

## Minutes

### PUBLIC SAFETY AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE

28 July 2021

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



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Keith Burrows (Chairman) Teji Barnes (Vice-Chairman) Jan Sweeting (Opposition Lead) Kuldeep Lakhmana Colleen Sullivan Steve Tuckwell</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Roy Clark, Parking Services Manager David Knowles, Head of Transport &amp; Town Centre Projects Fiona Gibbs, Stronger Communities Manager &amp; Prevent Lead Andy Goodwin, Interim Financial Planning Manager Steve Clarke, Democratic Services Officer</p>
12.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TO REPORT THE PRESENCE OF ANY SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Richard Lewis.</p>
13.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
14.	<p><b>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Following a brief discussion, the generalisation used within item seven, in that “The Committee highlighted the great work already undertaken by the Council’s ASB Team”, was deemed appropriate for the minutes.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 09 June 2021 be agreed as an accurate record.</b></p>
15.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED AS PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART II WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items of business were marked as Part I and would be considered in Public.</p>
16.	<p><b>2022/23 BUDGET PLANNING REPORT FOR SERVICES WITHIN THE REMIT OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p>

Andy Goodwin, Interim Financial Planning Manager, presented the report and highlighted that this was the first of two budget reports that would come before the Council's Select Committees relating to the Council's current position and budget planning for 2022/23 and beyond.

It was noted that the ongoing impact of COVID-19 on the Council's finances during 2021/22 was projected to generate pressures totalling almost £14.5m, bringing the total pandemic related pressures since March 2020 to over £47.5m. To date, sufficient funding had been received from central Government to meet those costs, however the Council had set aside over £10m in a dedicated Earmarked Reserve to manage any costs over and above the funding received from central Government. Officers also highlighted that the fall in journeys being made as a result of the pandemic had led to a significant loss of income related to Parking Services.

It was highlighted that the report in front of Members was the same as had been delivered to the Council's other Select Committees. Officers clarified that the focus of the report in front of Members was the broader financial position of the Council, with the report scheduled to be considered in January 2022 setting out the detailed budget proposals for the Select Committee's relevant service areas.

The Committee noted the size of the challenge in setting the 2022/23 budget and beyond given the uncertainty surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic and indicated that they were looking forward to the specified report in January 2022 giving more detail to the budget proposals within the Committee's remit.

**RESOLVED: That the Committee noted the financial context in which the 2022/23 budget setting process would take place in advance of detailed savings proposals being developed and approved at Cabinet in December 2021.**

17. **SERVICE OVERVIEW: TRANSPORT AND PROJECTS** (*Agenda Item 6*)

David Knowles, Head of Transport and Town Centre Projects, was present for this item and gave an overview of the work areas under his purview. The presentation was delivered in three parts: Community Engagement and Town Centres, Transport Planning and Development, and Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel.

Work within the Community Engagement and Town Centres was highlighted, including the following:

- Development of the Borough's town centres, in particular delivery of the Town Centre Improvement programme;
- Seeking contributions from the Council and external sources; managing programmes including 'soft' measures as well as shaping and overseeing environmental improvements;
- Managing the Council's £1m per annum Chrysalis Programme including alleygating schemes;
- Managing the £156k per annum 'Better Neighbourhood Fund';
- Ward Budgets;
- Street Champions.

Within the Transport Planning and Development remit, a number of work areas were covered, including:

- Highway Development Control including Section 106 and Section 278 funding;
- The Council's Transport and aviation policy;
- Major transport schemes;
- TfL 'Local Implementation Plan (LIP);
- Travel Plans (mostly linked to developers and their sites);
- Crossrail ('Elizabeth Line');
- HS2 'High Speed Rail' Project;
- Heathrow (primarily surface transport & freight matters);
- Bus, Cycling, Walking, Taxi and Electric Vehicle initiatives;
- Sub-regional liaison including the Department for Transport, Greater London Authority, Transport for London (TfL), Network Rail and neighbouring local Transport Authorities.

A number of areas within the Traffic, Parking, Road Safety and School Travel remit were also covered, including:

- The design of, and consultation upon, parking management schemes, loading and waiting schemes and Traffic Regulation Orders;
- Road safety engineering programmes;
- Traffic feasibility schemes;
- Technical advice for the Cabinet Member relating to Petitions
- The Council's 'School Travel and Road Safety' Team (STaRS);
- Road safety education, training and publicity;
- School travel plans and 'Lollipop people'.

Further to the work areas covered by the Transport and Projects team, officers raised the 'TfL Local Implementation Plan – Annual Spending Submission', which was scheduled for the September meeting of the Cabinet; it was highlighted that TfL's revenue stream had been extremely impacted by the pandemic and the Mayor of London had been seeking funding from central Government to keep TfL operating. Unfortunately, as a consequence of this, the funding received by all London Boroughs from TfL had either been withdrawn or deferred; Members were also informed that officers were waiting on a formal statement from TfL on what funding, if any, would be received in the current financial year.

The Committee asked whether the 'Safe Drive, Stay Alive' courses were still being delivered in the Borough as Members saw these to be of great benefit, particularly for young people. Members were informed that the courses were under review by TfL as they were the key funders for the programme and also owned some of the copyrights for the materials used in the programme. Members were also encouraged to use their capacity as Councillors and on the various bodies they sit on, including the London Roads Safety Council, to lobby for the Safe Drive, Stay Alive course on behalf of Hillingdon. The Committee highlighted how much of a success the programme had been, officers were proud of the programme and would like to maintain it if possible and would be exploring the feasibility of delivering a similar in-house programme for the Borough.

The Committee queried the level of impact being seen as a result of the introduction of TfL's new Elizabeth Line in the Borough, specifically around West Drayton Station where parking for rail users would be an issue. Officers noted that Station Approach in West Drayton was not owned by the Council and was in fact owned by Network Rail; a collapsed sewer underneath the station's forecourt led to delays with the project.

Officers were hoping for confirmation from TfL soon for the funding of 'Crossrail complimentary measures' which would fund much of the works required for the area outside of the station. It was also highlighted that much of the area around West Drayton Station was under a parking management scheme and rail users would find it difficult to park in an area that would negatively impact residents.

Members queried what actions the Council could take in steering HGV's away from high streets and smaller residential streets. Officers highlighted that due to the changing nature of last mile delivery methods, online and supermarket delivery vans were now a daily occurrence on residential streets. Members were informed that a number of depots in the Borough were serviced by larger depots which meant large HGV's were regularly using the Borough's road network. Members were told that the Council was in the process of re-joining the London Lorry Control Scheme (LLCS) administered by London Councils; the London-wide scheme is aimed at striking the right balance between the freight needs of London and residents' right not to be unduly disturbed. It was noted that the Council actually had left the LLCS over a decade ago due to the charges associated with being a member of the scheme and that the enforcement was not up to standard, the process had now changed in that membership was now free and enforcement was now better. The Council had also introduced 7.5 tonne weight limits where it was deemed to be appropriate and justified.

With regard to alleygating schemes, it was highlighted that an issue had recently become apparent whereby details of the individual keyholder for each scheme were sometimes getting lost when keys would change hands without the Council knowing about it, for example in cases where the key holder may have passed away. This could result in difficulties when emergency services may require access to the area or instances of fly-tipping had occurred. Officers noted that most alleygating schemes work efficiently as they are a direct response to requests from residents; they are funding schemes whereby the Council facilitates the implementation of a particular scheme and it is then managed in perpetuity by residents.

Regarding the Town Centre Improvements Programme, the Committee questioned how areas were selected for schemes. Officers noted that the selection process was very much Member driven and Members were encouraged to lobby the appropriate Cabinet Member regarding any particular areas where they felt a scheme would be appropriate. It was also noted that resident petitions were a good method of gauging residents' views and showing demand, this can help to inform Members in deciding which projects to take forward.

The Committee queried the length of time it usually took for a Parking Management Schemes (PMS) to be implemented and were minded to explore options for shortening the process. Officers explained that the first step towards a PMS was usually a petition being received, the petition would then be heard by the relevant Cabinet Member at a petition hearing; the testimony from residents at a petition hearing would inform the direction of officers' consultation. It was noted that petitions usually took around three months to be heard, this was down from around nine months a number of years ago. The next step would most likely be an informal consultation with residents, feedback from the consultation would then go to the Cabinet Member through the democratic process and a publicly available report. Once the network of roads or area for a PMS is known, officers would draw up detailed designs for the PMS; following this, officers are prescribed by law to advertise in the local press and conduct a formal 21-day consultation. There would then be a formal Cabinet Member decision on the implementation of a PMS. If the Council did not follow this due process, a parking adjudicator could find that a PMS was not justified and should be dissolved; there had

also been occasions where local authorities were instructed to pay back parking fines issued under an unjustified PMS, it was highlighted that this had not occurred in Hillingdon.

The Committee thanked the Head of Transport and Town Centre Projects for their presentation and commended the work done by officers in the team.

**RESOLVED: That the Committee noted the officer's verbal report.**

18. **SERVICE OVERVIEW: COMMUNITY COHESION** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Fiona Gibbs, Stronger Communities Manager & Prevent Lead, was present for this item and delivered a presentation outlining the work undertaken by the Stronger Communities and Prevent Team. The key theme of the Team's work was to support the Council's commitment to having stronger communities and equality in Hillingdon.

Key work areas undertaken by the Stronger Communities Team included:

- Providing a strategy and policy lead on community cohesion, integration and preventing violent extremism (Prevent).
- Advice and guidance on community cohesion, integration and preventing violent extremism across the council.
- Advice, guidance and support to external partners
- Holding a community engagement and community development role in relation to community cohesion and integration and building stronger communities.
- Leadership/coordination of partnership working related to community cohesion, integration and preventing violent extremism.

Elaborating on this, officers highlighted that establishing relationships with the Borough's diverse communities, building trust and enabling partnership working were core aspects of the Team's activities.

It was highlighted that, as part of the Council's COVID-19 response, the team had worked collaboratively with the voluntary sector and health partners in establishing the Community Champions Programme, wider community engagement and promoting vaccination take up. Going forward, the Team would work with public health, the NHS and other health partners in addressing health inequalities, particularly those that had been highlighted throughout the pandemic.

Members were informed that the Team managed and coordinated the Prevent Partnership and acted as a lead on the implementation of the Prevent Duty for Hillingdon. Under the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015, local authorities had a duty to deliver a 'Prevent' strategy. Objectives of the strategy included:

- Tackle the causes of radicalisation and respond to the ideological challenge of terrorism;
- Safeguard and support those most at risk of radicalisation through early intervention, identifying them and offering support;
- Enable those who have already engaged in terrorism to disengage and rehabilitate.

The Committee enquired as to how extensive the radicalisation problem was in Hillingdon; officers highlighted that Hillingdon was not designated an area of priority by Prevent which meant the Team were not funded by the Home Office. With regard to the

type of radicalisation deemed to be of concern, it was highlighted that right-wing extremism had emerged nationwide and evidence of that had been seen within the Borough around referrals of vulnerable individuals. It was also noted that there was still an endemic threat from Islamist extremism.

The Committee asked about Prevent training; whether it would be available for Members and how the delivery of Prevent training had gone throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. The Committee were informed that officers would be happy to offer Prevent training for Members. Officer highlighted the difficulties in delivering Prevent training during the pandemic however, the good relationship built up with schools ensured that the Team kept discussions and engagement going throughout the lockdown periods. It was also noted that the Home Office had been promoting a new 'Report It' app to report any suspected radicalisation content online that people come across; Hillingdon's team helped to disseminate this information out to communities and at training sessions.

By way of clarification, officers informed the Committee that Prevent training in schools followed two paths; firstly there was Prevent training for staff delivered once each academic year and was Home Office approved training, secondly there were workshops with younger people around issues such as hate crime and prejudice online.

Officers mentioned that it was difficult to measure community cohesion as it could be argued that a community was cohesive given there were no signs of community tension. An example of a successful event held by the Team was given as the 2020 International Women's Day, shortly before the first lockdown, whereby 200 people from diverse backgrounds came together at the Beck Theatre to celebrate women and enable networking.

The Committee commended and thanked officers on what was a small but extremely important team within the Council.

**RESOLVED: That the Committee noted the officer's verbal report.**

19. **SERVICE OVERVIEW: PARKING SERVICES** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Roy Clark, Parking Services Manager, was present for this item and delivered a presentation outlining the work undertaken by his team. It was noted that the Transport and Projects Team effectively introduced the Borough's parking restrictions and the Parking Services Team then enforced them. Parking enforcement formed a large portion, but not the entirety, of the work undertaken by the Team and was controlled strictly by various pieces of legislation. Enforcement was carried out by a mixture of foot patrols, vehicle patrols and CCTV monitored areas; patrols took place from 6am to 10pm Monday to Saturday, and 8am to 10pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

The key role of parking enforcement was to ensure road safety and to keep congestion clear, it was highlighted that if a driver was present, the enforcement officer would not initially issue a penalty charge notice and would ask them to move away from the area to remove the congestion. The Borough was broken up into either areas with a Parking Management Scheme (PMS) or unrestricted areas; particular areas of concern included: schools, footways, disabled parking areas, dropped kerbs and mini cab/ride hailing app vehicles. It was noted that since 1974 it had been an offence in London to park on the footway, unless where it was specifically stated that vehicles could be parked on the footway; outside of London, the opposite was the case.

Members were informed that the Parking Services Team also administered and processed parking appeals and residents/visitors parking permits, of which the Team issued around 16,000 residents parking permits per year. The Team also operated the Council's 33 car parks, including all on-street pay and display areas. Further to this, the Team processed the older persons Brown Badge Scheme, of which there currently were around 13,500 brown badge permits on issue. It was noted that another London Borough had introduced a similar scheme after seeing the success of Hillingdon's scheme.

The Committee discussed elements of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points and infrastructure and noted that information such as, options for EV charging for residents with no off-street parking and the number of EV charging points that were in the Council's car parks, would form part of the Committee's review and information gathering sessions.

Although it was noted that permit charges had increased, and the Team had experienced complaints from residents about this, it had not materialised in a decreased uptake of parking permits. It was noted that, for each household, the first permit and 10 visitor vouchers were free.

By way of clarification, the Committee were informed that Hillingdon did not, and had never, offered any incentives for enforcement officers in issuing a certain quota of penalty charge notices. Further to this, it was written into the Council's contract with the enforcement provider that no bonus or incentive scheme related to the issuing of penalty charge notices should exist. It was noted that this was often a public perception however it was untrue.

**RESOLVED: That the Committee noted the officer's verbal report.**

20. **COMMITTEE REVIEW: SCOPING REPORT** (*Agenda Item 9*)

The Chairman introduced the item highlighting that a scoping report had been prepared ahead of the Committee's review into electric vehicles (EVs) and EV infrastructure in the Borough. The report outlined the background, scope, timeframe and potential lines of enquiry for the review. The Committee were invited to make any amendments that they saw fit.

A Member highlighted that the scoping report referred to the expectation that the review's findings and recommendations would be presented to Cabinet not for immediate implementation but to offer guidance and direction in helping to shape future policy; it was noted that this should be justified given the Council had acknowledged a climate emergency. The Committee noted that the technology associated with EVs and EV infrastructure was evolving incredibly quickly and it was imperative for the review's findings to be applicable to the medium and long term rather than the immediate term where specific technologies may become obsolete. It was also highlighted that the local elections scheduled for May 2022 could change the makeup of the Council and Cabinet and the Committee's review would be a key tool in helping that Council develop its EV policies.

The Committee noted that EV infrastructure was a far-reaching topic and the scoping report was a good starting point. A Member highlighted for the Committee's information that the House of Commons Transport Committee had just published a report on zero emissions vehicles which highlighted challenges to the delivery of public EV charging

provision.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the Select Committee commented on and considered the scoping report; and,
- 2) Agreed the scoping report to initiate the review into EVs and EV Infrastructure.

21. **FORWARD PLAN** (*Agenda Item 10*)

The Committee noted the items on the Forward Plan and referred to the 'Transport for London Local Implementation Plan – Annual Spending Submission' which, as was noted earlier in the meeting, was reliant on the level of funding that was to be received from TfL, which was as yet unknown.

**RESOLVED: That the Committee noted the Forward Plan.**

22. **WORK PROGRAMME** (*Agenda Item 11*)

A Member requested that the topic of e-scooters could be covered in the upcoming September item, Service Overview for Anti-Social Behaviour and Enforcement Team. It was also clarified that an amendment was required as November's meeting would incorporate a third witness session for the EV review and not a 'Findings' session as stated in the Work Programme.

**RESOLVED: That the Committee noted the items listed on the work programme.**

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.19 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Steve Clarke - Democratic Services on 01895 250636. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.