

Revised version circulated on 14.10.2015

REPORT TO:	Cabinet 20 October 2015
AGENDA ITEM NO:	11
SUBJECT:	STAGE 1: RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM: STREETS AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING ON 7 SEPTEMBER 2015
LEAD OFFICER:	Borough Solicitor and Monitoring Officer, Director of Legal & Democratic Services
LEAD MEMBER:	Councillor Sean Fitzsimons Chair, Scrutiny and Overview Committee
WARDS:	All
CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT:	The constitutional requirement that Cabinet receives recommendations from scrutiny committees and to respond to the recommendations within two months of the receipt of the recommendations.

The Leader of the Council has delegated to the Cabinet the power to make the decisions set out in the recommendations contained within this report:

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

Cabinet is asked to:

- 1.1 Receive the recommendations arising from the meeting of the Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 7 September 2015 and to provide a substantive response within two months (ie. Cabinet meeting on 14 December)

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 On 7 September 2015, the Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee considered an item on the Norbury Avenue Experimental Road Closure at the request of Councillor Kathy Bee, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.
- 2.2 At that meeting the Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee made recommendations to Cabinet and Transport for London.

- 2.3 The recommendations to Cabinet are contained in Section 3 of this report.
- 2.4 The constitution provides for the recommendations of a scrutiny committee or sub-committee to be presented to the next convenient ordinary Cabinet meeting (i.e. not Council tax cabinet meeting) and for Cabinet to receive the recommendations.

In this report Cabinet is being asked to receive the recommendations.

The constitution requires that an interim or full response is provided within 2 months of this Cabinet meeting.

3. STREETS AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Norbury Avenue Experimental Road Closure (Minute number A28/15)

The Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee at its meeting on 7 September 2015, the Committee formed the following conclusions:

- Acknowledged that there was significant dissatisfaction amongst many local residents and some local Councillors regarding both the experimental closure itself and the consultation process. All Committee members agreed that residents' concerns should be heavily weighted in all such decisions.
- Acknowledged that a significant number of local residents don't want any changes to the current road set-up in the Norbury, Upper Norwood and Thornton Heath area.
- Noted that many non-residents driving to or from London or Croydon use roads like Norbury Avenue to avoid using roads such as London Road and Green Lane.
- Acknowledged that permanent road closures have been successfully implemented in Croydon, even when they were not always welcomed when first installed.
- Acknowledged that many residents don't currently cycle, as they believe Croydon roads are unsafe, especially along major roads such as London Road.
- Acknowledged that it was the Council's policy to encourage cycling as set out in Cabinet approved "Transport Vision for Croydon" and Quietways are a key part of the Council's transport strategy. Increase cycling will reduce road congestion, improve health outcomes, and make local areas more liveable.
- Noted that it was the council's policy to encourage healthy lifestyles and reduce pollution emitted by cars, vans and lorries.
- Noted the Croydon Scrutiny Committee carried out a review of Cycling provision in Croydon in 2014 and endorsed the need for major improvement in facilities. These recommendations were accepted by Croydon Cabinet at its meeting on 16 March 2015, including the recommending the use of Experimental Traffic Orders, to trial new road improvement projects.
- Noted from the presentations by Lambeth and Waltham Forest Councils that Experimental Traffic Orders are used by Councils across London, and that temporary road closures are likely to cause public concern if residents are not

fully engaged in the process, and believe their community as a whole is not benefitting from the proposals.

- Noted Sustrans' recognition that, in hindsight, aspects of the Norbury Avenue experimental closure could have been done better.
- Commended the swift removal of the Kensington Avenue closure when it was identified that the closure was not working.
- Noted that the Norbury Avenue experimental closure was treated by both Croydon Council and TfL as a local initiative and not a Croydon-wide one.
- Noted that the Norbury Avenue experimental closure did not deal with the issue of speeding or where the displaced car journeys were displaced to.
- Considered that the consultation for the experimental closure was neither wide enough in geographical scope, nor long enough in timescale.
- Acknowledged that for many local residents, especially those who didn't live on Norbury Avenue, there was no upside from the experimental road closure.
- Acknowledged that there was support for the scheme from local residents who live on Norbury Avenue and close by.
- Acknowledged the strong support from Croydon residents who cycle.
- Noted the involvement of some local Councillors in the consultation process.
- Acknowledged the opposition to the road closure by some Councillors.
- Acknowledged that a number of residents commented on the need for safer cycling facilities in Croydon and this Quietway would provide a safer route to destinations such as Tooting, Streatham and Brixton, and also into Croydon.
- Noted that traffic calming alone is not a solution to this issue, especially for disabled residents who cycle. Current design of speed bumps and humps in Croydon are a hindrance to disabled cyclists.
- Noted the number of events organised by Sustrans on the issue, and the involvement of many local Councillors.
- Noted the impact of the decision to suspend operations during the politically restricted period.
- Considered how the Council balances the views of local residents and Councillors with the need to improve local transport infrastructure, which benefits the whole of Croydon.
- Considered what weight should be given to local Councillors and residents' concerns in regards strategic borough-wide road projects such as the Quietway scheme.
- Noted that the experimental closure order was not treated as a "key decision" even though it significantly affected more than one ward, as three wards were directly affected, and the proposals affected residents across a number of other wards, and also on residents of Lambeth, Southwark and Wandsworth.
- Noted that the referral to Scrutiny in these circumstances was an appropriate course of action.
- Noted that the Mayor of London, through TfL, are trying to achieve a modal shift in terms of transport, and needs to support Outer London Boroughs like Croydon, with the necessary resources to achieve this shift.
- Supported TfL and Mayor of London's intentions to create a Quietway linking Croydon to Waterloo, and acknowledged that a route from Central Croydon to London has to go through Norbury and Upper Norwood.

The Sub-Committee **resolved** to recommend to Cabinet that:

- 1) It re-states its support for improved cycling facilities across Croydon and supports a Quietway from Central Croydon to London as one of its major transport infrastructure improvement.
- 2) For future Quietways projects, more collaboration is undertaken with Transport for London (TfL) from the outset with particular reference to implementation timescales and the allocation of additional resources for consultation.
- 3) Consideration be given to bidding for “Area Based” Quietways rather than “Road Based” Quietways in order to better demonstrate the benefits and that, where “Road Based” Quietways are proposed, the area for consultation be significantly expanded to cover a wider geographical radius from the affected road(s).
- 4) The street furniture deployed to close roads is reviewed in the light of complaints made about the units used in the Norbury Avenue trial.
- 5) It ensures that the needs of disabled residents, including pedestrians and cyclists, are taken into account when new plans are drawn up.
- 6) Future Experimental Traffic Order consultation is undertaken for a longer period of time using more innovative public engagement techniques.
- 7) When setting out consultation terms for future key transport infrastructure projects such as Quietways, it clearly set outs what it is trying to achieve, what options it is considering, and how residents and local Councillors are to be consulted.
- 8) It consider what weighting it gives to views of non-local residents who use minor roads like Norbury Avenue as cut-throughs.
- 9) Experimental Traffic Orders are useful tools for understanding the impact of Quietways and should continue to be used.
- 10) The decision-making process in relation to Experimental Traffic Orders be reviewed with a view to maximising the participation of Ward Councillors and local residents and that they be categorised as “key decisions” in the forthcoming review of the Constitution.
- 11) The Member Learning and Development Panel be asked to consider commissioning briefing sessions for Councillors on community participation techniques.

For information, the Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee also resolved to recommend to Transport for London that it:

- 1) Restates its continued support for Cycling Infrastructure projects in Croydon.
- 2) Reconsiders its level of funding for Outer London infrastructure projects and ensures that Outer London receives it fair share of expenditure.
- 3) Allocates additional resources in areas of South London, such as Croydon, where a modal change in behaviour away from car travel is needed, and where there’s a greater reliance on the car and a lack of viable alternatives including the Underground.
- 4) To help achieve its ambition for a modal shift in transport it considers funding large-scale Quietways projects in Croydon, similar in scale to the “mini-Holland” scheme in Waltham Forest, rather than smaller scale schemes such as the Norbury Avenue experimental road closure.
- 5) Reviews how consultation is undertaken for Quietways projects near borough boundaries.

6) Commissions a “lessons learned” report on previous TfL Quietways projects in order to inform further borough project planning.

These recommendations and a timetable for response are attached at **Appendix A**.

6. FINANCIAL AND RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Not relevant for the purposes of this report.

7. COMMENTS OF THE BOROUGH SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER

The recommendations are in accordance with the constitution. This requires that the Scrutiny report is received and registered at this Cabinet Meeting and that a substantive response is provided within 2 months (ie. Cabinet, 14 December 2015).

8. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT

Not relevant for the purposes of this report.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACT

Not relevant for the purposes of this report.

10. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Not relevant for the purposes of this report.

11. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

Not relevant for the purposes of this report.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Solomon Agutu, Head of Democratic Services
and Scrutiny and Statutory Scrutiny Officer
T: 020 8726 6000 X 62920
Email: solomon.agutu@croydon.gov.uk

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Background document 1: Reports to the Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee meeting, 7 September 2015

<http://egeprapwv01lc.lbcbau.croydon.net/akscroydon/users/demserv/admin/kab14.pl?operation=SUBMIT&meet=13&cmte=SES&grpId=demserv&arc=1>

APPENDIX A

<p>SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>DEPARTMENT AND CABINET MEMBER RESPONDING</p>	<p>ACCEPT/ REJECT RECOMMENDATIONS (inc. reasons for rejection)</p>	<p>IDENTIFIED OFFICER</p>	<p>ANY FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</p>	<p>TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IF ACCEPTED (ie Action Plan)</p>	<p>DATE OF SCRUTINY MEETING TO REPORT BACK</p>
<p>The Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee meeting on 7 September 2015 (Minute number A28/15 Norbury Avenue Experimental Road Closure - resolved to recommend to Cabinet that:</p>						
<p>1) It re-states its support for improved cycling facilities across Croydon and supports a Quietway from Central Croydon to London as one of its major transport infrastructure improvement.</p>						<p>Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2 February 2016</p>
<p>2) For future Quietways projects, more collaboration is undertaken with Transport for London (TfL) from the outset with particular reference to implementation timescales and the allocation of additional resources for consultation.</p>						<p>Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2 February 2016</p>
<p>3) Consideration be given to bidding for “Area Based” Quietways rather than “Road Based” Quietways in order to better demonstrate the benefits and that, where “Road Based” Quietways are proposed, the area for consultation be significantly expanded to cover a wider geographical radius from the affected road(s).</p>						<p>Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2 February 2016</p>

APPENDIX A

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION	DEPARTMENT AND CABINET MEMBER RESPONDING	ACCEPT/ REJECT RECOMMENDATIONS (inc. reasons for rejection)	IDENTIFIED OFFICER	ANY FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IF ACCEPTED (ie Action Plan)	DATE OF SCRUTINY MEETING TO REPORT BACK
4) The street furniture deployed to close roads is reviewed in the light of complaints made about the units used in the Norbury Avenue trial.						Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2 February 2016
5) It ensures that the needs of disabled residents, including pedestrians and cyclists, are taken into account when new plans are drawn up.						Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2 February 2016
6) Future Experimental Traffic Order consultation is undertaken for a longer period of time using more innovative public engagement techniques.						Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2 February 2016
7) When setting out consultation terms for future key transport infrastructure projects such as Quietways, it clearly set outs what it is trying to achieve, what options it is considering, and how residents and local Councillors are to be consulted.						Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2 February 2016

APPENDIX A

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION	DEPARTMENT AND CABINET MEMBER RESPONDING	ACCEPT/ REJECT RECOMMENDATIONS (inc. reasons for rejection)	IDENTIFIED OFFICER	ANY FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IF ACCEPTED (ie Action Plan)	DATE OF SCRUTINY MEETING TO REPORT BACK
8) It consider what weighting it gives to views of non-local residents who use minor roads like Norbury Avenue as cut-throughs.						Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2 February 2016
9) Experimental Traffic Orders are useful tools for understanding the impact of Quietways and should continue to be used.						Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2 February 2016
10) The decision-making process in relation to Experimental Traffic Orders be reviewed with a view to maximising the participation of Ward Councillors and local residents and that they be categorised as “key decisions” in the forthcoming review of the Constitution						Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2 February 2016
11) The Member Learning and Development Panel be asked to consider commissioning briefing sessions for Councillors on community participation techniques						Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2 February 2016