

WANDSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

ST. MARY'S PARK WARD **LET'S TALK MEETING**

held at St. John Bosco College, Parkham Street, SW11 3DQ on Monday, 5th December 2016 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT

Council Members

Councillor Govindia (Leader of the Council – in the Chair);
Councillors Mrs Hampton, O'Broin and Mrs Strickland (St. Mary's Park Ward Members);
Councillor Belton (Opposition Member).

Council Officers

<u>Name</u>	<u>Job title</u>	<u>Department</u>
Henry Cheung	Head of Inspection & Enforcement	Housing and Regeneration
Tom Crawley	Deputy Area Housing Manager (Eastern Area Team)	Housing and Regeneration
Graham Collins	Senior Democratic Services Officer	Chief Executive's Group
Tim Gibson	Interim Head of Schools Finance	Children's Services
Mike Gilroy	Head of Engineering, Group 1 (Traffic)	Environment and Community Services
Nigel Granger	East Area Team Manager (Wandsworth) Planning & Transport	Environment and Community Services
Steve Lane	Senior Parking Policy Officer	Environment and Community Services

Anthony Maher	Principal Engineer	Environment and Community Services
Fiona Rae	Democratic Services Officer	Chief Executive's Group
Michael Singham	Waste Strategy Manager	Environment and Community Services

Residents

Approximately 40 members of the public.

INTRODUCTION

The Chairman, Councillor Govindia, introduced the Council Members and the officers.

The Ward Members then gave a brief overview of their role representing ward residents and updates on recent local issues.

ISSUES, RESPONSES AND ACTION

1. Public transport. A resident expressed concern that the issues regarding the dangerous turning of buses (Routes 170 and 344) at the Chelsea end of Battersea Bridge - and the need for a pedestrian crossing - had still not been resolved despite having been raised for about eight years.

Councillors Mrs Strickland and O'Broin said that these concerns had been raised at meetings but, as this road is a Red Route, it comes under the responsibility of Transport for London (TfL). Cllr O'Broin indicated that this could also usefully be raised at the Passenger Transport Liaison Group.

A resident referred to the need for adequate provision of public transport in view of the major regeneration of the Vauxhall Nine Elms area – now as well as for the years ahead as far as 2030/35 - especially with the prospect of approximately 1,000 additional residents; similarly, residents asked if TfL were putting any resources into further improvement and development of Clapham Junction, in addition to the extensive amount of resources being spent on the Northern Line Extension (NLE) project – which several residents considered was largely for the benefit of the new USA Embassy. Specific issues for concern were trains operating from Clapham Junction Station and poor car parking facilities.

2. Approved tall building at 12-14 Lombard Road, SW11 and related planning matters. A resident questioned why the Council had granted planning permission for this 28-storey Tower and contended that residents were being blighted by all the high-rise developments in the area; also he asserted that Wandsworth Council was allowing so many developments to “go up” whereas other councils allowed them to “go out”. Another resident

acknowledged that there was a need to provide accommodation but explained that he had been blighted by the amount of development in St. Mary's Park. He asked what proportion of CIL income and Section 106 money was spent on St. Mary's Park Ward.

Mr. Granger undertook to provide some details of CIL income, and CIL and S.106 expenditure (and projects), to be added as a "Post-meeting Note" to the Notes of the meeting.

[Post-meeting note re. CIL:]

St. Mary's Park Ward falls within the Battersea Neighbourhood CIL area (which also includes Latchmere, Northcote, Queenstown and Shaftesbury Wards).

The following figures relate to the Battersea Neighbourhood CIL area:-

(a) Income 2012 to 30th June 2016

Total Wandsworth CIL (including strategic and neighbourhood): £8,741,751.29
of which:

Total allocated to neighbourhood CIL spend: £1,311,262.84 (this is 15% of the above amount).

(b) CIL spend 2012 to 2015/16 (information available in CIL Income reports):

Strategic spend:

2015/16:	Redevelopment of St John Bosco college -	£500,000
2015/16:	St. John Bosco College - Fixtures and ICT suite -	£620,000

Neighbourhood spend:

2015/16:		
Festive lighting:		£20,916
LED street lights/pavement improvements:		£53,651
Lavender Hill streetscape improvements including lighting:		£29,702
Culvert Rd streetscape improvements including lighting:		£2,954
Battersea roads and pavements (various):		£90,000]

Councillor Mrs. Hampton said that all the three Ward councillors were involved with officers and developers over many weeks to improve the development and the planning for public transport in the area and she was pleased to report that some improvements had already been achieved.

Mr. Granger outlined some of the principal features of the work being done which included predicting journeys and various transport modes. Mr. Granger explained that larger developments required Transport Assessments which had to demonstrate appropriate steps to mitigate the impact of the development. In the case of Lombard Tower, it was explained that hundreds of thousands of pounds had been secured to improve the local bus network. It was noted that, as the funding had been secured, improvements could be made when required. Mr. Granger explained that all transport strategies were co-ordinated centrally and constantly monitored by the Transport and Strategy Team.; also income from the Community Infrastructure Levy – CIL – was

£3.7million, while £357,733 was secured for local highways improvements and £270,000 was secured to improve the public bus service in the area. Assessments were made in relation to the immediate area but not in isolation.

In response to a number of questions from residents, Mr. Granger outlined some of the background to the approval of the Lombard Road development. The planning application had been received by the planning officers who assessed the application against the Council's Lombard Road/York Road Riverside Focal Point Supplementary Planning Document, the Greater London Authority Strategic Objectives and relevant Government guidance and legislation concerning national planning objectives.

A resident asked what was the public benefit arising from the development. Mr. Granger referred to the viaduct that had been opened, creating a connecting link between the two riverside walks.

A resident said that he disagreed with Mr. Granger's view that the Tower complied with national Guidelines, etc.; he contended (a) that there had been hundreds of objections but that these had not been addressed at the Planning Applications Committee; (b) that there appeared to have been no attempt by the Council to negotiate with the developer for a more reasonable design; and (c) that it was not clear why the Council had effectively ignored the concerns of local residents.

In response, Councillor Mrs. Hampton explained that she understood existing residents' views, noting that she had had an office in Plantation Wharf for the past 18 years, but highlighted that new accommodation was required. Councillor Mrs. Hampton also explained that all three ward members had attended Planning Applications Committee meetings to represent residents' views. Residents were encouraged to continue raising issues with ward councillors and to attend Planning Applications Committee meetings to see the complexity of planning matters.

The resident countered this by asserting that the dwellings there and at Lombard Tower were of the wrong type for Wandsworth's needs and he understood that a significant proportion of the properties at Lombard Tower and throughout London was owned by overseas buyers.

Councillor Belton said that he was the Opposition Speaker on the Council's Planning Applications Committee and that he and the other Labour Party Councillors on the Committee had opposed nearly all such planning applications.

3. Pedestrian footbridge. A resident said that one of the main benefits for the area was alleged to be the new footbridge.

Councillors Govindia and Mrs Hampton said that this was a TfL project for which full planning permission (expected) had not yet been granted by Hammersmith and Fulham Council. There were ongoing discussions between the Council and TfL regarding costings and there was a very clear recognition that public transport facilities in this location required improvement. The

developer provided the footings for the bridge as part of the Section 106 agreement with Barratts. On top of this, the developer separately has to pay CIL in line with the Regulations and charging schedule.

4. 20 mph speed limits. A resident asked how the Council planned to advertise and implement the 20mph speed limits; he asserted that, when complying with this speed limit, he had been subjected to abuse from other drivers who evidently considered that 20mph was far too slow and impractical. Councillor O’Broin said that the Council was keen to introduce this speed limit but he recognised that it was worthless if there was no meaningful enforcement. It was noted that the Police had been involved from an early stage and had agreed to the use of speed guns to enforce the 20mph speed limits. Councillor O’Broin acknowledged that the Police had their own priorities for dealing with crime but that the Council would try to hold the Police to account concerning 20mph speed limits through such bodies as the Safer Neighbourhood Board. He added that this limit was being rolled out in phases across the entire Borough – from West to East – mainly for less busy roads.

In response to concerns expressed by a resident regarding dangerous conditions in Vicarage Crescent and Cringle Street, Councillor O’Broin indicated that appropriate separate public consultation could be expected for these and other roads such as Lombard and Westbridge Roads whilst recognising the need to keep traffic moving.

Councillor Govindia explained that the Council strongly believed that Lombard Road, Battersea Square, and Battersea Park Road should all have a 20mph speed limit and he encouraged local residents to fill in the consultation when it was released. A resident enquired whether other types of traffic calming measures and pedestrian crossing zones might be preferable to 20mph speed limits. Councillor Govindia explained that these measures could be problematic for bus drivers but emphasised that TfL had the greater ‘say’ with regard to any speed limits on bus routes.

5. Cyclists. A resident (a cyclist) complained about the increasing frequency of motorcyclists indulging in excessive revving especially at or near traffic lights.

Another resident complained about the “insane” behaviour of numerous cyclists, such as in Prince of Wales Drive, and that the Police were failing to act when they cycled on pavements. Councillor Mrs. Hampton said that she applauded cycling as being both a very healthy activity as well as not being harmful to the environment but she considered that there was a huge problem of cycling too fast at the Riverside. It was noted that the Council had worked with St George’s and officers had installed planters to encourage cyclists to travel at a reduced speed. She commented that one of the planters had been thrown into the Thames by an unknown individual(s). She also explained that she had approached the Cabinet Member for Community Services to call for Police assistance but that it was difficult to catch offending cyclists and that there were limited penalties. A resident suggested that the Council should establish contact with the London Cycling Campaign about these concerns.

Another resident expressed the concern that a failure to address these matters could result in the emergence of vigilantes who might even be prepared to resort to the use of trip wires in order to impose some degree of 'corrective action'. He complained that pedestrians are not given any appropriate means of addressing the matter of cyclists being aggressive and flouting the Highway Code.

Councillor Govindia said that most cyclists observe the relevant laws but that those who breach the law should be apprehended. This was endorsed by Councillor O'Broin who added that the Council had opposed use of the Riverside Path in the Cycle Superhighway. It was noted that this was a Police matter and that the Council should apply suitable pressure on the Police.

6. HGV lorries. A resident complained that the unique character of Battersea Square was being destroyed by the noise and fumes from HGV lorries, especially those transporting concrete, and asked if the Council could require the lorries to use another route. Mr. Maher noted that this would require an agreement between Wandsworth, Kensington & Chelsea, and Hammersmith & Fulham Councils and that the Transport Strategy Team Manager (Mr. D. Tidley) could discuss this with relevant Transport officers at other councils and, of course, the highway authority for this particular road (i.e. TfL) and if need be, they could resort to seeking authorisation for appropriate Traffic Management Orders. Mr Maher highlighted that this would almost certainly force them to use other, residential routes.

A resident suggested that the Council could ban HGVs on Battersea Bridge. Mr Maher explained that TfL was the highway authority for Battersea Bridge and the Council could ask TfL to ban HGVs but could not require them to do so. A resident suggested that other measures such as width restrictions and/or height restrictions were worthy of consideration.

7. Roof railings at Somerset Nursery School. Angela Roden raised concerns, on behalf of residents of 1-20 Sunbury Lane, about the safety railings that had been placed around the flat roof of Somerset Nursery School; the residents wanted the School to remove them but that options to change their appearance would be considered unsatisfactory; the railings were unsightly and, as such, were a blight on the immediate locality. She explained that discussions with the School had been ongoing for far too long but was heartened by the support being given to the residents by local Councillors.

Councillor O'Broin said that the matter was due to be discussed again at a meeting of the School Governors on 6th December 2016 and that the Council agreed that the type of railings that had been installed were not appropriate in this Conservation Area. Mr. Gibson briefly outlined the officers' involvement in this case and reported that the Council had offered to provide some financial assistance towards the cost of a suitable replacement.

8. Property above food outlet. A resident of a first floor flat complained about smoke coming from a retail food outlet on the ground floor. Councillor Govindia advised the resident to provide details to Mr Granger after the meeting to enable him to investigate as necessary.

9. Lighting of Wandsworth Bridge. A resident complained that the floodlights on Wandsworth Bridge had been turned off since they were damaged by a barge in 2014. Councillor O'Broin said that the Council wanted the Bridge illuminated once again and it was not clear why this Bridge had been omitted from the Mayor of London's shortlist for his £20m River Thames Bridges illumination scheme; representations had been made to the Rothschild Foundation to get the Bridge added to the scheme. Councillor Govindia observed that his understanding was that the Mayor's scheme was to fund bridge illumination projects but not to the extent of costs of implementation.

10. Future of Somerset Nursery School. A resident expressed her warm appreciation of the family support she had received from the Nursery School but was appalled at the recent Government announcement to impose major cuts to funding for nursery schools. Councillor Mrs. Hampton said that options for the future were being looked into and she was aware of local residents' concerns. She added that the Council would be responding to the Government's consultation on the matter.

11. Waste collection and recycling. Two issues were raised by residents:-

- (a) Is it correct that people with front gardens should not place waste for collection in the street outside?

Mr Singham confirmed that this is correct and added that the Council has done much to get this message across, including poster campaigns, web site, targeted leafleting (see copy appended to these notes) and if necessary enforcement; and

- (b) What is the Council doing about fly-tipping?

Mr Singham mentioned the enhanced rapid response service introduced in April 2016, improved reporting systems, the adoption of powers to issue £400 Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) for fly-tipping and the Council's efforts to change perceptions about the acceptability of fly-tipping amongst those who think it is acceptable.

Councillor O'Broin said that fly-tipping had been rapidly increasing across the Borough – perhaps more significantly in the Tooting area. He added that the Council, as the enforcement authority for this, had introduced FPNs (as mentioned by Mr Singham), with an expanded team of staff to respond quickly to reports of fly-tipping offences. It was also noted that residents could report fly-tipping on the Council's website: <https://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/flytipping>.

A resident enquired whether the 'Report It' app was operational, noting that there had previously been some issues in using the app. Mr Maher explained that the app should now be functioning correctly. It was noted that residents could notify the Council of issues such as fly-tipping and graffiti by sending the location and, if desired, a photograph.

12. Statutory responsibilities of public bodies. A resident expressed concern that throughout the meeting there had been several instances where Councillors and officers had stated that the issue raised was not a Council responsibility but one that belonged elsewhere such as the Greater London Authority, TfL or the Police. He suggested that it would be helpful if the Council would clarify which matters it was and was not responsible for.

Councillor Govindia explained it was often a "struggle" to clearly distinguish between the various public bodies' statutory powers and functions and that the situation was further complicated by the fact that the Council had very limited ability to control the work of utilities – such as gas, electricity, water and telephones - in terms of works on the public highway. He emphasised that the Council sought to fulfil an intermediary role with all of these bodies - GLA, TfL, the Police and the utilities – in the interests of the Borough's residents and businesses as far as reasonably possible.

Councillor Belton added that the situation was even more complicated in services where there were 'cross-responsibilities' such as with Planning and Development Control where varying degrees of responsibility were attached to the local level (the Council), London-wide (the Mayor of London and the GLA) and at the national level (Acts, Regulations, statutory Guidance, etc.).

13. Cross-Rail 2. A resident asked for an update on the position regarding CR2 and the suggestion of a potential ventilation shaft in Westbridge Road.

Councillor Govindia said that the Government had asked TfL to sharpen up the business case for this and that TfL were currently preparing their response with a view to a further round of consultation with stakeholders (including the Council) in the spring of 2017.

Councillor O'Broin said that the Council had written to TfL stating that, if Westbridge Road is to be a location for a ventilation shaft, then the Council would expect TfL to include plans to mitigate the disadvantages of this. The resident suggested that mitigation should address concerns about noise, potential subsidence and complications regarding existing underground water channels.

14. Council income and the Council Tax. A resident said that, while he appreciated the Council's commitment to a distinctively low Council tax, he did not feel that the Council was exploiting its influence in the area of Planning as much as it could in order to reduce the impact of development on existing residents. He recognised that developers had made a considerable impact on the Borough and, whilst the Council should continue to negotiate with them in

the Council's interests, it should also have due regard to the need for sensible development and provision of sufficient truly affordable housing for local people.

In response, Councillor Mrs. Hampton said that a particular success of the Council's emphasis on sensible development was the large amount of public realm and open space that had been designed into the various major regeneration projects; and she was confident that councillors listen to the views of residents and ensure that these views are heard at the appropriate meetings.

CLOSE OF MEETING

Councillor Govindia thanked the residents for attending the meeting and invited them to stay and speak with councillors and officers about any further queries that they might have.

The meeting ended at 9.15pm

Graham Collins (020 8871 6021)
Fiona Rae (020 8871 6010)

APPENDIX
to Notes of Let's Talk meeting for St. Mary's Park Ward

See item 11(a) – Direction to residents for waste collection

WASTE COLLECTION LEAFLET



December 2016