

# **MINUTES OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Monday, 18 April 2016 at 7.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillors Liam Curran (Chair), Bill Brown, Amanda De Ryk, James-J Walsh, Mark Ingleby, Pat Raven and Paul Upex and

APOLOGIES: Councillors Pauline Morrison and Eva Stamirowski

ALSO PRESENT: Timothy Andrew (Interim Overview and Scrutiny Manager), Simone van Elk (Scrutiny Manager) and Simon Moss (Policy and Development Manager, Transport)

## **1. Confirmation of Chair and Vice Chair**

1.1 Simone van Elk (Scrutiny Manager) introduced the item, and invited Members to confirm the election of Councillor David Michael as the Chair of the Committee and Councillor James-J Walsh as the Vice-Chair of the Committee.

1.2 RESOLVED: that Councillor Liam Curran was confirmed as Chair of the Committee and that Councillor Suzannah Clarke was confirmed as Vice-Chair.

## **2. Minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2016**

2.1 RESOLVED: that the minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2016 were agreed as an accurate record.

## **3. Declarations of interest**

3.1 The following non-prejudicial interest was declared:

- Councillor James-J Walsh was a member of Zipcar UK (under agenda item 4. Mayor and Cabinet response – Modern Roads review).

## **4. Mayor and Cabinet response - Modern Roads review**

4.1 Simon Moss (Transport Policy and Development Manager) answered questions from the Committee. The following key points were noted:

- New road signs would be installed but with bags over them until the launch date where the 20mph zone across the borough would get implemented. The aim was to have everything in place before schools start again in September.
- The plan for the new road signs was not finalised yet. Road signs were likely needed on any side street of the South Circular, as the South Circular

would still have a maximum speed of 30mph. The Committee would be provided with information.

- Transport for London (TfL) was approached to see if they could lower the maximum speed on roads they managed. TfL was trialling 20mph on some small sections of A roads in London but these trials were mainly not happening in Lewisham.
- There was not one universal standard for road designs for cyclists and road designs, including traffic management orders, so these designs would need to be adapted to fit each specific location. A legal parallel crossing for cyclists in [add location] was being designed, which would be the first in the country.
- In the longer term, the Council would hope that TfL's Quietway routes would be extended into the borough.

4.2 The Committee made a number of comments. The following key points were noted:

- In Lambeth, not all the road signs used seemed to be metal. Only the ones that were a statutory obligation were made of metal, but any additional ones used were made of foamex which would cost less than metal signs. The Committee would be provided with information on whether foamex signs could be used in Lewisham and whether they would be more affordable.
- The Committee suggested that in addition to the school competition to design posters, youth clubs would also be asked to join the competition as not all children living in the borough attended schools in the borough.
- Lewisham Cyclists were preparing a cycling strategy for the borough, One of their main areas of focus was the A21 road between Loampit Vale in Lewisham through Catford towards Bromley Hill, which would be suited to adaptations for cyclists because of its width.
- The Committee requested information about the location of the 'Peddle My Wheels' market.
- There were 25 charging points for electrical cars in 8 locations in the borough at the time of the meeting. The plan was to add 38 charging points in 18 locations. The Council provided kerb space for these charging points and received a small level of compensation making the scheme cost neutral.
- The timing and funding available for the upcoming Local Implementation Plan (LIP) would be subject to the election of the new Mayor of London.

4.3 RESOLVED: that the Committee noted the report.

## **5. Mayor and Cabinet response - referral on Collection and use of S106 planning obligations and community infrastructure levy funds**

5.1 The Committee discussed the report. The following key points were noted:

- The response to the Committee's referral was quite general and did not specify in detail how decisions about the allocation of Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds get made. The Committee felt greater clarity was needed about the process used to allocate Section 106

and CIL funds, and that this process needed to be effective and accountable for local communities.

- The Committee's suggestion of setting up a Community Trust were aimed at avoiding the 2 year deadline for allocation Section 106 and CIL funds, and the Committee felt the response did not address this particular point.
- The Committee requested more information about the allocation of funding to areas that have a neighbourhood forum but did not have a parish council.
- The Committee also requested more information on how Councillors could be involved in the process of allocating Section 106 and CIL funds.
- The Committee wondered how the decision was made which wards to include in the pilot scheme for allocating unspent Section106 monies.

5.2 RESOLVED: that the Committee noted the report, and that the Committee requested that their views as listed be responded to as part of the 'Lewisham Community Trust – use of Section106 and CIL' report scheduled for the 12 May meeting.

## **6. Select Committee work programme**

6.1 This item was discussed after item 7 (Street lighting: variable work programme).

6.2 Simone van Elk introduced the report. The following key points were noted:

- That the draft work programme contained suggestions from officers, items considered each year, items considered by virtue of the Committee's Terms of Reference, and suggestions from last year's Committee.
- That the Committee might find the prioritisation process on page 17 helpful in prioritising its work.
- That Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee had considered an item on the accessibility of the public realm but thought it might fit better in the remit of Sustainable Development Select Committee.
- The Housing Action Zones item would be discussed at Housing Select Committee but Members of Sustainable Development Select Committee would be invited to attend so both Committees could look at the item.

6.3 The Committee suggested the following items for the work programme:

- The item on the Asset Register should include a mapping of the Council's assets as well as a register.
- To add an item on the planning enforcement service to the work programme, both to review performance as well as seeing if there would be opportunities for including planning enforcement in the Crime, Enforcement and Regulation Service.
- That an item on the communications plan for the new waste strategy be added to the work programme before implementation over the summer.
- That Lewisham Cyclists were preparing a cycling strategy for the borough which could be presented to the Committee after the summer.

- That the item on Work and Skills Strategy Implementation would include information about the number of students entering and succeeding at level 4, 5 and 6 qualifications.

6.4 The Committee also commented that:

- That they did not feel the room for that evening’s meeting was suitable as it was difficult to hear each other. The Committee also noted that there may be difficulties for the public in accessing meetings in Laurence House as due to security arrangements the front door may get locked before a meeting had finished.
- The Committee enquired whether alternative options would be available for the May and June meeting.

6.5 RESOLVED: that the Chair consider the Committee’s suggestions for the work programme and submit a finalised draft to Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel.

**7. Street lighting: variable lighting policy**

7.1 This item was moved forward on the agenda to be discussed directly after agenda item 5 (Mayor and Cabinet response – referral on Collection and use of S106 planning obligations and community infrastructure levy funds).

7.2 The Committee discussed the report. The following key points were noted:

- The Committee expected to be notified when the trial for dimming street lighting would take place, and noted that they had not been.
- The Committee further noted that criteria were presented for identifying streets and lights that would be exempt from the dimming of street lighting, but that at the same time a maximum of 20% of lights would be made exempt. The Committee questioned what would happen to streets and lights that would meet the criteria but would be over the 20% maximum.
- The Committee commented that it could be difficult to compare street dimming in Croydon with street dimming in Lewisham as they deemed most of Lewisham to be inner-city when was large areas of the London Borough of Croydon were deemed to be sub-urban.

7.3 RESOLVED: that the Committee noted the report and invited an officer to attend a future Committee meeting to answer some of the Committee’s questions as listed above.

**8. Items to be referred to Mayor and Cabinet**

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm

Chair:

-----

Date:

-----