

Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee - 11 January 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee held at Committee Room 5, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 11 January 2016 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** James Court (Chair), Theresa Debono, Mouna Hamitouche, Gary Heather, Clare Jeapes, Caroline Russell and David Poyser (Substitute) (In place of Spall)

Councillor James Court in the Chair

1 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Marian Spall and Diarmaid Ward.

2 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A2)

Councillor David Poyser substituted for Councillor Marian Spall.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A3)

None.

4 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A4)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee meetings on 14 July and 7 September 2015 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

5 PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item A5)

Public questions would be taken during the relevant agenda items.

6 CHAIR'S REPORT (Item A6)

There was no chair's report.

7 CCTV SCRUTINY REVIEW - WITNESS EVIDENCE (Item B1)

Daniel Tomey, Concierge Service Manager gave witness evidence.

In the presentation and discussion the following points were made:

- In the last five years there had been a change of focus in the concierge service. The monitoring of CCTV in the borough and communications had been improved, concierges had been made responsible for their cameras, all housing cameras were networked, office upgrades were undertaken, performance indicators were put in place and there was a focus on staff training. In this time the CCTV contract ended and the service was insourced.
- Next steps included undertaking a consultation on a restructure, considering how the service engaged with residents which would include increasing the number of electronic noticeboards, more training for staff on anti-social behaviour legislation and information sharing, ensuring all capacity was used, considering the use of technology e.g. movement sensors which would mean not all camera footage would

have to be shown on screens at one time, improving three of the offices and improving signage visibility.

- The Housing CCTV Service had over 1000 cameras and 12 concierge sites. 2 of the concierge sites were managed by tenant management organisations (TMOs) and 10 were managed by the council. They were open between 16-24 hours a day. There were 33 estates. There were 6 roof access systems and these included 11 cameras. There were also new build video entry systems in place.
- In terms of monitored CCTV, (Security Industry Authority) SIA licensed officers actively viewed live camera streams. Complimentary systems such as PA, intercom and access control were used and officers undertook investigating and reporting. This included making statements and attending court, calling the emergency services or Anti Social Behaviour team etc when appropriate and writing reports to the relevant council teams.
- Unmonitored CCTV was logged into each day by staff to ensure the cameras were working. If an incident was reported, the CCTV footage was obtained and sent to the police where appropriate.
- CCTV could be a deterrent for a short time but to be effective it required monitoring, immediate action, information sharing and third party action. The number, location and quality of cameras was important as was lighting. It was also important to work closely with partners, and have visible cameras, signage and the concierge visible.
- Customer satisfaction surveys had indicated that 87.5% of respondents considered the service provided to be good or very good, 88% of respondents were satisfied that the concierge service provided value for money and 94% of respondents considered that the introduction of the concierge service had reduced the number of incidents or crime and anti social behaviour in their block/estate.
- Performance monitoring included monitoring anti social behaviour, crime reports per office and per person, the number of incidents, where and when they occurred and the number of arrests as a consequence of concierge actions.
- One in five perpetrators were identified from CCTV.
- Concierge staff built relationships with residents e.g. they took in parcels for residents and arranged repairs where necessary. They were often able to identify those involved in incidents using CCTV footage.
- The sites managed by TMOs received the same funding as the council run sites did. They had chosen to run the sites themselves so the council did not usually get involved with their management.

RESOLVED:

That the evidence be noted.

8

SMART CITIES SCRUTINY REVIEW - WITNESS EVIDENCE (Item B2)

Trevor Gibson, from Opportunities Peterborough gave a presentation on Peterborough DNA, part of the Future Cities Programme.

In the presentation and discussion the following points were made:

- A Smart City was “the effective integration of physical, digital and human systems in the built environment to deliver a sustainable, prosperous and inclusive future for its citizens”.(BSI PAS 181)
- “A smart city dramatically increases the pace at which it improves its sustainability and resilience by fundamentally improving how it engages society, how it applies collaborative leadership methods, how it works across disciplines and city systems, and how it uses data and integrated technologies, in order to provide better services and quality of life to those in and involved with the city (residents, businesses, visitors)”. (ISO June 2015)

Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee - 11 January 2016

- Peterborough was the UK's second fastest growing city. It had a population of over 188,400 people.
- Peterborough was one of four cities which received funding from the Technology Strategy Board to develop and test ideas for how smart, future-proofed cities could work. The project was delivered by Opportunity Peterborough and Peterborough City Council. It received £3million to deliver a project over 3 years.
- The principles of the project were to focus on innovation, sustainability and growth, to provide a catalyst to change mind-sets towards an efficient and sustainable urban future and act as an enabler to delivering the city's vision.
- Transparency, participation, empowerment, collaboration, engagement and openness were important.
- A requirement of the funding was that projects should be replicable and scalable.
- Peterborough was actively involved in national Smart City thinking and standards development and applying PAS 181 (the Smart City Framework) to systematically approach the challenge from strategy through to implementation.
- Key Initiatives were 1) Digital Peterborough – having open data and becoming the first gigabit city with superfast broadband for businesses and residents; 2) Brainwave – a platform to facilitate immediate match-making between innovators and challenges; 3) Circular Peterborough – working demonstration projects were developed to improve resource efficiency; 4) Developing Skills for our Future through the Peterborough Graduate Scheme, bursaries and Smart Suppers in which young people pitched their solutions to city challenges and one was chosen and its development supported.
- The Smart City Leadership Programme was developed in partnership with BSI and Urban DNA Ltd. It was built around the PAS 181 Smart City Framework. It was aimed at increasing the personal and collective knowledge of city leaders about the need for, and possibilities arising from, a smart city approach. It established the foundations to increase the pace at which cities responded to the Smart City opportunity.
- Standards Based Assessment engaged city leadership in a simple assessment process (personal or small groups) that provided a snapshot of their city's current state of 'smartness'. It helped to reposition 'standards' in the eyes of city leaders. It directly related to the PAS 181 framework and added rapid value to the Smart City standards. The assessment approach was now included in the BSI Smart Cities Overview guide, PD8100:2015.
- In conclusion, the smart city approach should accelerate the pace of change in addressing city challenges, framework guidance could help inform each area's approach, there was no Smart City without Smart City leadership and engagement, collaboration and partnerships were the key starting point – Smart Cities was not just about technology or investing significant resources.
- Peterborough was 2 ½ years into its Smart Cities work so was in the early stages of seeing benefits. It would be another 2-3 years before tangible benefits would be seen.
- It was hoped the quality of services would increase at the same time as costs decreased.
- It was suggested that Islington Council was already be doing Smart Cities work but might not see it as such. This work could be used as a catalyst to learn across the wider remit of the council.
- Smart Champions in the council could help to promote Smart Cities. Leadership and support from management was critical.
- Peterborough was going to put sensors in the homes of vulnerable people who received social care in order to monitor temperature and movement. In addition 25 weather stations were being installed in schools. The data would be connected so that when temperatures were recorded as extreme, this would trigger support where

necessary. It was anticipated that this project could build partnerships in the community, improve the quality of service and result in a corresponding reduction in the cost of service.

- There had been few problems with the installation of the super broadband other than many of the main roads being dug up. The broadband was working effectively and many businesses had relocated to where the superfast broadband was in place. The council had installed the superfast broadband in conjunction with City Fibre who had undertaken the work in a number of cities.
- The Brainwave platform had not been used as much as expected and therefore consideration would be given to how it could be promoted.

Matthew Homer, Waste Strategy Manager, gave a presentation on Smart Cities and Recycling. In the presentation and discussion the following points were made:

- Smart recycling measures improved efficiency and improved service.
- Recycling and waste sites were currently emptied on a regular weekly schedule irrespective of how full they were. Bins filled at different rates at different times of the year so a regular schedule was not always possible. Visiting a half empty bin was twice as expensive as visiting a full bin.
- Dynamic scheduling meant emptying a bin when it needed to be emptied and finding the best route from site to site. This resulted in efficient collections, better customer service and improved monitoring.
- A bin sensors trial was taking place. The sensors were fitted to recycling bins on one of the rounds. These measured hourly fill levels and reported back to a database. The sensors advised officers when each bin was full and also predicted when the bin would be full.
- Commercial bins and wheelie bins were currently excluded.
- Prison bins had been excluded pending prison security checks on the system.
- Trial smart plans would be undertaken.
- Potential uses for sensors were in the remaining recycling sites, communal waste bins, skips, grit bins and litter bins.
- Big Belly bins were litter bins with inbuilt sensors. They provided fill data and alerts.
- The Clean Islington App was a mobile app which enabled residents to easily report issues to the council. It was a good example of using mobile technology to improve services for residents. It was possible that in time this could be expanded to report issues to other services.
- Potential opportunities were not in place yet but could include 1) the digitalisation of services e.g. digital back office systems, in cab devices for front line staff and vehicle technology (GPS tracking, bin weighing and cameras); 2) management and efficient services e.g. real time dynamic routing, GPS tracking, service productivity, resource allocation, reduced administration and health and safety implications; 3) customer and better services e.g. messaging to crews, better customer service information, more use of the web and phone app.
- Overall, a smart recycling and refuse service would provide a more efficient and better service.
- Opportunity Peterborough had six members in the team; three of which were part time. It was well integrated with the council.

RESOLVED:

That the evidence be noted.

9 EXECUTIVE MEMBER PRESENTATION ON PARKING CONSULTATION (Item B3)

Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee - 11 January 2016

Councillor Claudia Webbe, Executive Member for Environment and Transport gave a presentation on the Controlled Parking Zone Review.

In the presentation and discussion the following points were made:

- Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) were introduced to discourage commuter parking and manage parking demand.
- No reviews of CPZs had been undertaken since 2007. Parking needs had changed since then and new pressures had put a strain on the council's existing on-street parking places.
- The council had identified five areas to review current parking controls aimed at trying to make it easier for residents to park near to their homes. These areas were 1) Stadium control area, 2) Angel, 3) Finsbury Square and Farringdon Station area, 4) Whittington Hospital area and 5) Archway regeneration area.
- The proposed changes aimed to benefit resident permit holders by providing additional protection for parking, without any extra cost or action needed from them.
- There was a significant level of engagement and response rates with over 11,000 responses.
- When assessing the total number of responses received, it appeared there was not overall support from the individual areas. However, when analysing the returns from those who actually lived/worked in the Whittington Hospital area, (Zone K), there was overwhelming support for the proposals. In addition, there was a slight majority in favour from those who lived/worked in the Finsbury area (Zone C).
- Zones K and C showed support for the proposals from those directly affected by them. In addition, Zones K and C had very high parking stress for resident permit holders.
- In response to a question from a member, Councillor Webbe stated that it was not known how many of the respondents were car owners as the consultation did not differentiate between those who owned a car and those who did not. It sought to obtain the views of all those affected by the CPZs.
- In response to concern about some match times not coinciding with CPZ hours, Councillor Webbe advised that the council had very little control over match times. Generally they fell within the CPZ hours but on rare occasions they did not. The council sought to encourage those setting match times to consider the impact on Islington.
- There was a long term vision to look at increasing the use of digital parking. If this took place, access issues and paper alternatives would be considered. E-visitor vouchers for Zones K and C would be introduced this year.

RESOLVED:

That the presentation be noted.

10

RECYCLING (Item B4)

Matthew Homer, Waste Strategy Manager, gave a presentation on the Food and Garden Waste Recycling Pilot. In the presentation and discussion the following points were made:

- Currently there were collection crews for dry recycling, green and kitchen waste and other crews that collected rubbish from doorstep properties.
- The concept was to replace the kitchen waste collection service with on street 'smart' bins and provide a green waste collection service upon request (at a charge) or from communal points. These measures would reduce the number of crews and vehicles by collecting dry recycling and rubbish in the same vehicle. Food waste door-to-door take up was only about 25%-30%.
- The pilot area was mainly in Tollington ward. The pilot was launched on 15 June and lasted for three months. The area covered 2,000 households and there were 13 food

waste sites and 6 garden waste sites. The garden waste sites were located on paved areas adjacent to parks. The food bins were co-located with the waste bins or located on the pavement.

- Consideration had been given to accessibility to the food waste bins. Some people had to walk further than others to their nearest bin. Travel routes had been considered.
- The communal food bins were smart bins with sensors to notify officers when they were full.
- About 5% of pilot households contacted the council with concerns, primarily that they thought it would affect recycling. As the pilot proceeded, the correspondence reduced. Prior to the start of the pilot there had been complaints from people concerned the food waste bins would cause a hygiene problem. However there had been no complaints since the start of the pilot.
- For those with mobility issues, the assisted collection service currently offered would be extended to include garden waste.
- The design of the food bin was very important. Factors to consider included aesthetics, usability, size and manual handling.
- Contamination had been manageable.
- The recycling rate had not been significantly affected and similar tonnages of recycling material had been collected.
- The next steps would be a final review of resource requirements for door to door collections and servicing communal food and garden waste sites; a decision was yet to be made regarding implementation and timescale; equalities implications would be reviewed and consideration would be given to container design, route optimisation, communication and implementation.
- At the moment split body vehicles collected 60% residual waste and 40% recycling. The compartments could be reversed in the future if the proportion of recycling increased to levels greater than that of the residual waste.
- In response to a question from a member of the public, the officer stated that there had been more detailed analysis than had been shown in the presentation. Weighbridge data had been compared and showed there was a significant increase or decrease on the pilot round compared with the other five areas.

RESOLVED:

That the presentation be noted.

11

SOLAR PANEL REPORT (Item B5)

- Councillor O'Sullivan presented the report of the solar panel task and finish group which had been set up to look at the feasibility of putting solar panels on council owned property. A recent change in the feed in tariff meant schemes that would have been viable, were no longer viable.
- Scaffolding was a significant cost in installing solar panels on roofs. Therefore installing solar panels when scaffolding was in place for other works would reduce costs. Alternatively some roof spaces could be accessed from inside buildings and the technology for installing solar panels had changed so this meant scaffolding was not always necessary.
- Solar panels had been installed on the Waste Recycling Centre, the Tennis Centre, the Sobell Leisure Centre and 222 Upper Street and this was reducing the council's electricity bills.
- Solar panels had been installed on some school roofs.
- The council now had a model set up so it was possible to monitor the figures and ascertain when schemes became viable.

Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee - 11 January 2016

- It would not be possible to put solar panels on the blocks of partners until the contracts with partners ended. 480 would end by 2022 and there were a further 2000 that would not end until 2032.
- A member referred to a pilot being undertaken in Camden using battery powered solar panels. Officers would look into this.
- A member of the public requested that the figures in Figure 2 be updated.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

12

WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16 (Item B6)

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the work programme be noted.
- 2) That future meetings of the committee start at 7pm.

The meeting ended at 10.15 pm

CHAIR