council do to address this? Could number plate recognition be used to combat the issue?

Enforcement of the maximum stay time would be a matter for the parking enforcement team; however, it is likely that it would be down to the diligence of the parking enforcement officers to make sure that they note what vehicles they see, and how long they have been parked, before taking the relevant enforcement action. The suggestion of number plate recognition could be fed back to the parking team for consideration. Members could also report details of suspected infringements to the parking enforcement team who can then investigate the matter.

How did the Council manage those busy roads where, due to parked vehicles, access by emergency services was difficult?

Each case would need to be reviewed individually, and appropriate actions taken in line with policy.

It was requested that a larger map showing the current parking management schemes within the Borough be made available to the Committee following the meeting.

It was suggested that a briefing note regarding the enforcement of parking management schemes be considered for inclusion on the work programme at a later date.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the information in the report be noted;**
- 2. That a list of list of legacy roads where parking enforcement is suspended be forwarded to the Committee;**
- 3. That the suggestion of number plate recognition as a way to combat Stop**

and Shop parking infringements be fed back to the parking team for consideration;

4. That a larger map showing the current parking management schemes within the Borough be made available to the Committee; and
5. That a briefing note regarding the enforcement of parking management schemes be considered for inclusion on the work programme at a later date.

28. **ANNUAL COMPLAINT & SERVICE MONITORING REPORT FOR 1 APRIL 2018 TO 31 MARCH 2019 - INCLUDING EDUCATION COMPLAINTS** (*Agenda Item 7*)

The item was deferred to a future meeting of the Committee.

29. **REVIEW INTO LITTERING AND FLY TIPPING WITHIN HILLINGDON - FIRST WITNESS SESSION** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Cathy Knubley, Head of Waste Services, and Nathan Welch, ASB and Environment Manager, provided the Committee with information to aid the review into littering and fly tipping within the Borough.

Fly tipping was confirmed as being distinct from littering, in that fly tipping usually involved the deliberate aim of disposing of waste material unlawfully. The number of reported incidences of fly tipping was confirmed to be decreasing, but the volume of material being dumped was increasing. This was mostly due to organised crime, though a large proportion of fly tipped waste was due to elements within the Traveller community.

Littering involved the leaving of waste material from a person or vehicle, and as a result, gave rise to the perception that the Borough was untidy or unsightly. Littering also had implications for the environment, and wildlife. Littering could be domestic waste put out by residents onto the street for collection, but at the wrong time or in the wrong place.

Council resources to address littering and fly tipping included seven ASBET Rapid officers whose job was to deal with fly-tipping Borough-wide, three dedicated Cage Crew van operators who visit the fly tipping hotspot areas within the Borough, the Partnership Tasking team MPS North/South teams, and the Environmental Enforcement Team which consisted of ten officers. ASBET Rapid officers are trained in gathering evidence to review potential prosecution, while the environmental enforcement team predominantly address littering in high streets and public spaces. However, this team can also be tasked on various waste carrier operations in support of the Police, which can involve stopping vehicles carrying waste to ensure that they have the correct documentation and licenses to be conducting that waste carrier operation.

Members sought to gather further information, and asked a number of questions, including:

What was the cost to the Council to clear up littering and fly tipping?

Costs varied, though fees to recently clear three sites totalled £35k, £62k, and 72k, respectively. Cost details for preceding years could be forwarded to the Committee following the meeting.

Were there significant hotspots for littering and fly tipping?

Yes. Littering is mostly within areas of heavy footfall, such as parking areas or shopping areas. Popular fly tipping sites have been identified, with particular sites identified as problem areas due to illegal incursions and the occupation of land. To address this, the Council had secured an interim injunction to protect land from illegal incursions and remove occupiers quickly, to limit potential fly-tipping. Talks are ongoing with the police, with the idea that within three hours of a notified incursion there will be a waste carrier operation at the site, that will stop and search every vehicle going in and out of the site. Vehicles could then potentially be seized, which will have a dramatic impact on offenders.

However, while officers understand the most common locations, and secure the sites as much as possible, if people are determined to gain entry then they will use petrol-driven angle grinders and other such equipment to do so.

Officers are confident that the best way to deal with fly-tipping is while it is in transit before it is dumped, as often it has been cleansed of identifying data, making dumped waste impossible to trace. Therefore, resources are being expanded to increase the number of ID checks and other measures. A further update on the success of these new tactics can be brought to the Committee at a later date.

Would larger, clearer signage (including details of the penalties for offenders), or a change to the design of refuse bins, help dissuade people from fly tipping/littering or using bins for domestic waste?

Signage could be reviewed, though signs are in place at some sites and on bins, and issues remain. Regarding bin design, experience has shown that smaller bins would result in rubbish piled up outside the bin, while larger bins would simply be filled. Bin emptying is dependant on location, with remote areas collected weekly, and high traffic areas collected throughout each day. If a bin is often reported to be full, then the frequency of its collections could be reviewed.

What powers did the Council have to prevent dumping in private alleyways?

Firstly, it would be necessary to identify all those responsible for that private land. Once identified, those responsible would then be served a notice requiring the waste to be cleared. If not cleared, the Council would carry out the works and issue an invoice for reimbursement. Currently, those responsible would have 21 days from the notice to resolve the issue. If not resolved, or and the Council is not allowed on the land, then the Council would seek to obtain a warrant of entry. If the material was hazardous, such as asbestos, the Council has powers to carry out quicker clean-up operations. However, each case would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure that the Council's actions were correct in law.

How successful was CCTV in combating fly tipping? Could Councillors be of help with identifying persons captured on CCTV?

CCTV can be used as a deterrent, though prosecutions can be difficult if the footage does not include identifying features such as vehicle details, etc. An upgrade of fixed CCTV cameras had taken place, and the quality of image was much higher, but the cameras were still dependant on proper siting and adequate lighting to be effective. Regarding Councillors helping to identify those persons captured on CCTV, this could potentially be of use though would be subject to legal and data protection approval.

Does the Council have a standard letter that Councillors and residents could put to people that are known to be persistent offenders?

Not currently, but this could be produced.

Has the Council's bulk waste collection service had any impact on reducing fly tipping?

The service has proven very popular, but despite this, the volume of fly tipped waste has continued to increase. A regular bulk collection day could be considered (as opposed to residents arranging bespoke collections), but this could have the potential for areas to be designated as 'waste areas' which could upset residents (particularly if these areas were close to homes, etc.)

Were there any plans to introduce recycling to flats?

While recycling was a complicated issue, officers were keen to provide recycling to every property in the Borough, regardless of whether it was a flat or a house, and to that end, the matter was currently being looked into.

Members highlighted the importance of learning from other local authorities who had been successful in combating littering and fly tipping. In addition, it was suggested that further efforts could be made to highlight the issues and engage and educate residents of the costs and impact of littering and fly tipping, including liaising with traveller groups, schools, local businesses, and the like. Officers advised that they were looking to begin a campaign focussed on having pride within one's local area, which would involve engaging with schools and other groups. Further updates on the campaign could be provided to the Committee as the campaign progresses.

The need to engage with young people and encourage them to act as advocates for their environment, and by extension highlight the importance of proper waste management to their parents, was highlighted. The potential for increased use of social media and other youth targeted platforms was also recommended, as well as the use of clear messaging in multiple languages (where appropriate).

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the information provided be noted;**
- 2. That details of the cost of addressing littering and fly tipping in recent years be forwarded to the Committee; and**
- 3. That officers draft a standard letter that Councillors and residents could put to people that are known to be persistent offenders.**

30. **CABINET FORWARD PLAN** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Consideration was given to the Cabinet Forward Plan.

Regarding the item on the Local Plan Part II, scheduled for Cabinet in October 2019, Members requested that the clerk speak to officers to determine whether a report could be brought to a future meeting setting out how residents would be affected by the proposed change to residential areas from suburban to urban designation.

In addition, it was requested that the clerk speak to officers to determine whether the item on the Collection and Processing of Co-Mingled Recycling was relevant to the Committee's current review into Littering and Fly Tipping.

RESOLVED:

1. That the report be noted;
2. That the clerk review, with officers, whether a report on the Hillingdon Local Plan Part II could be brought to a future meeting of the Committee; and
3. That the clerk determine whether the item on the Collection and Processing of Co-Mingled Recycling was relevant to the Committee's current review into Littering and Fly Tipping.

31. **WORK PROGRAMME** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Consideration was given to the Forward Plan.

Members were advised that the item on Charity Shop Waste had been removed from the Work Programme pending rescheduling, following feedback from officers that further work on the topic was required.

Members sought further information on primary school class sizes vs. secondary school class sizes, and requested that a regular item on Year 7 year group capacity be added to the programme. The Chairman reminded Members that a quarterly school places update was present on the Work Programme, and would include such information.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.50 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Neil Fraser on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.