London Borough of Islington

Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee - 5 December 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 5 December 2016 at 7.00 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** James Court (Chair), David Poyser (Vice-Chair), Raphael Andrews, Mouna Hamitouche, Gary Heather, Clare Jeapes and Caroline Russell

Councillor James Court in the Chair

78 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A1)**
There were no apologies for absence.

79 **DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A2)**
There were no substitute members.

80 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A3)**
Councillor Court declared a personal interest in Item B1 as the organisation he worked for represented electric vehicles and a number of staff there worked on charging points.

81 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A4)**

RESOLVED:
That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2016 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

82 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item A5)**
Public questions would be taken during the relevant agenda item.

83 **CHAIR'S REPORT (Item A6)**
There was no chair's report.

84 **PROMOTING THE USE OF ELECTRIC VEHICLES - PRESENTATION (Item B1)**
Will Umney, Principal Planner, Spatial Planning and Transport and Peter Hazzard, Parking Projects Manager, Traffic and Parking Services gave a presentation on Islington Council's promotion of electric vehicles. In the presentation and discussion the following points were made:

- The Office for Low Emission Vehicles had awarded London £13million for the Go Ultra Low City Scheme to drive up the uptake of ultra low emissions vehicles.
- A Londonwide delivery partnership would be established to provide, manage and maintain charging infrastructure in residential areas.
- Car club bays would be retrofitted with electric vehicle (EV) charging points via the partnership responsible for residential charging infrastructure.
- The funding would support the increase of rapid EV chargers and Neighbourhoods of the Future. These were local schemes to prioritise and encourage the uptake of ULEVs.

- There would be £20m available from the Mayors Air Quality Fund for London between 2013 and 2023.
- Various zero emission projects were taking place to promote electric vehicles including free trials and encouraging electric delivery vehicles.
- Current on street charging infrastructure in Islington consisted of Hall Street (a single 7KW space), Highbury Crescent (a double 7KW space), Tufnell Park Road (a single 7KW space), Hemingford Road (a single 3KW space), Farringdon Lane (a single 3KW space) and Tolpuddle Street (a double 7KW space).
- 7KW was the maximum level that could be reached using cables from the road. A 7KW charger could charge a car in 6-8 hours and a 3KW charger would charge a car fully overnight.
- There was an app users could use to see whether each charging point was working and available for use.
- Users could sign in via a card. To obtain one if they had a hybrid car currently cost £20 a year but was free if they had a vehicle that was fully electric. Members suggested that this figure could be increased.
- Proposed infrastructure expansion would effectively double the amount of on street charging points in Islington.
- Hall Street would have a single 7KW space operational in September 2016.
- Subject to consultation there would be a rapid charger (22KW) on Sheringham Road. The rapid charger could charge a Tesla fully in 25 minutes and a new spur would be run from the nearby school which meant 22KW was achievable. This would be funded by DEFRA. As a build out would be necessary, a member suggested that this could also be used for cycle parking.
- Additional spaces on St Luke's Close, Banner Street and Cahill Street were likely to be operational this financial year as consultation had been completed and a Lever Street charging point was being discussed with the Executive member.
- Using Hall Street as an example to illustrate costs – the Feeder Pillar cost £6,000-£7,000 to supply and install, a 7KW Charging Pillar cost £8500 to supply and install, changes had to be made to the street e.g. signs and lines and additional costs such as consultation cost £3000-£5000.
- The on street charging infrastructure contract was advertised on the portal in October 2016 and 7 bids had been returned. It was likely the contract would be signed in March 2017. The contract was for multiple suppliers. It would be a concession contract at zero cost to the council. The network would be expanded with a combination of charging infrastructure such as lamp column charging and traditional rapid and slower chargers.
- The main reason for breakdowns was because the charging points had a lot of use. Another reason was faulty car batteries tripping the residual current device (RCD). There was usually a 72 hour turnaround on repairs. Most of the charging points had been updated recently.
- There were four off street charging points at the Business Design Centre. Users did not need to be a member of the Islington scheme to use these points but the Business Design Centre did charge for their usage.
- Concern was raised that there was a large amount of money being invested into a small number of charging points for private vehicles rather than council or business vehicles. The officers explained that it was not possible for the whole fleet to be electric e.g. some required a lot of power to lift bins etc. However the council's electric vehicle fleet was growing slowly.
- Concern was raised that this might not be the most effective use of money and instead should be spent on encouraging people to walk and cycle instead of using a car. The officers explained that certain funding had to be spent in certain ways and the infrastructure concession contract would not cost the council.

- In response to concern about street clutter and whether the Royal National Institute of Blind People had been consulted, officers advised that whilst consultation with the RNIB had not taken place, street clutter was a consideration and charging points were carefully placed.
- Concern was raised about people trailing the cables from charging points across pavements to their vehicles. The council advised them this was dangerous and created a trip hazard. The committee requested information on whether anyone had been fined for doing this and for details of the fining process.
- Officers were asked how Islington compared to neighbouring boroughs in terms of its electric vehicle charging provision. Officers advised that in 2013 the council decided not to put any more charging points. Only recently had the decision been taken to increase provision. Islington had a similar amount of provision to Haringey and Camden. By the end of this year, Islington would be level with councils with a higher level of provision.

1) That the presentation be noted.
2) That members be provided with information on whether anyone had been fined for trailing cables across pavements and for details of the fining process.
3) That officers be invited to attend a meeting of the committee in a year's time to provide an update.

85 **REGENERATION OF RETAIL AREAS SCRUTINY REVIEW - INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATION (Item B2)**

Ben Johnson, Career Grade Planner gave a presentation on policy. In the presentation and discussion the following points were made:

- In the current policy there were four town centres (TC) and central activities zones (CAZ) (Angel, Archway, Nags Head and Finsbury Park). There were also 40 local shopping areas. Existing retail was protected across the borough and new, small shops of 80sqm or less were supported.
- Town centres were identified in the Mayor's London Plan.
- Retail uses were directed to town centres in the first instance. This reflected government policy.
- Core retail areas were protected in relation to primary frontages (where the aim was to maintain 70% retail) and secondary frontages (where the aim was to maintain 50% retail).
- Specialist shopping areas covered areas of unique function e.g. Fonthill Road and Camden Passage.
- There was a strong protection and enhancement of cultural uses such as theatres, cinemas and arts venues in town centres and the CAZ.
- There were 40 areas across the borough designated by the local authority as local shopping areas. These were of differing sizes between 4 units and 200 units. They generally met day-to-day needs and were essential shops or provided essential services although there was also a distinct leisure role.
- A1 units were protected but Local Shopping Areas had more flexibility of uses than town centres. There was no threshold of A1 units to try and retain.
- The Finsbury Local Plan covered the CAZ in the south of the borough. There was a broad mix of uses in this area but significant development pressure. There was a global employment function (e.g. office space) but a need to provide services for local residents also.
- The local plan review updated the evidence base, continued the protection of core retail areas in some form but with recognition of the changing retail landscape. Development in town centres would be prioritised in the first instance and the specific role of each centre would be recognised. The Local Plan was currently out to consultation which had started on 25 November and would run for three months.

250 groups on the planning policy database had been asked to contribute as had other groups and in addition posters and leaflets were distributed. If members were aware of any other groups that could be consulted, they could inform officers. The last review had received approximately 400 responses. The consultation gave people the opportunity to make suggestions about Islington's future and how it should develop in the next 15 years.

- In response to questions about the status of Essex Road and a comment about the number of DIY shops along the road, the officer advised that part of Essex Road was part of the Angel Town Centre and further down the road there were two local shopping areas. DIY shops were classed as A1 so would be protected where there was a threshold.
- In Whitecross and Exmouth markets there was a 35% threshold for A1 use so the council would seek to resist planning applications for a change of use if the level went lower than the threshold.
- Concern was expressed at the number of pubs being replaced with flats. The officer advised that there was a pub policy to help protect against their loss. Pubs had permitted development rights unless they were designated as a community asset. However there were strict regulations and not every pub was suitable for this. Planning had asked for pubs being sold to be marketed as pubs but had lost appeals on this.

Martijn Cooijmans, Team Leader – Planning and Projects E/W gave a presentation. In the presentation and discussion the following points were made:

- Place making was about improving places for people to come together and to strengthen retail areas.
- At the Archway the gyratory was being removed and a new public space was under construction. There would be a new heart for Archway town centre and the potential for a market and other street trading. In the new year a new square would be built and the shops that were on the island would be more easily accessible.
- Subject to the plans for Highbury Corner being taken forward, the roundabout would be removed and a new public space and park created. It would create a new gateway to Upper Street and Holloway Road and the potential for some street trading.
- Subject to the plans for Old Street being taken forward, the roundabout at Old Street would be removed and a new public space would be created which would provide a new gateway to Old Street, Whitecross Street market and Shoreditch. There would be the potential for some retail and street trading.
- In Farringdon, there would be a new Crossrail station and improved public space. There would be a new gateway to 'Mid-Town' and a potential for some street trading.
- There was a masterplan for Central Street which included public space improvements to the King's Square shopping area.
- Clerkenwell Green was being redesigned with the 'car park' being used to provide improved public space.
- Finsbury Park would have new public space as part of the City North development. There would be a new pedestrian street leading to a new station entrance and new retail provision.
- The council was working with TfL to look at the possibility of removing the gyratory at King's Cross and making improvements to the Caledonian Road high street.
- The council was working with TfL to look at the possibility of removing the gyratory at the Nag's Head and making improvements to the Seven Sisters Road high street. This scheme was unlikely to go ahead as the scheme was the most problematic.
- In the Spring there would be a full consultation of the town centre strategy for Angel.

- Martijn and his team were thanked for his ongoing work in relation to the plans for the borough.
- In response to a question about the plans for the existing shopping centre including the supermarket at the Nag's Head, the officer advised that the landowner had not submitted a planning application. The site allocations would be revisited and engagement would take place with the landowner.
- In response to a query about whether the tree pits on the Archway public square were large enough, the officer advised that there were.
- Concern was raised that the new bus stops at Archway could mean bus users were unsure which bus stop to wait at for the next bus to their destination. The officer advised that some bus routes that had previously stopped at the same stop would now stop at different stops but some buses that previously stopped at different stops would now stop at the same stop. TfL would be putting an electronic board in Archway station advising people which bus stop the next bus would arrive at. Due to the high frequency of buses, even if a bus user did not go to the bus stop where the next bus was due to stop, they would not have to wait very long for the next bus to arrive at their stop.
- Work would take place with the Town Centre Management Team and the local community on the design of the public space at the Archway early in the new year. In response to a member asking if independent coffee shops could be prioritised over chain ones, an officer advised that it was not possible to differentiate in planning terms.

Gemma Aked, Town Centre Development Manager gave a presentation. In the presentation and discussion the following points were made:

- The town centre development function was established in 2015. It was restructured from the Chief Executive's Directorate to the Environment and Regeneration Directorate in October 2016. It was currently externally funded through the New Homes Bonus. There was a commitment to ongoing funding for staff.
- Key functions were 1) the strategic overview of town centres, 2) to increase footfall in the town centres, 3) To manage the council's relationship with town centre businesses, 4) To provide a gateway to other council services for businesses, 5) To provide business support advice, guidance and training, 6) To provide brokerage and partnership development, 7) To undertake project management and delivery of strategic projects and programmes, 8) To lever additional investment into town centres.
- There was a direct town centre management function to Archway, Finsbury Park and Nag's Head and an indirect town centre management function to the Angel. Funding support was provided by the council to the Angel Business Improvement District (BID) covering two seconded staff posts.
- Core priorities were drawn up following a survey of over 300 businesses. They were 1) Business Engagement and Support which included business support programmes, Town Centre Management Groups and Traders Associations, 2) Town Centre Environments including cleaner, greener and safer, improving public realm and transport infrastructure; 3) Thriving Town Centre Economies included developing the town centre offer, key development sites and engaging investment partners including the GLA and London Councils to ensure a link into funding schemes and into other projects, 4) Unlocking wider opportunities including employment and skills e.g. asking businesses to provide local employment and skills training, community cohesion and tourism and 5) Galvanising and promoting strong town centre offers and animating town centres.
- The core priorities had driven the projects that had been undertaken in the last 18 months.

- The current programme included delivering the Town Centre Partnership's Business Plans 2016/17, supporting the development of the Economic Development Strategy and delivering core projects funded by NHB and GLA High Streets Programme.
- Projects included maintaining (and establishing in Finsbury Park) Town Centre Management Groups, the Shop Front Improvement Programme in Finsbury Park (engaging with 35 businesses), Marketing and Promoting Town Centres, (Focussing on Finsbury Park to establish brand identity, website and promotional campaign), Developing Business Support Programme (Business rates/marketing/visual merchandising), Festive Lighting and Events programme, supporting the delivery of Archway Square.
- Key challenges included a potential increase in business rates for small businesses in March 2017 (businesses would be offered workshops and one to one sessions, an increase in rents for small business and general land value increases, managing relationships with key landowners and developers, parking (identified by businesses as a problem, although evidence had shown 80% of their customers did not drive to visit them), retail and office space to residential, capacity and managing expectations, resources for strategic posts, programmes and ongoing commitments, promoting town centres and making the most of the wider offer.
- In response to a member's question about whether the team mentored new businesses, the officer advised that this had not taken place as it was not in the core priorities but this might be considered in the future.
- 95% of the businesses who attended the town centre management groups were independent. Chains generally engaged through the Chamber of Commerce.
- In response to a member of the public's suggestion that Essex Road was being neglected, the officer advised that the Angel Business Improvement District's boundary was being extended to Essex Road station. Any suggestions for improvements could be sent in and would be considered.

RESOLVED:
That the presentations be noted.

86 FUEL POVERTY - REFERRALS TO SHINE (SEASONAL HEALTH INTERVENTION NETWORK) - PRESENTATION (Item B3)

Julie Billett, Director of Public Health gave a presentation on referrals to SHINE. In the presentation and discussion, the following points were made:

- SHINE was a one stop shop established to tackle fuel poverty and reduce seasonal deaths and hospital admissions in Islington.
- It worked in partnership across the borough to deliver a package of interventions designed to improve seasonal health and wellbeing.
- The project had been running since the winter of 2010/11 and in that time had helped over 11,500 vulnerable residents across thousands of interventions.
- Referral analysis showed that 47 NHS services and groups were identified as referring to SHINE. Each year there were a similar proportion of referrals from the NHS.
- There were 49 GP referrals from 16 of the 34 Islington practices, mostly in 2014/15 and 2015/16.
- There were 48 referrals from the dementia navigator service in 2014/15 and 2015/16. The dementia navigator service was a non-clinical service.
- There were 39 referrals from health visitors who had contact with every family in the borough with a new child, 11 iCope (talking psychological therapy) referrals all in 2014/15 and 2015/16. There was a decline in referrals in 2014/15 and 2015/16 from most other services.

- Non-NHS referrals came from services such as housing, caretakers, council staff and the voluntary and community sectors.
- The low percentage of NHS referrals could be due to a council run service not being a classic place for health professionals to refer patients. The challenge was to get health professionals to think of SHINE as a place to refer people. Health professionals had pressure on their time and in short appointments were often unable to explore the wider influences and determinants around the health condition being presented.
- Seven training sessions were held in March and April 2016 on health and housing for primary care practitioners. This was part of the Islington Community Education Provider Network (CEPN) working with the Recovery College. This was multi-disciplinary training aimed at breaking down barriers between disciplines.
- Around 60 front line health practitioners, including GPs and health visitors were present over the sessions.
- A training session had been delivered for over 15 Age UK locality navigators.
- Two sessions had been delivered for Children's Centres in September and this included health visitors. Approximately 30 people were present over the two sessions.
- A quarterly SHINE newsletter was distributed to many NHS staff.
- SHINE was included in Making Every Contact Count (MEDD) with 436 Islington staff completing online training and 150 Islington health and social care staff completing ½ day training to date.
- Making Every Contact Count was launched in June 2016. It made use of conversations staff had with residents every day. It delivered additional support and advice where appropriate to help local people improve their wellbeing in relation to healthy living, money worries, debt and fuel poverty, unemployment and housing concerns. SHINE was an integral part of MECC.
- Receptionists, nurses and the wider primary care workforce could all refer to SHINE.
- Feedback on individuals' progress to referrers was a positive reinforcing action which encouraged further referrals.
- SHINE was embedded in the GP "Map of Medicine" which was a computerised pathway system used by medical professionals to refer people to the most appropriate place.
- MECC (and hence SHINE) was being embedded in new NHS standard contracts and new staff would receive training.
- SHINE participated in locality multi-disciplinary teams, although housing was often not raised as an issue by health services.
- Islington Winter Warmth campaign consisted of SHINE (contacting known clients aged 70+, or had a child under 5 or had a disability), Help On Your Doorstep (identifying neighbourhoods of high deprivation and then knocking on every door in that neighbourhood), North London Cares (volunteers provide a mix of befriending, social activities and practical help to older residents), Housing (visit to tenants aged 75 and over), Age UK and Pensioners forum, CCG activities (e.g. flu campaign).
- Gap analysis showed there had only been one referral from Community Pharmacists despite training. There were opportunities to encourage them to refer to SHINE.
- There had been a slowing of referrals from health visitors. There was the potential to include this in all new birth visits or at the one year of 2 ½ year reviews.
- Referrals from 16 out of 34 GP practices suggested scope for increases including referrals from practice nurses (9 to date) and health care assistants.
- Two individual GPs had made seven referrals each so there was a potential for SHINE peer champions.
- CCG Care navigators were not currently represented in referrals so there was the potential to provide training for them.

- Referrals from teams across UCLH and some Whittington Hospital departments had slowed in recent years. Staff turnover created a training issue and busy departments did not always think about referring to services such as SHINE. There was the potential to raise awareness or provide training sessions.
- In response to a question about whether sharing hospitals with other boroughs prevented hospitals from referring and whether there was a case for rolling out SHINE to other boroughs, Julie Billett advised that Camden had a similar service – Wish Plus. SHINE was a model that could, in theory, be rolled out elsewhere taking account of local circumstances and services available.
- The chair suggested that the Health and Wellbeing Board should do more to promote SHINE. Julie Billett stated that the board operated at a strategic level and recognised the importance of health and housing. The Health and Wellbeing Strategy referred to SHINE as helping to address health and housing issues. The Health and Wellbeing Strategy was being revised and was currently being consulted on so the committee could contribute to the consultation.
- In response to a query as to whether councillors could refer people to SHINE, members were advised that they could.
- In response to a question from a member of the public about whether teachers and school staff were offered MECC training, Julie Billett said school nurses were offered the training. She was not aware if other school staff were offered training but would take this suggestion away to look into.

RESOLVED:

1) That the presentation be noted.
2) That the committee respond to the consultation requesting that SHINE be included in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy as a priority and that the scrutiny report on Fuel Poverty be included for information.

87 WORK PROGRAMME (Item B4)

RESOLVED:

That the work programme be noted subject to the following amendments:

- That TfL would be attending the meeting on 9 March for a review of the Holloway Road closure. The chair would advise colleagues that TfL would be attending.
- That an item to be considered as a possible item for a future agenda be the money the Mayor for London was making available for Local Implementation Plans and projects officers could bid for money for.
- That the presentation on the use of barbecues in public open spaces be moved from 9 March 2017 meeting to 23 January 2017 meeting.

The meeting ended at 9.50 pm

CHAIR