

Minutes

PUBLIC SAFETY AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE

19 October 2021

Meeting held at Committee Room 6 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Keith Burrows (Chairman) Teji Barnes (Vice-Chairman) Scott Farley Kuldeep Lakhmana John Morgan Colleen Sullivan Steve Tuckwell</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Alan Tilly, Transport Planning and Development Manager Tom Campbell, Planning Policy Team Leader Dan Kennedy, Corporate Director – Planning, Environment, Education and Community Services Steve Clarke, Democratic Services Officer</p> <p>Also present: Adam Heritage, Hillingdon Resident (Witness present for Item 5)</p>
33.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TO REPORT THE PRESENCE OF ANY SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Jan Sweeting and Richard Lewis with Councillors Scott Farley and John Morgan substituting.</p>
34.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
35.	<p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 21 September 2021 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
36.	<p>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 (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were marked Part 1 and would be considered in public.</p>

37. **SELECT COMMITTEE REVIEW: ELECTRIC VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE AND FUTURE POLICY DIRECTION FOR THE BOROUGH** (*Agenda Item 5*)

The Chairman briefly introduced the item highlighting that it was the second of three witness sessions composing the information gathering phase of the Committee's review into Electric Vehicles (EVs), EV infrastructure and future policy direction. The Committee began by welcoming Adam Heritage to the meeting, a Hillingdon resident who had been considering the purchase of an EV for some time, however remained cautious due to several reasons, including:

- He did not have access to off-street parking and therefore could not charge a prospective EV at home.
- The current local availability of publicly accessible EV charge points was minimal and not enough to rely on for an individual with no off-street parking.
- The reality of owning an EV in his current situation would mean regularly finding a public car park with EV charging provision that would also be open overnight. This would induce 'range anxiety' which was a major barrier in purchasing an EV.
- Further to range anxiety, returning home after any long trips would mean charging the EV just before finally reaching home, this was seen as a common inconvenience for those without access to home charging.
- The battery component of EVs was still the largest signifier of cost, if an EV had a larger battery, it would be significantly more expensive to purchase; therefore, if there was access to an EV charge point within walking distance, he would have the option of purchasing a more affordable EV with a lower battery capacity.

The Committee were informed that, working in central London, Mr Heritage had a number of colleagues who had already purchased EVs despite not having any available off-street parking, and therefore off-street charging facility, at their respective homes; they had felt confident enough to purchase an EV after liaising with their local Council's to have a publicly accessible charger installed on or near their street. It was also noted that, thus far, Mr Heritage's experience liaising with the Council in Spring 2021, to have a publicly accessible EV charge point installed close to his home had been difficult. There was no information available on the Council's website regarding how one could go about expressing interest in having a public charging point installed nearby, this led to him reaching out through other related Council departments for assistance. Mr Heritage raised concerns that he had to repeatedly follow up with Councillors and officers to obtain useful information around charging options and felt that Hillingdon was not, at the time, doing its part to help promote the transition from internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles to EVs.

The Committee were grateful to hear from the perspective of a resident and felt that the need for residents to have access to consistent information and to have their expectations managed regarding the provision of EV charge points in the Borough was vital; it was suggested that a standard operating procedure for when residents expressed interest in a prospective on-street charging point could be introduced to avoid any confusion.

With regard to the availability of information on the Council's website, it was highlighted

that up-to-date information informing residents of the Council's upcoming EV charge point projects would go a long way in alleviating the worries that residents like Mr Heritage may have when considering the transition to an EV. It was also noted that London Councils had an online facility for residents to suggest possible charge point locations across London. Although Hillingdon did not currently have such a bespoke online facility, the Committee were in agreement that an online expression of interest form would help the Council collect data concerning demand for EV charge points across the Borough. Further to this, it was suggested that a link to the London Councils page would be a useful and easy to administer tool in temporarily pointing residents in the right direction.

Alan Tilly, Transport Planning and Development Manager, was in attendance for this item, he gave some background to the Council's previous provision of EV charge points and updated the Committee on the work that had been ongoing with regard to future charge point provision. The EV charge points currently in Council operated car parks were installed some ten years ago as part of a research project with the Ford Motor Company, Strathclyde University and Scottish and Southern Electricity; residents were given the opportunity to drive an EV and provide feedback to the project. Following the project, the charge points were operated by Transport for London's Source London company, when that network was sold on, the Hillingdon charge points were not included. Since that time, the charge points were repaired on a piecemeal basis by the manufacturers and have since become outdated and require replacing.

Members were informed that, where one in 16 new cars registered in London were EVs in 2019, one in eight new cars registered in the capital were EVs in 2021. In response to the growing need, the Council had, in October 2021, published an invitation to tender using the Crown Commercial Services framework. The tender was inviting companies to supply, install and maintain EV charging points in public car parks and to establish wider EV charging infrastructure across the Borough. The three primary strands of the tender were replacing and updating the existing EV charge points in Council operated car parks, assessing 43 other car parks in the Borough for charge point provision, and the provision of on-street EV charge points along residential streets utilizing either stand alone units or existing lamp columns. Amongst a number of factors, companies applying would need to demonstrate their awareness of grant funding and ability to apply for said funding (including the On-street Residential Charging Scheme ORCS funding), how they will ensure that any installed charge points offer appropriate network coverage for users, their fault reporting process and how quickly any faults would be repaired when they occur. Members highlighted that an online facility whereby residents could register their interest in having an on-street EV charge point installed would assist specifically regarding delivery of the third strand of the project.

The Committee were also informed that a further part of the tender included provision of a dashboard to be made available for officers to, in real time, see which charge points were operational at any one time. The data from this dashboard could prospectively be used to estimate demand and areas for future provision, the information could also be reported back to the Select Committee periodically. With regard to the free EV charge points found in many supermarket car parks, Members noted that although they were incredibly useful, they were often faulty and any such installations under the Council's purview would need to have their faults addressed comprehensively to avoid down time and maximise reliability as residents would be relying on the infrastructure.

Concerns were raised as to a potential disparity in the costs that would be incurred by residents who had the ability to charge their vehicle at home and those who would

need to charge publicly at car parks, on-street chargers or EV forecourts. It was understood that those charging publicly would likely end up paying more to charge their vehicles; however, there was still a significant cost associated with the purchase and installation of home chargers which offset the disparity. It was also noted that all charging options were likely to be a cheaper alternative than fueling an ICE vehicle. Officers highlighted that other local authorities had been known to, as a temporary measure, charge cheaper parking rates, or have free parking altogether, for EVs in public car parks to help alleviate some of the prospective cost disparity as these spaces were likely to be used more frequently by residents with no off-street parking as a means of charging their vehicle.

The Committee discussed the way in which parking spaces in public car parks may be allocated to EVs and highlighted the importance of getting the balance right and ensuring that both ICE vehicles and EVs were accommodated as the 2030 deadline for the sale of new ICE vehicles approached. Further to this it was highlighted that some supermarket car park operators fined individuals who park in an EV space with an ICE vehicle. Officers noted that, as long as enough EV charge point spaces were provided for, both ICE vehicles and EVs would be able to park in any space within a public car park. The Committee highlighted the need to ensure the Council's enforcement policies were fit for purpose regarding this issue that may emerge in the coming years.

Tom Campbell, Planning Policy Team Leader, was also present for the item and gave the Committee an overview of the Planning Policies that underpin the provision of EV charging points in new developments. It was initially clarified that new developments formed a fraction of existing dwellings and retrofitting would be necessary for the majority of homes. It was highlighted that the London Plan carried the most weight with regard to what is requested from developers around EV charge points; there were different standards based on the use class of the development, however, commonly developers were required to provide 20% active EV charging spaces and 80% passive. Active spaces were ready to use EV charge points and passive spaces were not immediately ready to use but were connected to the grid and could be retrofitted with a charge point at a later date. It was noted that the National Infrastructure Commission had recommended the 20% figure until 2025, at which point, it would be expected to increase.

With regard to enforcement and ensuring that developers were installing the required EV charge points, the Committee were informed that there were two mechanisms in place; the standard planning enforcement procedure requiring a case officer or resident to highlight the non-adherence and a Transport for London funded project carried out by West Trans who would monitor the travel plans of new developments ensuring that they included sustainable travel. Due to TfL funding issues stemming from the COVID-19 pandemic, Members were informed that the West Trans officer responsible for West London was not currently funded; it was hoped that this would be restored in future. The Committee queried if enforcement action had been taken against any developers for not installing the required charging points, to which officers were not aware of any formal enforcement action taken. Members raised concerns that enforcement officers may be reliant on residents knowing that new developments should have EV charge points provided and reporting when developers have not met planning requirements. Officers noted that EV charge point planning policies had been in place since 2016 and therefore the first developments approved under this policy would have only recently reached completion. The Committee were minded to ensure that, going forward, the Council was proactive with regard to enforcing this aspect of new developments. Officers were supportive of this noting that it was something that could be mapped and targeted.

With regard to supercharging sites, EV forecourts and charging hubs, officers noted that they had recently spoken to TfL who had three potential sites in mind within Hillingdon for charging hubs; in addition to this, the Greater London Authority anticipated providing 1,000 rapid EV charging hubs on their own land across London. It was highlighted that there were a number of private and public bodies installing EV infrastructure which could be seen as an electric evolution of petrol stations. The Committee queried whether existing planning policies take into account prospective applications for charging hubs and EV forecourts on greenbelt land. Officers highlighted that greenbelt planning policies were incredibly robust, and any application would need to pass rigorous tests to be considered appropriate for greenbelt land. It was noted that there were planning policies with general support for EV charge points which would be considered a material planning factor.

The Committee thanked the witnesses and officers for attending and providing valuable insight for the review. Members noted how rapidly EV charging technologies were evolving along with the growing demand for EVs and emphasized the need to develop EV infrastructure appropriately; this was highlighted by the expected emergence of a secondhand EV market in the near future and the importance of having today's EVs be compatible with tomorrow's charging infrastructure.

RESOLVED That the Select Committee noted the update on the Council's EV charging infrastructure activities and used the second witness session of the review to enquire as to the existing demand for EV infrastructure and potential barriers stopping residents from transitioning to EVs.

38. **SERVICE OVERVIEW: ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AND ENFORCEMENT TEAM**
(Agenda Item 6)

Dan Kennedy, Corporate Director for Planning, Environment, Education and Community Services, was present for this item and gave the Committee an overview of the Council's Anti-Social Behaviour and Enforcement Team (ASBET) and some of the changes that would be taking place to the service. Members were informed that ASBET dealt with a broad spectrum of issues from low level nuisance to serious harassment, which could cause distress, damage quality of life and interfere with the ability for people to enjoy the peace and quiet of their home, local environment and community. The Council's response team was composed of three types of officers:

- **Case Officers** - who dealt with reports of harassment and neighbourhood nuisance and manage long standing case work.
- **Rapid Response Officers** - who dealt with the majority of environmental nuisances for example depositing waste material and littering, flyposting, dog fouling, abandoned vehicles, overgrown gardens, vermin infestations.
- **Out of Hours Officers** – night rota - who primarily dealt with noise nuisance.

The Committee were also informed that, where possible, visible patrols were coordinated with police in hotspot areas.

Members noted that the ASBET service typically received a stable amount of service requests at around 1,000 per month; there was usually a seasonal spike in the summer months primarily related to noise complaints. Roughly half of service enquiries came through the Council's Contact Centre and half came through the online self-service

tool. 24% of enquiries were concerning the depositing of waste material, it was noted that officers did follow up with fly-tipping prosecutions where evidence was obtained however gathering evidence was often very resource intensive and the priority was removing the waste. 23% of enquiries were noise related and officers addressed these where complaints persisted. 15% of enquiries were vehicle related incidents, primarily where vehicles had been abandoned.

Officers gave some examples of positive outcomes noting that joint working and prosecution with a neighbouring local authority had resulted in the conviction of an offender for 16 offences related to illegal waste disposal across the two Boroughs. CCTV images of perpetrators fly tipping were now being circulated on social media platforms for identification purposes. Officers had identified six offenders from CCTV footage provided by the CCTV Control Room which resulted in Fixed Penalty Notices being issued.

The Committee were also given an overview of the Council's new approach to Anti-Social Behaviour with a move towards proactive prevention in the first instance rather than reactive enforcement; although it was highlighted that enforcement would still be a key part of the service particularly where early intervention methods may not be achieving results. From August 2021, ASBET had moved towards a geographical patch-based model, this would allow officers to dedicate their resource to designated wards and areas and build a relationship with local Ward Councillors and give officers an improved understanding of the complexities of their specific area. Previously, officers had worked all over the Borough travelling between jobs and weren't getting to know specific areas. A key facet of the new prevention model would be working with a range of Council departments to deliver targeted problem-solving days to identify areas of concern with Ward Councillors and develop plans to address the most significantly disruptive behaviours and issues in their ward. The Committee were also notified of the ASBET service's new case work management system which would be coming online over the coming months which would allow management a stronger oversight and evaluation of ongoing case work.

Other work that the Committee were informed of included ASBET patrols over the early November fireworks period where clear guidance had been issued over the appropriate use of fireworks; additionally, there would be an upcoming campaign with the Public Health team raising awareness in schools about the dangers of nitrous oxide canisters.

Members were encouraged by the new approach to ASBET and enquired as to the roll out of the new geographical patch-based model; they were informed that the roll out would be phased and a series of meetings with Ward Councillors and the Cabinet Member for Public Safety & Transport would be taking place to explain the new approach and methods of working. It was highlighted that the new working model for ASBET had been devised in direct response to what had been set out in the recent internal audit resolutions. Members emphasised that the internal audit had highlighted changes that needed to happen and were confident that the changes would bring about positive outcomes.

The Committee queried whether the clearance of instances of fly-tipping could set a precedent for repeat offenders. Officers noted that the speed of the response was the top priority for public health reasons, each incident was plotted and where trends were formed and evidence found, action could be taken against perpetrators.

With regard to vermin and complaints that animals, including foxes and rats, had been causing damage to residents' vehicles and properties, the Committee noted that

effective remedies to the situation were limited and the issue was a sensitive one. Unfortunately, with regard to foxes, removal of the animals was not deemed an effective solution due to their territorial nature, it was understood that this was a common issue across many London Boroughs. Officers highlighted that, generally speaking, where the individual experiencing an animal infestation was the homeowner, they would be required to make arrangements to deal with the infestation themselves; more vulnerable residents could contact the Council for assistance. Officers noted that discussions were ongoing about developing an education campaign to help prevent rat and vermin infestations, Members noted that an education campaign would prove useful and unassuming items such as birdfeeders and fallen fruit from fruit trees could be seen as a food source for vermin.

The Committee were encouraged by the officer's presentation and thanked the ASBET team for the important work that they do within the Borough.

RESOLVED That the Select Committee noted the officer's verbal report.

39. **FORWARD PLAN** (*Agenda Item 7*)

The Committee noted the items listed on the Forward Plan. The Democratic Services Officer informed Members that, since the publication of the meeting agenda, a new Forward Plan had been published with one additional item listed under the Public Safety and Transport portfolio for the January 2022 Cabinet meeting; this was the Electric Vehicle Charge Point and Infrastructure Contract.

RESOLVED That the Committee noted the Forward Plan.

40. **WORK PROGRAMME** (*Agenda Item 8*)

RESOLVED That the Select Committee noted the items listed on the work programme.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.35 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 250693. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.