

Traffic Management Advisory Committee

Meeting held on Monday, 15 February 2021 at 6.30 pm.
This meeting was held remotely; to view the meeting, please click [here](#).

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Muhammad Ali (Vice-Chair);

Councillors Luke Clancy, Karen Jewitt, Michael Neal, Robert Canning and Paul Scott

PART A

7/20 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

8/20 Disclosure of Interests

There were none.

9/20 Urgent Business (if any)

In response to questions, the Chair stated that the appointment of Members to Committees was a Group matter and urged that any queries in relation to the matter should be referred to the relevant Group Whip.

10/20 Crystal Palace and South Norwood Low Traffic Neighbourhood Addendum Report

The Committee considered the [Report](#), presented by Steve Iles, Director of Public Realm, which comprised of an addendum to the January 2021 Report requested by the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon. The Addendum advised on the continuing soundness of the recommendations made to Traffic Management Advisory Committee (TMAC) in the January 2021 Report in the light of the judgment in R (UTAG & LTDA) v Mayor of London and Transport for London (TfL) [2021]. The Addendum additionally considered the revision to the Equality Analysis since the publication of the 'Pave the Way' report; the access of taxis and buses to the South Norwood and Crystal Palace Low Traffic neighbourhood (LTN); and a Greater London Authority (GLA) and TfL commissioned study into the air quality improvement effects of implementing the Mayor's air quality related policies. This Addendum recommended increasing the categories of vehicle to which Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) camera technology exempted and asked the committee to endorse the proposed 12 month experimental orders.

The Chair explained that the meeting was to consider the additional information contained within the Addendum Report. During the 12 January 2021 meeting of TMAC, Committee Members listened and considered the views of those who registered to publically address the advisory Committee. This procedure was in line with the Protocol for Participation in Meetings of the TMAC which was contained in [Part 5H of the Constitution](#).

Questions from the Committee to Officers

Councillor Luke Clancy asked if LTNs should instead be introduced after the result of the TfL appeal to the high court ruling was available. He secondly asked what the timetable would be if the recommendations were implemented as set out. The Director of Public Realm firstly replied that the reasoning of the introduction of provisions was clear in the January 2021 Report and officers agreed with the recent adjustments which allowed for taxis, care workers and those who need access to the LTN. The Director of Public Realm secondly replied that the timeline was subject to the decision, following the statutory process of issuing a notice to neighbouring boroughs as set out in 121B of the Road Traffic Management Act (1998). This would provide one month for any concerns to be raised and reviewed. After the one month notice period, the notice would be referred to the GLA as the adjudicator in the statutory process.

In response to Councillor Luke Clancy asking whether dispensations were planned for those with disabilities without a Blue Badge, the Director of Public Realm stated that people who believed they met the criteria to hold a Blue Badge should seek that provision. Councillor Luke Clancy stated the report detailed the opinion that the monitoring of the experimental LTN should be designed to determine if the worsening of air quality would disproportionately affect BAME groups. He asked how this would be achieved and what baseline data would be used. The Director of Public Realm replied that the January 2021 Report described the roll out of monitoring methods to gather data using a number of sources, also noting there was a wealth of data across London available. The challenge at this time were the implications of Covid which informed the decision to introduce experimental orders to gather data over a longer period of 12 months.

In relation to the categories the ANPR would not apply to, Councillor Karen Jewitt asked how tracking would work in instances where a permitted vehicle had to use a different vehicle, with a different number plate, due to unforeseen circumstances. The Director of Public Realm responded that this process would be advised and was not yet fully defined. There would be an exemption list and users would be notified on how to make amendments to that list. Croydon Council would use learning from other London boroughs and seek best practice as this process would not be unique to Croydon LTNs.

Councillor Michael Neal asked if there would be a first time warning for those entering a restricted zone. He secondly asked what dialogue the council had with Bromley Council since the 12 January meeting of TMAC. The Director of Public Realm firstly stated that there would be a warning and proper signage,

compliant with traffic regulations, to communicate entering the restricted zone. Secondly, he stated that conversations were open with Bromley Council since the last meeting; they were aware of the Addendum and they had provided a letter to the TMAC with their position remaining the same. The Director of Public Realm told the Committee that both the original Report and the Addendum were working to achieve a medium of driving forward with healthy streets whilst recognising the challenges by liaising with residents and neighbouring boroughs.

Councillor Robert Canning stated that the extended list of exempt ANPR categories was an improvement, however there were still gaps and unknowns to rules relating to other services. There were services such as Veolia, supermarket delivery vans and take away food deliveries which were important to residents. The Director of Public Realm replied that Category G, 1.1 of the Recommendations, covered those bases and motor vehicle access to all properties would be maintained. There would be signage in place, more than the regulations required, to ensure proper communication and the council would continue to engage before the scheme was introduced.

Debate

Councillor Paul Scott made comments in relation to the scheme as a whole. He stated that people needed to change their lifestyle in the face of the climate crisis, which included how people travelled considering their carbon footprint. Pollution caused by vehicles in London, particularly the growth in usage in local neighbourhood streets, contributed to poor health outcomes and local streets should be a place for communities. The further updates to the report relating to schools and drivers with disabilities was a valuable additional consideration to the plans. Councillor Paul Scott stated he had received powerful emails in support of LTNs from residents. He stated that this was the beginning of the rollout of protection measures and clearly reasoned arguments were detailed in the Report. To achieve positive mental and physical health outcomes for residents, there should be more LTNs implemented to make more neighbourhoods safer and cleaner to use.

Councillor Luke Clancy stated that he could not support the recommendations as the scheme risked exacerbating inequalities by creating exclusive and desirable areas to live in the style of a private estates, therefore the scheme created winners and losers. He explained that he received many emails urging the council to urgently open roads. These including reasons relating to: residents being unable to travel to work, nurses who were unable to risk using public transport for their clients, residents in Bromley complaining of displaced traffic and associated problems, delivery drivers being held up and residents with asthma looking to sell their property due to increased and unbearable fumes. He stated that the Cabinet Member should respect the outcome of the original consultation and remove the entire scheme.

Councillor Robert Canning stated that he agreed with the case for driving policies towards positive environmental change and noted the improvements in the recommendations seen in the Addendum. There were still areas of

uncertainty about the scheme in practice, however the worst outcome in the given situation was to implement nothing. Experimental schemes should be encouraged because the success of the scheme would be considered in a future TMAC. To ensure robust data would be considered at that stage, it was critical for a robust monitoring system to be in place to measure the air quality in the LTN and surrounding areas because displacement of traffic and pollution was a key factor.

Councillor Michael Neal stated he felt there had not been sufficient dialogue with the local schools, whose staff and visitors would be considerably effected by the scheme. Despite the further amendments, the schools were still opposed and requested further dialogue. The statement from Harris Academy asked if there were other methods of achieving calmer traffic in the area other than a LTN. Bromley Council were also still opposed and Councillor Michael Neal stated that the council should continue dialogue and find a cross-borough solution. It should be noted Sutton Council removed their LTN following the high court ruling and Lewisham Council halted their scheme following opposition. Croydon Council should listen to its schools and business owners as this option was clearly wrong for many stakeholders, which was demonstrated by the emails received by Member. He hoped the council would reconsider the scheme, consult on the proposals properly and following that rightly remove the scheme entirely.

Recommendations

Councillors Michael Neal and Luke Clancy stated that they did not endorse the recommendations made to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon.

Councillors Robert Canning, Karen Jewitt and Paul Scott endorsed the recommendations made to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon.

Recommendations outlined in the report:

The recommendations made to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee in the January 2021 Report are maintained subject to the following changes:

1. Having considered the revised Equality Analysis, the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Croydon that:
 - 1.1 The categories of vehicle to which Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) camera technology (Recommendation 1.3.1 in the January 2021 Report), shall not apply is extended to include:
 - a) a vehicle being used for fire brigade, ambulance or police purposes;
 - b) anything done with the permission of a police constable in uniform or a civil enforcement officer;
 - c) a vehicle being used for the purposes of a statutory undertaker in an emergency, such as the loss of supplies of gas, electricity or Page 4 water to premises in the area, which necessitates the

bringing of vehicles into a section of road to which the order applies;

- d) buses;
- e) licensed taxis
- f) Dial-a-Ride vehicles;
- g) vehicles to which a valid exemption permit has been provided.

for the reasons set out in this report and summarised at paragraph 3.12 and 15.3 of the January 2021 Report.

The Cabinet Member consider the revised Equality Analysis when making their decision in relation to recommendations 1.1 and 1.3 -1.7 in the January 2021 Report.

11/20 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

This item was not required.

The meeting ended at 7.18 pm

Signed:

Date:

.....