

Wandsworth Healthy Streets Forum
Minutes

Wednesday 6 October 2021

7pm – 9pm

	<p>Attendees: Cllr Locker (Cabinet Member of Strategic Planning and Transportation), Cllr McDermott (Chairman of Strategic Planning and Transportation), Cllr Rigby (Active Travel Speaker), , Nick O'Donnell (Assistant Director for Traffic and Engineering), Jeni Jackson (Assistant Director for Planning and Transport), David Tidley (Transport Strategy Team Manager), Margo Turner (Principal Transport Planner), Rebecca Howarth (Transport Strategy Programme Co-ordinator), Jason Andrews (RSP), Miar Crutchley (RSP), Steve Diamond (Head of Economic Development), Robert Molteno, Susie Morrow, Mike Grahn (Wandsworth Living Streets), Margaret Brett (Southfields Grid Resident's Association), James Houghton (Tooting Healthy Streets), John Hallmark</p> <p>Apologies: Paul Chadwick (Director of Environment and Community Services) Garry Hipple (Head of Schools IT, Information and Library Services), Lorinda Freint (Business and Enterprise Manager), Wandsworth Chamber of Commerce, Metropolitan Police, Wandsworth Community Transport, Wandsworth Cycling Campaign, Wandsworth Older People's Forum, Enable, Wandsworth Access Association, Share Community, Wandsworth Friends of the Earth, Royal National Institute of the Blind, Youth Council</p>	<u>Action</u>
1.	<p>INTRODUCTIONS.</p> <p>Everyone introduced themselves and the organisation they represent.</p>	
2.	<p>OVERALL PURPOSE OF THE MEETING</p> <p>Key aim is to make streets as healthy as possible with input and engagement from a wide range of partners.</p> <p>Want streets to be physically and economically healthy, safer and more attractive. Public money should be spent wisely and effectively.</p>	
3.	<p>WALKING AND CYCLING STRATEGY</p>	

	<p>Margo Turner (MT) presented slides of the key issues and ideas arising from stakeholder discussions, officer analysis and consideration of the draft document at the September meeting of the Council’s Strategic Planning and Transportation Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>MT advised the public consultation would start later in 2021 with a view to a final version of the Strategy being reported to a later OSC.</p> <p>Questions related mainly to the reach of the consultation. JH asked if responses could be broken down by area (e.g. Clapham Junction). Others asked about Roehampton. SM asked about younger people as under 19’s are often under-represented. JR raised 6th form colleges and schools. BH responded that the Council would reach out to Childrens Services and that the School Travel advisor would also be approached. MT advised that post code analysis would be possible.</p> <p>An update would be expected to be on the agenda for the next meeting.</p>	<p>MT/BH</p> <p>MT/BH</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>BIKEHANGARS</p> <p>MT updated on progress on bikehangars. We are consulting on over 100 locations boroughwide, including some sites on housing estates. This was a large programme. The expectation was that many sites would be non-controversial, some might require relocation and a few would probably be inappropriate for reasons that we are unaware of.</p> <p>JR questioned how the Council would consider objections. Her view was that complaints about loss of parking were not really material given the demand for bikehangars and sustainability policy. SMc said that the number of cars was the problem. The Council should not avoid installing cycle parking just because some streets have too many cars in them.</p> <p>DT noted that the consultation was about asking residents if they have any particular issues with the proposed locations that we might not know about, and not so much about whether they supported the location yes or no. The consultation letter/website sets out the benefits of bikehangars and the Council’s desire to proceed. A lot of work has gone into identifying the locations (e.g. adjacent flank walls, end of bays, not directly outside windows etc.) such that common concerns (e.g. loss of parking, noise and nuisance) were both less likely to be raised and where they were raised were unlikely to carry much weight. The team had become skilled in pitching consultations correctly – as evidenced in the programmes of school streets, car club bays and electric vehicle bays.</p>	

	<p>MT noted that supply chain problems were more likely to cause delay objections. An update would be reported to the next Forum.</p>	MT
5.	<p>AL FRESCO SCHEMES</p> <p>N'OD provided an update on the Northcote Road and Old York Road schemes. Northcote Road was wrapped up in September. The intention would be to bring it back and to design it in more permanent form to avoid the ongoing costs of and management of temporary materials. A more permanent design would be subject to approvals.</p> <p>The Old York Road arrangements were proposed to be made permanent subject to Committee consideration in November. A permanent re-design to embed the changes was expected to then be consulted upon. DT confirmed he anticipated the public consultation to be undertaken in early 2022. Financial provision had already been identified for a redesign if that was what the community wished.</p> <p>N'OD noted that the bridge works in Old York Road would be completed in December. JL said the Council had taken the opportunity to add to Network Rail's works in order to provide greater improvements for passing pedestrians and cyclists, including better lighting.</p> <p>RM welcomed the broad support for the pedestrianisation schemes.</p>	
6.	<p>SCHOOL STREETS</p> <p>BH provided an update on school streets. Each of the 19 schools required a bespoke arrangement. JR said it was important for the school to decide what was best for it. BH advised that some schools relied on volunteers, some signs only, some cameras and all combinations in between. They were considered on a case by case basis. BH gave examples of individual schools and their arrangements. These arrangements were changing over time as the schemes bedded in. They had been introduced as a trial to enable flexibility.</p> <p>JL commended Sustrans role in messaging and promoting school streets. He had heard very good feedback about their training and educating of volunteers, parents and residents.</p>	BH

	<p>RM asked if Sustrans could include additional consideration of scooter usage in their training which officers agreed to take away.</p> <p>MB asked if Sheringdale was in the school streets programme. BH said that all secondary schools had been written to and invited to be in the programme. An agreed programme for another phase of school streets was being developed with consultation likely at the end of 2021 or early in 2022. Beatrix Potter and Tooting Primary were schools that had been put forward by local councillors.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>BRIEF UPDATE ON AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN</p> <p>JA described the Council’s AQAP and air quality monitoring arrangements. He noted the general trend of improving air quality, not least as vehicles and buses got cleaner and greener. He noted the Council’s anti-idling efforts and invited locations for investigation.</p> <p>SM noted most pedestrian and cyclist movements were on main roads. These were roads where improvements for pedestrians and cyclists were most needed and where also the roads that were most dangerous and polluted.</p> <p>JA noted that most monitoring occurred in main roads and town centres and the Council has a good understanding of the air quality in these locations.</p> <p>SMc commented on the good work the team does in monitoring air quality near schools.</p>	<p>All</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>MOPED DELIVERY DRIVERS</p> <p>DT was unsure of the context of this item being placed on the agenda. RM thought the issue was delivery drivers being parked on pavements such as pizza deliveries getting in the way of pedestrians. N’OD explained this was a difficult area to enforce as drivers would leave only to return later. JH noted that the number of delivery services was increasing. DT noted that pavement parking behaviour was rarely enforceable or expedient to enforce through planning or licensing.</p> <p>SMc supported the Council reaching out to businesses, SNT, town centre managers and delivery companies to see what could be done to better manage the issue. DT agreed to investigate.</p>	<p>DT</p>

	<p>It was also noted that much of this pavement parking was on the red routes – so TfL should be asked to police it better.</p> <p>There followed a discussion on moped drivers illegally using cut throughs and footpaths. RM agreed this was difficult to control without impacting on cyclists and buggies. JL wanted to see better design and signing, but he too agreed that there was a limit to what could be achieved and better education/training was needed.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>OVERHANGING VEGETATION</p> <p>The Forum discussed overhanging vegetation. DT had spoken to Enable who had advised that the Council has a programme of cutting back vegetation on its land and the street. Overhanging vegetation from private property was a matter for the land owner – however, the Council can require landowners to cut back vegetation or do it and charge the landowner. JH and SM referred to low branches and overgrown hedges being particularly problematic, particularly for disabled people. There was also a greater need to clear little from vegetation.</p> <p>JL said that whilst there could always be demand to do more, the Council carried out extensive cutting back of vegetation and tree pruning better or on a par with other Councils. DT would find out regime for next Forum</p>	<p>DT</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>2nd March 2022</p>	