

London Borough of Harrow



ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 17 JULY 2003

7.30 PM

SUB-COMMITTEE AGENDA (SCRUTINY)

COMMITTEE ROOM 5
HARROW CIVIC CENTRE

MEMBERSHIP (Quorum 3)

Chair: Councillor Blann

Councillors:

Lavingia
Lent
Miles

Mrs Kinnear
Janet Mote
Seymour

(none)

(none)

Reserve Members:

1. Ismail
2. Marie-Louise Nolan
3. Thammaiah
4. Anne Whitehead

1. Arnold
2. Billson
3. John Nickolay

(none)

(none)

Issued by the Committee Services Section,
Law and Administration Division

Contact: Ben Jones, Committee Administrator
Tel: 020 8424 1883 E-mail: ben.jones@harrow.gov.uk

NOTE FOR THOSE ATTENDING THE MEETING:
IF YOU WISH TO DISPOSE OF THIS AGENDA, PLEASE LEAVE IT BEHIND AFTER THE MEETING.
IT WILL BE COLLECTED FOR RECYCLING.

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 17 JULY 2003

AGENDA - PART I

1. **Appointment of Chair:**
To note the appointment at the Special meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 15 May 2003 of Councillor Blann as Chair of the Sub-Committee for the Municipal Year 2003/2004.
2. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**
To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.
3. **Declarations of Interest:**
To receive declarations of interest (if any) from Members of the Committee arising from business to be transacted at this meeting.
4. **Arrangement of Agenda:**
To consider whether any of the items listed on the agenda should be considered with the press and public excluded on the grounds that it is thought likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, that there would be disclosure of confidential information in breach of an obligation of confidence or of exempt information as defined in the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.
5. **Appointment of Vice Chair:**
To appoint a Vice Chair of the Sub-Committee for the Municipal Year 2002/2003
6. **Minutes:**
That the minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2003, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.
7. **Public Questions:**
To receive questions (if any) from local residents or organisations under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4B of the Constitution).
8. **Petitions:**
To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4B of the Constitution).
9. **Deputations:**
To receive deputations (if any) under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution).
10. **Annual Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2002/03:** (Pages 1 - 4)

Enc.

Report of the Chief Executive

- Enc. 11. **Draft report of the Review of Consultation for Highway and Transportation Schemes:** (Pages 5 - 12)
12. **Reports on Rent Arrears and Voids for Local Authority Housing Stock:**
Item placed on the agenda at the request of the Chair
13. **Update on the Waste Management Strategy Review:**
14. **Any Other Urgent Business (If any):**

AGENDA - PART II

This page is intentionally left blank

Meeting:	ENVIRONMENT & ECONOMY SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE
Date:	17 JULY 2003
Subject:	ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 2002/03
Responsible Chief Officer	CHIEF EXECUTIVE
Status:	Part I
Ward:	N/A
Enclosures:	REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Summary

- 1.1 In the last cycle of meetings, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Scrutiny Sub-Committees agreed the process by which the 2002/03 annual report should be prepared and agreed for presentation to Council. This process provided for a composite report to be produced which includes an overview of the work undertaken over the past year supported by individual contributions from each of the scrutiny bodies. The Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 10 July 2003 has considered and approved the annual report, which will be submitted to the next Ordinary meeting of Council. The Chair's report on this Sub-Committee's work is attached for Members' information and formal endorsement.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 To note and formally endorse the Chair's report of the Sub-Committee's work over the past year, as agreed for inclusion in the 2002-03 scrutiny annual report.

3. Policy Context (including Relevant Previous Decisions)

- 3.1 This report addresses the requirement placed on the Committee to report to Council on the work done in the previous year and on its annual work programme for the forthcoming year.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 1.4.03
Sub-Committee meeting - 31.3.03

4. Relevance to Corporate Priorities

- 4.1 The work of scrutiny bodies seek to support all of the Council's corporate and strategic priorities.

5. Background Papers:

Report to Overview & Scrutiny Committee 1.4 .03

Minutes of the meeting of this Sub-Committee held on 31.3.03

- 6. Author:** Frances Hawkins, Scrutiny Support Officer, Civic Centre, Harrow.
Tel 020 8863 5611 x 3156

5 ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

- 5.1 This report covers the initial year of the expanded Overview and Scrutiny Committee. We have inevitably been on a steep learning curve over the year with the consequence that progress on some of the reviews has been slower than we would have hoped. It should also be noted some of the regular reports and statutory plans such as the Local Implementation Plan and Best Value review of Planning Services were delayed and are for consideration in 2003/4. In common with all budget issues other than those affecting education matters (where there is a statutory right for voluntary aided sector and parent governor members to be involved), the Housing Revenue Account for 2003/4 was considered by the main Committee.
- 5.2 During the year we considered a number of referred issues. The removal of asbestos roofs on garages was referred to us by the Tenants' and Leaseholders' Consultative Forum. The problems were examined and several recommendations were made to ensure that Health and Safety legislation is adhered to in all future Housing Department Contracts of this nature.
- 5.3 We also received a report outlining proposals to tackle empty homes in the borough and bring them back into occupation, which would form Harrow's strategy for Empty Homes. It was noted that Harrow was third best in London and that it should improve once steps had been put in place to improve performance in the Council sector. We requested that the Portfolio Holder should investigate the release of funds from council house sales for investment in housing and additional capital funds have been allocated for empty homes in 2003/04.
- 5.4 The annual report of Brent and Harrow Trading Standards was reported to us for information and noted.
- 5.5 During the year we also undertook two key areas for review, both of which are still ongoing.
- 5.6 The small working group looking at consultation undertaken on highway and transportation schemes considered the public consultation procedures for all areas of work. It agreed that the review should concentrate on Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) but also look at Cycle networks, Traffic Calming and Local Safety Schemes. It was felt that all other areas had little scope for genuine consultation. A joint meeting of the Sub-Committee and the Transport and Road Safety Advisory Panel was held on CPZs where good practice in other boroughs was noted and suggestions for improvements were identified. Meetings with residents and staff within Highways and Transportation are scheduled. Once these are completed, a report with recommendations will be drawn up and reported to the Sub-Committee at the September 2003 meeting.

- 5.7 Our second review is focused on the development of Harrow's waste management strategy. We commenced with a meeting to review policy and performance data on Harrow's Waste Management and the Mayor of London's Draft Waste Strategy. In order to obtain an overview of waste management, we decided to adopt an innovative approach and arranged for presentations on policy at National, Greater London Authority, West London Waste Authority and Harrow level to be given at a seminar by speakers from these organisations. The session proved informative and the

COMMITTEE STATISTICS	
Committee meetings	4
One off Working Group meetings	-
In-depth reviews	2
Review meetings	4
Visits/informal meetings	-
Attendance by Portfolio Holder	-
Statutory items considered	-

speakers were questioned by scrutiny and other Members. The information gathered at this seminar has led to a discussion paper which, together with the views of Harrow Agenda 21 and Council staff, will form the basis of the report and recommendations to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee.

- 5.8 The first part of 2003-04 will see the completion of the reviews on Consultation on Highway Schemes and the Development of the Waste Management Strategy. In addition to this ongoing work, we are intending to consider a short report on the influence the Council has on transport providers together with a briefing note on Housing loans and grants, with a view to determining whether a full review should be undertaken on the latter.
- 5.9 We will, of course, also consider any Statutory Plans, Regular Reports and other matters referred for consideration.

Alan Blann
Chair, Environment and Economy Scrutiny Sub-Committee

REVIEW OF CONSULTATION FOR HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION SCHEMES

1. Executive Summary

2. Background

It was agreed at the sub committee meeting on 5 September 2002 that:-

(a) the scope of the review be

To identify and evaluate the effectiveness of current consultation procedures with the objective of incorporating best practice and standardising where possible.

Areas for examination to include:-

Highway maintenance
Street Tree Removal
Enforcement
Local Safety Schemes
CPZ

Crossovers
Pedestrian Crossings
London and other Cycle Networks
Waiting restrictions

(b) The Methodology be

The review will be conducted through a combination of officer reports, views of customers, traffic panel inc. Advisors etc. and by comparison with best value in other Boroughs.

Current procedures, the views of traffic panel and advisors, and customers, legal requirements and costs will be taken into account. The relationship between speed of carrying out schemes and the consultative mechanism employed will be explored.

3. Initial Review

A full set of documents for each of the areas under review was assembled by the officers and considered by a working group (copies at Appendix A if considered necessary). The examined each set of documents against the criteria of consultation and drew up a list of those which it was considered should be examined in more detail and those where it was felt there was no real consultation aspect. The table below sets out their conclusions which were endorsed at the December meeting of the Sub Committee.

SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE 2 DECEMBER 2002

Appendix A DRAFT

Consultation arrangements for Highway and Transportation Services

(Figures in brackets refers to consultation letters deposited in the Member Library)

<u>Examine</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Consultation/Information Process</u>	<u>Other Authority Practice</u>
Yes	Controlled Parking Zones Mike Symons Ext: 2535	<p>Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel has adopted a 4 stage approach to CPZ consultation (20 June 2002) and this is set out on see CPZ1 (attached). All schemes are subject to the procedure but where a fast track is agreed by Members stage (b) is omitted.</p> <p>The stages are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Stakeholder meeting to discuss study area, with residents, businesses, emergency services b) Seek views of residents and businesses and Ward Members in proposed scheme on whether or not to proceed (see CPZ/2) c) Amend design/area in the light of comments and re-consult (see CPZ/3) d) Statutory notice of proposed scheme advertised (see CPZ/4) <p>Statutory Notices for all schemes involves widespread notification and include statutory bodies, local residents associations, pedestrian and cycle groups etc but not individual residents</p> <p>The scheme as implemented is reviewed in about 12 months if there are outstanding concerns.</p> <p>Average response to the consultation stage (b) and (c) is about 20%-30%. Schemes only proceed with majority agreement. It takes about 2 years from the start to the implementation of a scheme due to the extent of consultation and the need to report to Traffic Panel. Omitting stages can in the long run delay schemes due to counter petitions.</p> <p>Scrutiny Committee of 29 September and 22 May 2001 reviewed the consultation arrangements for CPZs.</p>	<p>Hertfordshire advertise in a local paper and display in the library.</p> <p>Newham publish glossy consultation papers but in a trial of glossy vs plain paper Westminster saw no difference in response from residents</p>

<u>Examine</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Consultation/Information Process</u>	<u>Other Authority Practice</u>
Yes	Cycle route schemes Sajadd Farid Ext: 2484	Major cycle route schemes are subject to consultation and results are reported to the traffic panel. There is a separate notification where traffic management schemes are also involved.	
Yes	Local Safety Schemes	Local safety schemes are carried out following an analysis of accidents in the area and the work is fully funded by Transport for London who will only grant monies if a rigorous approach is used. Frontagers are therefore informed of their scheme but not consulted. This has caused concern to some individuals in the past generally when the scheme reduced their parking options.	
Yes	Bus Lanes Elaine Wyatt Ext: 2548	All schemes have one consultation (see BL1). All of these schemes are carried out by a consultant engaged to work for NW London Boroughs and managed by a lead Borough. Response rate is very low typically less than 10%.	
Yes	Traffic Calming Mohsen Nekouzad Ext: 2888	Funding has been secured for TFL for the first time in many years.	
Yes	Waiting Restrictions Mike Symons Ext: 2535	These are usually a response to representation and petitions and where there is clear agreement the consultation is by way of the statutory traffic order.	
No	Street Tree Removal Ext: 2759	Trees are removed if they are dead or endanger safety, where subsidence is being caused to private property and sometimes where a pavement crossing has been agreed. In the case of safety removal and for subsidence claims the immediately adjoining residents, Ward Members and Portfolio Holder are informed about the planned removal (see ST/1)	Ealing advised residents of planned removals. Bexley also do so and post Notices on the tree affected. Hillingdon consult and provide options where appropriate.

<u>Examine</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Consultation/Information Process</u>	<u>Other Authority Practice</u>
No	Highway Maintenance Dave Masters Ext: 2580	Consultation is carried out by way of letter drops to affected residents on major schemes. IN addition letters are put on vehicles where parking is an issue which could impede the works. Copies of letters are also sent to Ward Councillors. In most cases one of several standard letters is (see HM1)	
No	Highway Enforcement Dennis Thompson Ext: 2500	As an enforcement duty there is no consultation undertaken but there are many standard notices depending upon the infringement (see HE1).	
No	Crossovers John Almond Ext: 2497	An information leaflet 'Parking in front gardens – a guide' is available to applicants and one of 31 standard letters is used for various stages. (see C1) Neighbours and Ward members are informed in the case of tree removal, where the Principal Landscape Architect considers that the tree is not significant to the overall streetscene.	

4. Joint Meeting of the Environment and Economy Scrutiny Sub-Committee and the Transport and Road Safety Advisory Panel

This meeting took place on 25 February 2003 and Members were given presentations from officers within the Transportation Section on Harrow's CPZ. Procedure which is set out below, and that of other London Boroughs.

STAGES INVOLVED IN PREPARING A CPZ

NB – This is a simplified model approach, for illustrative purposes, assuming no complications.

There is an annual review of priorities and agreement of work programme. All petitions and requests received during the year are considered at this meeting. Once the principle of investigating a CPZ is agreed, the following stages are typically involved:

- a) Define study area – including consideration of area(s) that are likely to receive displaced parking
- b) Stage 1 Consultation – stakeholder meeting to discuss study area and clarify issues, problems and policy framework
- c) Agree boundary and scheme principles with Traffic Advisory Panel/Portfolio Holder
- d) Stage 2 Consultation – do people want a CPZ/residents permit scheme or not? Only proceed with majority support
- e) Analyse results and determine area to go forward to detail design – agreement by Traffic Advisory Panel/Portfolio Holder if necessary ie. if contentious or uncertain
- f) Detail design of selected area
- g) Stage 3 Consultation – on detail design
- h) Amend design in light of consultation and agree “final” design (via Traffic Advisory Panel/Portfolio Holder if contentious or uncertain)
- i) Draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)
- j) Consult Police on TRO (statutory)
- k) Stage 4 Consultation – Advertise TRO (statutory)
- l) Consider objections to TRO (statutory) – Traffic Advisory Panel/Portfolio Holder
- m) Agree final scheme (can be concurrent with previous stage)
- n) Prepare detailed drawings for manufacturers and contractors and arrange procurement
- o) Implement
- p) Review within 12 months, subject to demand

q) Further reviews subject to workload prioritisation

A discussion then took place on both Harrow's and other Boroughs procedures and the following conclusion was reached:-

That overall the consultation process worked. However, in order to achieve a higher response rate and greater customer satisfaction, the following recommendations should be considered:-

- 1) That where there is firm evidence of overall support for the scheme Stages 1 and 2 should be combined
- 2) That more use be made of Public Meetings and/or exhibitions at Stage 2
- 3) That use is made of Street Notices, the Council Website and Press Notices to alert people to the Consultation Process
- 4) There is a need to improve consultation with business and face to face meetings are suggested
- 5) Where schemes have a low response rate respondees should be targeted in an attempt to increase the response rate
- 6) The results of the consultation should be published on the Council Website, in a Press Release and at Local Libraries
- 7) A one off use of a communications advisor to review language and layout to create a Clear consistent style and identity
- 8) Roads just outside the CPZ area should be alerted to possible consequences that might arise once the CPZ is in operation

The lessons that Harrow might learn from other Boroughs were considered but mainly confirmed that Harrow was on the right lines i.e. most boroughs had a response rate of 30% similar to Harrow's. However, some of the more innovative steps from elsewhere form part of the recommendations above/

We would also recommend that a Parking Guide for the Zone is issued to coincide with the commencement of the scheme and be issued to all Householders and local libraries.

It was also felt that on Cycle Networks that the Harrow representatives of The London Cycling Campaign should be consulted.

5. Consultation with London Borough of Harrow Staff

To be carried out

6. Feedback from Residents

To be carried out

7. Recommendations

List those above and others from final stage at 5 and 6.

This page is intentionally left blank