

Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee - 24 May 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 24 May 2016 at 7.00 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** James Court (Chair), Diarmaid Ward (Vice-Chair),
Raphael Andrews, Gary Heather, Clare Jeapes,
Caroline Russell and Rupert Perry

Councillor James Court in the Chair

42 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A1)

Apologies were received from Councillor Hamitouche.

43 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A2)

There were no substitute members.

44 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A3)

There were no declarations of interest.

45 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A4)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee meeting on 25 April 2016 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

46 PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item A5)

Public Questions would be taken during the relevant agenda items.

47 CHAIR'S REPORT (Item A6)

There was no chair's report.

48 ARRANGEMENTS AND TERMS OF REFERENCE (Item B1)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

49 AIR QUALITY PRESENTATION (Item B2)

Paul Clift, Environmental Health Manager gave a presentation on Air Quality.

In the presentation and discussion the following points were made:

- The National Air Quality Strategy was introduced in 1997.
- The first Air Quality Action Plan was drawn up in 2003.
- The Air Quality Strategy 2014-17 was in place.
- Particulate Matter (PM) and Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) were the main pollutants.
- The air quality in Islington had improved and had been complying with the PM 10 limit for several years. However the NO₂, although within compliance of daily limits, exceeded the annual mean at measured sites.

Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee - 24 May 2016

- Since the air quality scrutiny, more work had been undertaken on lobbying for cleaner buses, working with schools and reducing exposure.
- Funding had been received for a schools programme with Haringey and Hackney. Work had taken place in three schools in each of the boroughs. In Islington these were Montem, Grafton and Ambler. Walking information had been produced and work had taken place with the children to help them understand more about air quality and how to reduce their exposure.
- Work had taken place to engage businesses and community groups.
- A Car Free Day would be held in September.
- There was a £300,000 commitment from the Mayor's Fund for an air quality project in Archway.
- The council was looking to install electric hooks up on the canal and introduce more electric charging points.
- The new London Mayor had announced a formal policy consultation on air quality and had indicated that the ultra-low emission zone could be extended. If it was extended, it would cover Islington.
- Air Pollution Exposure in London had identified 20 schools in London with the highest exposure. This included four Islington schools.
- Biomass could result in carbon reduction but did not help air quality.
- DEFRA had submitted best projections of NO2 limits being reached by 2020 across the UK and in London by 2025.
- The borough had two monitoring stations – one at the Ecology Centre and the other on Holloway Road. In addition there were diffusion tubes at sites around the borough.
- Air pollution was worse in the south of the borough than in the north.
- The introduction of 20mph roads had not had a significant impact on air quality but it had helped encourage a change of behaviour, with more people walking and cycling.
- Part of Seven Sisters Road was a NO2 focus area.
- A member of the public reported concerns about barbecuing on Highbury Fields. A study had been done with Kings College as residents were concerned about the health impacts, particularly on the vulnerable including the elderly and young children. Measurements were taken on a weekend when there were lots of barbecues taking place and high levels of pollutants were recorded. The officer advised that the figures a snapshot but this was a different way of measuring to the way it was measured across the borough which made it hard to compare. However they did not dismiss that there could be an effect on air pollution. Public Health had concluded the levels of PM2.5 had been high but confirmed that the figures could not be compared to those produced across the borough as they were measured differently.
- A member who had Highbury Fields in her ward stated that she received questions from concerned residents. She asked that Public Health provide her with a written assurance that there was no serious risk to public health from barbecues taking place if this was the case.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the presentation be noted.
- 2) That the committee be provided with information on the progress towards Silver FORs accreditation, changes to the fleet, the fuel used by Car Clubs and levels of personal car ownership.
- 3) That Public Health be asked to provide a written assurance that there was no serious risk to public health from barbecues taking place if this was the case.
- 4) That a session on barbecuing in parks be arranged for a future meeting.

50

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY PRESENTATION (Item B3)

Eric Manners (Team Leader – Planning Obligations) gave a presentation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), a copy of which would be interleaved with the agenda.

In the presentation and discussion the following points were made:

- Islington Council adopted its CIL in September 2014. It replaced most infrastructure contributions through Section 106 but was more flexible as it had to address the impacts of growth.
- Pre-CIL S106 agreements would remain in effect and Section 106 funds would continue to be received for some years.
- CIL Regulations required a minimum of 15% to be allocated based on 'agreed local priorities'.
- Since the adoption of Islington's CIL the total CIL liabilities issued was £27.6 million. (This would only be received once development commenced).
- The estimated future CIL receipts between 2015 and 2018 was £15-21 million.
- The CIL allocation process was an annual Executive decision made as part of the budget setting process. After monitoring and collection fees of 5%, it was proposed that CIL income be split into 50% - Strategic CIL, 35% Local Strategic and 15% Local CIL.
- The 50% Strategic CIL would be allocated by the council as part of the annual budget setting process. Strategic CIL schemes included projects that contributed to revenue savings, projects that delivered statutory requirements, committed capital projects with a funding shortfall, projects that supported the delivery of new council homes e.g. Finsbury Leisure Centre and projects with other community benefits.
- The 35% Local Strategic CIL would be allocated by ward councillors for 'the provision, improvements, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure'. It could be spent on anything that was included on the strategic 'CIL Regulation 123' infrastructure list within that ward or a neighbouring ward if appropriate. This list would be revised following consultation due to take place in the next month.
- The 15% Local CIL was to be allocated by ward councillors for 'the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure' and/or 'anything else that was concerned with addressing the demands that development placed on an area.' It was likely to be used to fund many high priority Ward Improvement Plan (WIP) schemes although not all WIP schemes were eligible for CIL funds.
- £127m of strategic infrastructure needs had been identified. £32m funding had been secured, leaving a shortfall of £95m. After a 50/50 split, only £7.5-£10.5 m of strategic CIL was likely within the first three years of CIL receipts.
- The £24m shortfall for school place provision could be at most 1/3 funded by Strategic CIL over three years. Other council funds were scarce. There were also no strategic CIL funds available for supporting social housing provision through major projects such as the redevelopment of Finsbury Leisure Centre, parks/housing estate open spaces, adventure playgrounds, ball courts, Multi-Use Games Areas (MUGAs) or community centres so Local CIL and S106 was required.
- £37 m of Section 106 funds was held and \$24 m of this had been allocated to projects. Future S106 funds likely to be received were £6m. S106 funds had to be allocated locally.
- Several scenarios had been modelled. The July Executive report would propose a minimum £30,000 of local strategic CIL for each ward. Annual calculations would take place each December.
- The July Executive paper would allocate Islington's first £1.6m of carbon offsetting contributions secured through S106. All allocations of carbon offsetting funds were agreed by the Affordable Energy Board. Initial priorities included insulating high-rise

estate buildings (£1.5m), 'Housing and Health' fund (£50,000) and 'Energising Small Business' fund (£50,000).

- The CIL 'Regulation 123' infrastructure list set out how strategic CIL funds were likely to be spent. Islington's list was quite broad. Minor revisions were proposed through public consultation and the Executive would make a decision on these in July. The list was mainly to ensure developers could not claim that carbon offsetting contributions used on housing estate high-rise insulation represented a duplication of their CIL liabilities.
- It was proposed that to speed up the allocation process that one member per ward would act as the leader councillor for WIP review and allocations with the lead member consulting colleagues and reporting back. Where a ward had members from more than one party, both parties would have a lead member.

RESOLVED:

That the presentation be noted.

51 SMART CITIES SCRUTINY REPORT (Item B4)

RESOLVED:

That the report be agreed subject to the addition of a recommendation to refer to the importance of the council retaining the ownership of data the wording of which was delegated to officers in consultation with the chair.

52 CCTV SCRUTINY REPORT (Item B5)

RESOLVED:

That the report be agreed.

53 SCRUTINY TOPICS - 2016/17 (Item B6)

RESOLVED:

- 1) That members email the chair with any suggestions.
- 2) That an additional meeting be arranged to approve topics.

The meeting ended at 9.25 pm

CHAIR