

# Merton Council Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel



Date: 16 October 2013

Time: 7.15 pm

Venue: Committee rooms D & E - Merton Civic Centre

## AGENDA

Page Number

1	Declarations of pecuniary interest	
2	Apologies for absence	
3	Minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2013	1 - 6
4	Matters arising from the minutes	
5	Presentation: Sutton and East Surrey Water draft business plan 2015-2020	
6	Scrutiny Review - 20 mph limits / zones update	7 - 12
7	Climate change and the Green Deal task group scoping report	13 - 18
8	Update of Progress on Action Plan from Scrutiny Review on Trees	19 - 30
9	Update on Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel task group reviews	31 - 60
10	Presentation: Town Centre Planning/Regeneration	
11	Key Performance Indicators (verbal update)	

---

**This is a public meeting – members of the public are very welcome to attend.  
The meeting room will be open to members of the public from 7.00 p.m.**

For more information about the work of this and other overview and scrutiny panels, please telephone 020 8545 4035 or e-mail [scrutiny@merton.gov.uk](mailto:scrutiny@merton.gov.uk). Alternatively, visit [www.merton.gov.uk/scrutiny](http://www.merton.gov.uk/scrutiny)

Press enquiries: [press@merton.gov.uk](mailto:press@merton.gov.uk) or telephone 020 8545 3483 or 4093

Email alerts: Get notified when agendas are published  
[www.merton.gov.uk/council/committee.htm?view=emailer](http://www.merton.gov.uk/council/committee.htm?view=emailer)

## Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel Membership

### Councillors:

Russell Makin (Chair)  
Stan Anderson  
Samantha George  
Dennis Pearce  
John Sargeant  
Ray Tindle (Vice-Chair)  
Ian Munn BSc, MRTPI(Rtd)  
David Williams

### Substitute Members:

Philip Jones  
Peter Southgate  
Geraldine Stanford  
Janice Howard  
Miles Windsor

### Note on declarations of interest

Members are advised to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered at the meeting. If a pecuniary interest is declared they should withdraw from the meeting room during the whole of the consideration of that matter and must not participate in any vote on that matter. If members consider they should not participate because of a non-pecuniary interest which may give rise to a perception of bias, they should declare this, withdraw and not participate in consideration of the item. For further advice please speak with the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance.

### What is Overview and Scrutiny?

Overview and Scrutiny describes the way Merton's scrutiny councillors hold the Council's Executive (the Cabinet) to account to make sure that they take the right decisions for the Borough. Scrutiny panels also carry out reviews of Council services or issues to identify ways the Council can improve or develop new policy to meet the needs of local people. From May 2008, the Overview & Scrutiny Commission and Panels have been restructured and the Panels renamed to reflect the Local Area Agreement strategic themes.

Scrutiny's work falls into four broad areas:

- ⇒ **Call-in:** If three (non-executive) councillors feel that a decision made by the Cabinet is inappropriate they can 'call the decision in' after it has been made to prevent the decision taking immediate effect. They can then interview the Cabinet Member or Council Officers and make recommendations to the decision-maker suggesting improvements.
- ⇒ **Policy Reviews:** The panels carry out detailed, evidence-based assessments of Council services or issues that affect the lives of local people. At the end of the review the panels issue a report setting out their findings and recommendations for improvement and present it to Cabinet and other partner agencies. During the reviews, panels will gather information, evidence and opinions from Council officers, external bodies and organisations and members of the public to help them understand the key issues relating to the review topic.
- ⇒ **One-Off Reviews:** Panels often want to have a quick, one-off review of a topic and will ask Council officers to come and speak to them about a particular service or issue before making recommendations to the Cabinet.
- ⇒ **Scrutiny of Council Documents:** Panels also examine key Council documents, such as the budget, the Business Plan and the Best Value Performance Plan.

Scrutiny panels need the help of local people, partners and community groups to make sure that Merton delivers effective services. If you think there is something that scrutiny should look at, or have views on current reviews being carried out by scrutiny, let us know.

For more information, please contact the Scrutiny Team on 020 8545 4035 or by e-mail on [scrutiny@merton.gov.uk](mailto:scrutiny@merton.gov.uk). Alternatively, visit [www.merton.gov.uk/scrutiny](http://www.merton.gov.uk/scrutiny)

# Agenda Item 3

## SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL 25 JUNE 2013

7.15PM – 9:15PM

PRESENT: Councillor Ray Tindle (in the chair), Councillors Stan Anderson, , Samantha George, John Sargeant, Dennis Pearce, John Bowcott, Ian Munn

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Nick Draper, Cabinet Member for Community and Culture, Councillor Andrew Judge, Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration, Councillor Phillip Jones (substitute for Councillor Russell Makin), Chris Lee, Director of Environment and Regeneration, James McGinlay, Head of Sustainable Communities, Yvonne Tomlin, Head of Community Education, Tom Walsh (Sustainable Merton), Harold Forbes (Sustainable Merton)Rebecca Redman, Scrutiny Officer

### 1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Dennis Pearce – Member of Trustee of Morden Park Playing Fields.

### 2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Russell Makin and Councillor David Dean.

### 3 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25 APRIL 2013

RESOLVED: Panel agreed the Minutes as a true record of the meeting.

### 4 MATTERS ARISING

The Panel agreed to receive a brief demonstration of the new microphone system being trialled at the meeting from facilities.

### 5 PRIORITIES FOR 2013/14 – PRESENTATION BY CABINET MEMBERS

Presentation provided by Councillor Nick Draper and Councillor Andrew Judge on their portfolio priorities for the 2013/14 municipal year to provide Members of the Panel with some key areas/services that they may wish to scrutinise to add value to the work being undertaken by Cabinet and the Environment and Regeneration and Community and Housing departments in the year ahead.

Members heard that the following areas were priorities in the year ahead:

Sports, Culture and Arts –

- Canons Art Facility in partnership with local schools; and
- Consider potential options for replacement of Morden Park Pools

## SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL 25 JUNE 2013

Councillor Nick Draper emphasised the need for partnership, spending resources more effectively and for a focus upon sustainability. Getting people working together was key in this endeavour.

Councillor Samantha George enquired about Morden Park Pools and timescales for taking this forward. Councillor Nick Draper stated that no specific timescales could be stated at this stage.

Parks and Greenspaces –

- Investment in new play facilities in a number of parks across the borough;
- Development of new sports facilities at Figges Marsh and Canons;
- Development of the capacity and opportunity to enhance green spaces, for example, with food growing using an umbrella partnership which will include friends groups and allotment holders. Independent management of these spaces will be encouraged and a number of potential spaces have been identified; and
- Supporting new Community Trusts in range of areas as part of the Fields In Trust scheme, The council is in talks with residents groups that have taken an interest in this area

Councillor Andrew Judge stated that there was a balance to be struck in terms of maintaining and improving the parks and green spaces provision in the borough in light of reduced funds.

Councillor Andrew Judge stated that the budget for maintaining grass verges had been brought back in house and that this meant there was an opportunity to work with residents to draw up a priority plan.

Councillor Ray Tindle asked if there was evidence that there was an increased demand for sports facilities. Councillor Andrew Judge stated that there had been an increase in demand, particularly in cricket, rugby and football.

Councillor Samantha George enquired about the deeds related to the Fields in Trust Scheme. Councillor Andrew Judge confirmed that the deeds would be signed by the end of the month and that this scheme would enable funding to be received along with the protected status of the fields. Chris Lee added that Fields in Trust was a 2012 initiative that dedicated 2012 playing fields and open spaces with deeds set aside for the purposes originally described. The London Road and Figges Marsh playing fields were the only ones that were ready to sign deeds for.

Councillor Ian Munn asked if the timescales were being met and that this was being pursued as a priority. Chris Lee confirmed that this was the case. Councillor Nick Draper also added that there were plans for a new multi use sports area at Canons which is being financed by Sports England and run by Greenwich Leisure with a profit sharing agreement between Greenwich

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL  
25 JUNE 2013

Leisure and the council.

Tom Walsh expressed thanks to Chris Lee for the land assigned for the provision of 60 allotments which was gratefully received by residents and that all plots are expected to be filled within the next month. This has been achieved through partnership and is an excellent opportunity for residents to grow their own food.

Regeneration –

- Mitcham town centre works to begin shortly;
- Morden town centre developments are being designed and planned and consultation is on going;
- Colliers Wood and South Wimbledon developments are underway (including ensuring better transport links, cycling and pedestrian provision and Merton High Street developments);
- Housing Supply developments (with Brenley and Rowan Estates and other areas planned for expansion); and
- Working with Wimbledon Business Improvement District and the Merton Chamber of Commerce to work towards the future Wimbledon vision and generate investor interest.

Councillor Andrew Judge noted that this period is a particularly active time for the borough in terms of regeneration activity. The success of many regeneration schemes completed or underway has been linked to the existing good working relationships with partners.

Councillor Ray Tindle asked about the potential investor interest in Wimbledon. James McGinlay confirmed that a Future Wimbledon Conference would be held to test the market and see what interest there is in the area. Many investors are keen to hear what Wimbledon has to offer. The SW19 brand is a key component of what attracts businesses to Merton and the area needs to be maintained and developed to retain existing investment and attract future investment.

Councillor Stan Anderson enquired about the YMCA and plans for redevelopment. James McGinlay added that Orion Holdings are proposing to develop the YMCA site to bring forward residential accommodation jointly with the YMCA to a higher standard than the current YMCA provision plus additional housing in keeping with the area. A consultation will be undertaken in due course prior to a formal planning application being submitted.

Transport –

- Promote cycling as safe and aim to increase number of cycling journeys – enhancing cycling infrastructure and promoting behaviour change – ‘Mini Holland bid’ (as part of the Mayor of London’s fund, working with Merton’s cycling campaign). This bid is being collated at the present

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL  
25 JUNE 2013

time;

- Tramlink and promoting the business case for Sutton and Wimbledon link; and
- 'Homezones' – developing a Merton approach to safer neighbourhood streets.

Parking –

- Deliver response to town centre parking research and develop response to the shopping parade parking survey;
- Highlight the availability of parking – changing perceptions as there is 30% under usage of parking in the Wimbledon area;
- Implementation of mobile phone paying facility; and
- Working with local businesses to improve customer parking for local parades.

Councillor Samantha George enquired about parking charges and the provision of 20 minutes of free parking and if there were plans to expand this. Chris Lee confirmed that the shopping parades parking survey was now closed which focused on supply, location and tariff and that results were being analysed at present. Mobile phone payments are to be introduced and the council are just about to tender for bids on implementing this.

Tom Walshe enquired if the technology for mobile phone payments could also extend to timing the actual amount of time spent parking and a fee being charged per minute could be calculated, rather than a blanket tariff. This may encourage use of the car. Chris Lee confirmed that it was within the council's gift to set tariffs.

Waste/Cleaning –

- Increase recycling further (have successfully rolled out kitchen waste collection and other recycling working with the South London Waste Partnership);
- Maximising the benefits and opportunities of the South London Waste Partnership (between Merton, Croydon, Kingston and Sutton); and
- Improving commercial waste trading position (there is a significant income target attached to this which is a challenge and the recent independent review has resulted in an action plan which is aiming to reduce back office costs as a priority).

Councillor Nick Draper welcomed comments from the Panel on whether they felt that these were the right priorities.

With regard to waste, Councillor Andrew Judge confirmed that the council



SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL  
25 JUNE 2013

would do as much as possible to expand recycling and to generate an income from waste. The potential for waste heat to be used was also considered.

Councillor John Sargeant asked if the feasibility of the introduction of more 20 mph zones could be explored.

RESOLVED: Panel received the presentation and considered these priorities in relation to setting their 2013/14 work programme.

6 SUSTAINABLE MERTON - PRESENTATION

Tom Walsh introduced Sustainable Merton to the Panel, as a local charity that has a role in helping residents, businesses and other groups cope with climate change, in particular the effects of peak oil and the changes that this will bring to peoples lives in the coming years.

Tom Walshe explained that sustainability should concern:

- Waste
- Transport
- Food
- Energy

The risk of people going into fuel poverty was highlighted to the Panel. Tom Walsh explained that by 2019 the average wage would not be sufficient to meet escalating fuel costs. This change would impact upon the council and the support residents would require.

Installation of solar panels has been a success story in relation to energy and this is a scheme that should be sold more to residents with the council leading by example.

Tom Walsh highlighted that there was a need to develop an energy supply and network for south west London. The knock on impact of this would be the profits that could be generated by the council. What is key is innovation.

There is also a need for behavioural changes by local residents; climate change is not just the responsibility of larger organisations. The council could play a key role in this education and in explaining policies in a clearer way.

Sustainable Merton have undertaken some work into resident's response to the governments Green Deal and found that it has not been popular, particularly due to the inability to pay back the charges for the measures associated with the Green Deal. This is making some residents reluctant to participate. Furthermore, water conservation, waste management and education are not commented upon in the Green Deal.

RESOLVED: Panel received the presentation and considered the issues raised by Sustainable Merton in relation to setting their 2013/14 work programme. Members thanked Tom Walsh and Harold Forbes of Sustainable

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL  
25 JUNE 2013

Merton for their presentation.

7 WORK PROGRAMME 2013/14

Mr Anthony Fairclough was invited to address the Panel with his topic suggestion and the associated petition he had gathered on residential parking charges. The Panel heard Mr Fairclough's explanation of the issues he and other residents felt were associated with residential visitor parking permits and asked the Panel to consider investigating this issue.

Councillor John Sargeant added that the Task Group review should be focused. Councillor Ian Munn asked for the implications if housing targets were not met. A report was requested on this issue.

RESOLVED: Members agreed their 2013/14 work programme.

8 PUBLIC TRANSPORT LIAISON COMMITTEE – VERBAL UPDATE

Councillor Dennis Pearce updated the Panel on the discussion at the Public Transport Liaison Committee (PTLC) and asked that the Minutes be circulated to the Panel for information

Councillor Ian Munn asked for a question to be responded to regarding the S1 bus route by the lead officer managing the PTLC. Rebecca Redman agreed to forward this question to Richard Lancaster.

Councillor Phillip Jones noted that the PTLC was well attended by operators but that the public attendance was relatively low.

RESOLVED: Panel noted the update and requested that the Minutes of the PTLC meeting be circulated to Members when possible.

9 SCRUTINY REVIEW OF ADULT SKILLS AND EMPLOYABILITY – DRAFT FINAL REPORT

Councillor Ray Tindle, as Chair of the Adult Skills and Employability Task Group, introduced the report. The Panel thanked the Task Group for a piece of work well done.

RESOLVED: The Panel endorsed the report and recommendations to be forwarded to Cabinet for consideration.



## **Committee: Sustainable Communities Overview & Scrutiny Panel**

**Date: 16<sup>th</sup> October 2013**

Agenda item: 6

Wards: All

### **Subject: Scrutiny Review – 20 mph limits / zones update**

**Lead officer:** Chris Lee, Director of Environment and Regeneration

**Lead member:** Councillor Andrew Judge, Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability & Regeneration

**Forward Plan reference number:** N/A

**Contact officer:** Mario Lecordier / Richard Lancaster

---

#### **Recommendations:**

- A. That Sustainable Communities O & S Panel considers the information in the report and the council's approach to Speed Management.
- 

#### **1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to provide an overview to Members regarding the council's approach to 20mph zones and limits.

#### **2 Details**

##### *Background*

- 2.1 There are still a high number of casualties on urban roads in the UK. In 2008, there were 771 fatalities and 92,714 injuries reported on built up roads in Great Britain. A large proportion of these collisions occurred on residential roads.
- 2.2 The majority of pedestrian casualties also occur in built up areas: 24 child pedestrians and 278 adult pedestrians were killed in 2010 on such roads. In total there were 24,950 pedestrian injuries. Pedal cyclists are also vulnerable in built up areas and there were 59 cyclist fatalities and 15,995 casualties of all severities.
- 2.3 Merton has demonstrated positive progress in order to meet collision reduction targets over the last 15 years. Between 1996 and 2011 Merton experienced a 65% reduction in those Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI's), along with a 34% reduction in the number of slight casualties during the same period.
- 2.4 Speed significantly increases the chance of being injured in a collision. Studies which compare injury severity with vehicle speed show that accidents at speeds above 20mph are more likely to result in severe injuries, rather than slight injuries. The risk of being fatally injured increases too, and a UK study of accidents found that at 20mph there was a 2.5% chance of being fatally injured, compared to a 20% chance at 30mph.

### *History*

- 2.5 In December 1990 the Department of Transport issued Circular Roads 4/90 which set out guidelines for the introduction of 20mph speed limits; local authorities had to apply for consent from the Secretary of State to introduce a 20mph zone.
- 2.6 In 1999, the law was changed by the Road Traffic Regulation Act (Amendment) Order 1999, which gave Highways Authorities more flexibility so they no longer had to apply for permission to introduce a zone. The updated legislation made two distinct types of 20mph speed limit possible:
- 20mph limits**, which consist of just a speed limit change to 20mph which is indicated by the speed limit (and repeater) signs, and
- 20mph zones**, which are designed to be “self-enforcing” due to the traffic calming measures that must be introduced along with the change in the speed limit.
- 2.7 The Department for Transport’s current guidance is set out in DfT Circular 01/2006 which encourages and supports Local Authorities to implement 20 mph limits and zones in situations where there is a particular risk to vulnerable road users. The guidance sets out that the purpose of 20 mph areas is to create conditions in which drivers naturally drive at around 20 mph as a result of traffic calming measures or the general nature of the location.
- 2.8 It, therefore, suggests that 20mph limits are appropriate for roads where average speeds are already low (below 24mph) or can be reduced to this level following the introduction of traffic calming. Ultimately the Local Authority is responsible for deciding which of these is the most appropriate.
- 2.9 The Department for Transport has recently announced its intention to revise and reissue “*Circular 01/06, Setting Local Speed Limits*’ with a key aim of increasing flexibility for Local Authorities when considering the introduction of 20mph zones and limits.
- 2.10 The guidance in the document on 20mph zones and 20mph limits has been expanded to make it clearer that highway authorities have flexibility in the use of 20mph zones and limits, and should apply the option best suited to the local circumstances and that brings the most benefits in terms of casualty reduction and community benefits. This amends the previous advice that 20mph zones without traffic calming should generally be restricted to single or small groups of streets, and traffic authorities are reminded that they can, over time, introduce 20mph zones or limits into:
- Major streets where business on foot is more important than slowing down traffic and;

- Lesser residential roads in cities, towns and villages, particularly where this would be reasonable for the road environment, there is community support and streets are being used by pedestrians and cyclists

*Characteristics of 20mph zones and speed limits*

- 2.11 There is a significant difference between the characteristics of a 20mph speed limit and a 20mph zone.

**20mph limits** are areas where the speed limit has been reduced to 20 mph but there are no physical measures to reduce vehicle speeds within the areas. Drivers are alerted to the speed limit with 20mph speed limit repeater signs.

20mph limits are most appropriate for roads where average speeds are already low, and the guidance suggests below 24mph. The layout and use of the road must also give the clear impression that a 20mph speed or below is the most appropriate.

**20 mph zones** use traffic calming measures to reduce the adverse impact of motor vehicles on built up areas. The principle is that the traffic calming slows vehicles down to speeds below the limit, and in this way the zone becomes “self-enforcing” . Speed humps, chicanes, road narrowing, planting and other measures can be introduced to both physically and visually reinforce the nature of the road.

*Effectiveness of 20mph limits*

- 2.12 Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) carried out research on 20mph limits in 1998 which examined the effectiveness of 20mph limits without traffic calming measures. It found that traffic calming was a more effective way of reducing vehicle speeds than signs only, which only produced a small reduction in speed. There was some evidence that public awareness campaigns and enforcement further reduced traffic speeds.
- 2.13 In 2009, an interim analysis was conducted of the 20mph limits introduced in Portsmouth, which cover 91% of the 438km of the city’s roads. The evaluation was taken from 158 sites which were monitored for vehicle speeds, one year after the limits were implemented.
- 2.14 It found that 20 mph speed limits reduced the average speed by 0.9 miles per hour, which was not statistically significant. However, at sites where the average speed was above 24mph before the new limit was introduced, there was a statistically significant average speed reduction of 7 mph.
- 2.15 An analysis of accidents found that there was an overall reduction in casualties but it was not significant when compared to the national trend. Further research after 3 years of the scheme will hopefully clarify its effectiveness.

### *Next Steps*

- 2.16 Focusing specifically on 20 mph limits, Islington became the first borough in the country to introduce the limit on all side roads after introducing a scheme in early 2012. On 12<sup>th</sup> October 2012 Camden also announced that it 'would consider introducing the 20 mph limit on all roads under its control in a bid to reduce the number of accidents and encourage more people to walk and cycle.'
- 2.17 Within Merton, like a number of other London Boroughs, there is a combination of roads with 20 mph limits and 20 mph zones, the majority of which have been implemented during the last 4 years.
- 2.18 In order to assess the effectiveness of the current schemes that have been implemented in Merton, monitoring analysis has recently been commissioned. This has focused on a comparison of before and after accident data at each of the individual limits and zones, along with before and after traffic flow and vehicle speed data at each of the individual limits and zones.
- 2.19 The Audit was carried out in July 2012 and used the following methodology.
- Analysis of before and after accident data at each site
  - Analysis of before and after Traffic Flow and Speed at each site
  - Overall comparison of accidents, traffic flow and speed measures at each site.
- 2.20 A total of twenty three 20mph Zones / Limits were reviewed as part of this audit. These are:

#### **20mph Zones**

High Path area  
Pelham Road area  
Parkway area  
Pollards Hill area  
Easfields area  
Ridgway area  
Lake Road area  
Hillcross area  
Commonside East area  
Cromwell Road area  
West Barnes area

#### **20mph Limits**

Trinity road  
Merton Hall Road  
Quicks road  
Merton Park

Melrose Avenue  
Wandle Road  
Ashbourne Road  
Cambridge Road  
Claremont Road  
Ernle Road  
Edge Hill  
Farm Road

2.21 The majority of the speed reducing measures was introduced in 2009 with the rest in 2010/11. The report concluded that:

- Both zones and limits experienced an increase in Personal Injury Collisions per year with an increase in Zones greater than that of Limits.
- Limits delivered a significant reduction in pedestrian and child accidents
- Zones experienced a greater reduction in 85<sup>th</sup>ile speeds (3.7% reduction (0.9mph – change from 26.69 to 25.79mph) on average per Zone compared to 2.7% (0.75mph – change from 27.65 to 26.9mph) in limits). Limits experienced a greater reduction in average speeds
- Overall vehicle speeds were down by 5.5% (1.19mph) in limits and 7.8% (1.73mph) in zones.
- Zones performed best with regards to traffic flows with a marginal increase in traffic flows across the zones.
- Pelham Road and Eastfields Zones and Merton Park 20mph Limit were the worst performing in terms of collision reduction.

2.22 Reducing speed remains the most effective way of reducing the severity and number road casualties the outcome of the Audit does not support a borough-wide approach to the introduction of 20mph limit in Merton. This is supported by the results of the audit which shows that both zones and limits have shown a slight increase in the annual accident rates. This could be due to the short before and after assessment period. A longer before and after assessment period (over 5 years) would be required to get a better understanding of the impact of 20mph limits on mean speed, average speed and casualty reduction. It is however clear that inappropriate or excessive speed remains a concern to both residents and the Council. The Council will therefore focus its resources on developing Home / School Zones aimed at reducing speeds in key areas such as in the vicinity of schools, areas with high pedestrian footfall and major trip generators such as Town Centres and also in residential areas. Speed reduction measures will also be considered to encourage sustainable local travel by making cycling, walking and the use of public transport more attractive and effective.

- 2.23 Enforcement will also remain a key consideration in achieving the objectives of reducing the number and severity of road casualties. The Council has no legal powers to undertake speed enforcement and caution drivers in breach of speed regulations. Only the Police have the necessary powers to undertake enforcement and prosecute offenders. It is however recognised that the Police is not sufficiently resourced to undertake local speed enforcement and the Council will continue to work with them to encourage a pro-active Police participation in managing speeds on local roads.

### **3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 3.1 Not applicable – this report is for information only.

### **4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED**

- 4.1 N/A

### **5 TIMETABLE**

- 5.1 Performance information is monitored annually as a requirement of TfL.

### **6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 There are no financial, resource or property implications arising from this information report. All related services are delivered within existing resources.

### **7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 This report is for information only.

### **8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 There are no specific human rights, equalities or community cohesion

### **9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 There are no specific crime and disorder implications arising from this information report.

### **10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 There are no risk management or health and safety implications arising from this information report.



## **Committee: Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

**Date: 16<sup>th</sup> October 2013**

Agenda item: 7

Wards: All

**Subject: Task Group - Scoping Report**

Lead officer: Rebecca Redman, Scrutiny Officer

Lead member: Cllr Russell Makin, Chair of the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Contact officers: Rebecca Redman, Scrutiny Officer

---

### **Recommendations:**

1. That Members consider and approve the proposed Terms of Reference, timescales, sources of evidence, and witnesses for the review of climate change and the green deal.
- 

### **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To make proposals to Members for their forthcoming task group review of Climate Change and the Green Deal, and to seek agreement on the proposed Terms of Reference, timescales, sources of evidence and witnesses for the review.

### **2. DETAILS**

- 2.1 At the meeting of the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel held on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2013, Members considered and agreed their Work Programme for the 2013/2014 municipal year. Members proposed that climate change and the green deal be the focus of a Task Group review.
- 2.2 The following Members were nominated to sit on the Task Group: Cllr James Holmes, Cllr Russell Makin (Chair), Cllr Ian Munn, Cllr Suzanne Grocott and Cllr Ray Tindle.

### **3. AIM OF REVIEW**

- 3.1 The aims of the task group review are as follows:
  - To support the council in its refresh of the Climate Change Strategy 2013-2016;
  - To address the impact of climate change in Merton and determine how the council will support residents in relation to energy improvements; and
  - To support the council to agree a way forward for the Governments Green Deal initiative in Merton

#### **4. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE REVIEW:**

4.1 The terms of reference of the task group review as decided at the Task Group meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup> September are as follows:

- To determine what the government's policy is on Climate Change and how Local Authorities are required to respond;
- To determine the impact climate change could have on the borough and the councils responsibilities to respond to this change;
- To determine what action Merton has taken to date, and proposals for the future, to tackle climate change in Merton (focusing on energy improvements: Merton RE:FIT Project, energy efficiency activities with schools and renewable energy);
- To determine what impact not implementing certain climate change measures will have on service delivery and the councils resources;
- To determine if the Governments Green Deal policy is suitable for Merton and how they should respond;
- To identify what funding streams the council has to support climate change activity, as outlined within the Climate Change Strategy, and which work streams are prioritised by the council;
- To explore potential funding streams to implement preventative measures to mitigate the impact of climate change;
- To determine how partner organisations can be more effectively engaged in supporting the delivery of the Climate Change Strategy for Merton;
- To determine how the council can work more effectively across departments to ensure that climate change objectives and measures are built into business planning and strategy development

#### **5. POTENTIAL SOURCES OF EVIDENCE AND WITNESSES FOR THE REVIEW**

5.1 Members can request a range of evidence and comparative information throughout the course of the review. Members can also invite a variety of people to attend to assist in the forming of evidence-based recommendations to the Executive, and where appropriate, to partner organisations.

5.2 Members may wish to consider the following in this review: -

- Detailed officer reports supplemented by verbal evidence;
- Best practice from neighbouring Local Authorities;
- Government legislation and guidance (national, regional and local policy);
- Site visits;
- Evidence from partner organisations and stakeholders;
- Research reports/briefing papers; and
- Consultation activities

5.3 It is proposed that the Task Group consult the following stakeholders in this review:

- Sustainable Merton (Tom Walsh and Kevin Godding – Co-opted Members)
- Neighbouring local authorities
- Housing Associations

## 6. OFFICER SUPPORT

6.1 Members of the Climate Change and Green Deal Task Group will be supported by:

**Rebecca Redman, Scrutiny Officer**

Rebecca.redman@merton.gov.uk, 020 8545 4035

## 7. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

7.1 The Panel may choose to agree a different scope and terms of reference to those proposed in this scoping report.

## 8. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

8.1 Members are asked to give consideration to if, and how, they would like to engage witnesses in this review.

## 9. TIMETABLE

9.1 It is envisaged that the Task Group will undertake and complete its review within 6 months. The final report and recommendations from the review will be presented to the Sustainable Communities O&S Panel for endorsement at its meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2014.

9.2 The following reporting timescale should be borne in mind when conducting the review to ensure completion by April 2014: -

Agree scope – Sustainable Communities Panel October 16 <sup>th</sup>
Evidence gathering and analysis – September 2013 to January 2014
Agree Draft Final Report and Recommendations – 22 <sup>nd</sup> January 2014
Draft Final Report to be endorsed by Sustainable Communities Panel – 26 <sup>th</sup> February 2014
Final Report to be considered by Cabinet – 10th March 2014
Executive Response and Action Plan to Sustainable Communities Panel – June 2014

## 10. CO-OPTION

10.1 Members are asked to give consideration to co-opting representatives onto the Task Group for part, or the duration, of the review to assist the Task Group. In accordance with the Constitution any representative co-opted onto the Panel or

Task Group will be a non-voting member of the Task Group and will be required to adhere to the Council's Code of Conduct for Members.

## **11. PUBLICITY**

11.1 Members can publicise the review to encourage and facilitate resident and partner engagement and to promote the outcomes of the review upon completion. The following mechanisms for promotion/publication may be utilised throughout the review: -

- Press release in local press;
- My Merton;
- Community Forums;
- Merton council website;
- Ward councillors;
- Posters/materials in libraries and Merton Link;
- Staff bulletin board and plasma screens in civic centre; and
- Residents' panel and Centre for Public Scrutiny (outcomes)

## **12. FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS**

12.1 There are none specific to this report. Any financial, resource and property implications arising from the review will be accounted for in the Task Group's Final Report.

## **13. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

13.1 None for the purposes of this report. Any legal and statutory implications arising from the review will be accounted for in the Task Group's Final Report.

## **14. HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS**

14.1 None specific to this report. Any human rights, equalities and community cohesion implications arising from the review will be accounted for in the Task Group's Final Report.

## **15. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

15.1 None specific to this report. Any crime and disorder implications arising from the review will be accounted for in the Task Group's Final Report.

## **16. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

16.1 None for the purposes of this report. Any risk management and health and safety implications arising from the review will be accounted for in the Task Group's Final Report.

## **17. APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT**

17.1 None

**18. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

18.1 None

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Committee: Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

**Date: 16<sup>th</sup> October 2013**

Agenda item: 8

Wards: All Wards

## **Subject: Update of Progress on Action Plan from Scrutiny Review on Trees**

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration

Lead member: Councillor Andrew Judge, Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration

Forward Plan reference number: N/A

Contact Officer: Doug Napier, Greenspaces Manager. Tel: 020 8545 3657

---

### **Recommendations:**

A. That the Sustainable Communities O&S Panel notes the updated position and progress on the action plan arising from the scrutiny review on trees, undertaken in the period 2011 to 2012.

B. That the Panel determines whether and when it wishes to receive a further progress update.

---

### **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 To present an update on the action plan and recommendations included within the Scrutiny Review report on trees that was produced earlier this year and presented to the Panel on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

### **2. DETAILS**

2.1 The Council's Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel agreed to establish a task group to review the management of the borough's trees in May 2011.

2.2 The Sustainable Communities O&S Panel agreed the task group membership and the project's terms of reference in September 2011

and subsequently the task group met on six occasions to review a number of tree related issues and consider relevant evidence.

2.3 The task group completed its report in February 2012 and made six recommendations aimed at improving the borough's street scene and wider environment through improvements to the management and procedures in relation to its tree stock.

2.4 The report was considered and endorsed by the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 24 April 2012.

2.5 The task group report and its recommendations were considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 11 June 2012 when it was agreed that officers, working in conjunction with relevant partners and Cabinet members, would implement the recommendations.

2.6 The Sustainable Communities O&S Panel considered an action plan in relation to the six recommendations at its meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2013 and agreed to performance manage delivery of the action plan every six to nine months as part of their work programme

2.7 This report is the first update on progress on the delivery of the action plan.

### **3. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN**

3.1 In carrying out its review, the Panel task group circulated a questionnaire to members of the public in the autumn and held an information evening on the topic of trees in February 2012. The task group also raised awareness of the review through the Community Forums. 89 questionnaire responses were received from individual residents and the analysis of the responses was included in the report considered by the Panel in April 2012.

3.2 Key members and senior officers from the relevant teams and divisions were consulted and contributed to the preparation of this report.

### **4. TIMETABLE**

4.1 The task group was established by the Sustainable Communities O&S Panel and the report was presented to the Panel meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2012 for the Panel's approval.

4.2 The report was considered and endorsed by the Council's Cabinet on 11<sup>th</sup> June 2012.

4.3 The formal response in respect of the Panel's report's recommendations was presented to the Panel on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2013, including an action plan.

4.4 Details of the implementation timescales were included within the action plan.

## **5. FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 None for the purposes of this report. The financial, resource and property implications of implementing the agreed recommendations will be met by the various local authority departments and divisions concerned. The timescales outlined within the action plan reflect the fact that there is no anticipated revenue growth provision for the projects and initiatives contained therein.

## **6. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 None for the purposes of this report.

## **7. HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 None for the purposes of this report. The subject matter of the report and its implications are borough-wide, cover all sections of the community and do not discriminate against any particular group.

## **8. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 None for the purposes of this report.

## **9. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 None for the purposes of this report.

## **10. APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT**

10.1 Appendix 1: Progress Update on action plan arising from the Scrutiny Review of Trees, 2011-12

## **11. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

11.1 Action Plan arising from the Scrutiny Review of Trees, 2011-12

# APPENDIX 1

## Progress Update on action plan arising from the Scrutiny Review of Trees, 2011-12

### Introduction

The following table provide an updated position of progress against the original action plan timetable in relation to each of the six recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of trees conducted in the period 2011-12 by the Sustainable Communities Overview & Scrutiny Panel task group.

#### **Recommendation 1:**

*That Cabinet lead on the development of a Tree Strategy for the Council. The Strategy should be aligned to the Borough's development aims, Local Development Framework, Core Strategy etc and Duty of Care considerations - as set out in paragraph 56.*

<b>Task</b>	<b>Original Timetable</b>	<b>Progress Update</b>
Establish a cross-divisional and interdepartmental steering group involving relevant officers and other key stakeholders to oversee production of tree strategy	By April 2013	Established April 2013 with representation from the key tree-managing sections within the Council
Identify resources to support process	By June 2013	Resources secured
Agree timetable, scope and themes	By September 2013	Agreed
Commission strategy	By October 2013	On target
Progress review	From November 2013	On target
First draft report	By March 2014	By March 2014
Final draft report	By June 2014	By June 2014
Report sign-off by key stakeholders and members	By October 2014	By September 2014

--	--	--

**Recommendation 2:**

*That existing data collection and analysis should be established and strengthened - as set out in paragraph 60.*

Proposed and Current Actions:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Original Timetable</b>	<b>Progress Update</b>
Implement 3-year cyclical inspection cycle within parks and open spaces	Current & ongoing	Current & ongoing
Implement 2-year cyclical inspection cycle for schools and other non-highway Council trees	Current & ongoing	Current & ongoing
Implement 3-year inspection cycle for Highways trees	Current & ongoing	Current & ongoing
Liaison with other London boroughs and partners, including via London Tree Officer's Association, to share information and data	Current & ongoing	Current & ongoing, including in relation to, for example: biosecurity threats; de-icing salt damage to trees; conflicts between trees & CCTV cameras; canopy cover; drought measures, etc.
Corporately, to utilise the improved data and analysis for the better management of the borough's tree assets	From January 2013	Data gathering exercise completed for schools sites and for highways trees in the Wimbledon Park Grid area to inform future operational strategy
Conduct i-Tree canopy assessments for the borough.	Current & ongoing	Two i-Tree Canopy datasets now exist 1. Total tree & other green infrastructure landcover: approximately 24% of the borough is under tree canopy 2. Tree and green infrastructure cover

		broken down by private & public ownership
Combine benefit and value data with i-Tree canopy assessments	From January 2013	Both data sets exist in sample format and can be combined when required and resources are available

**Recommendation 3:**

*That Planning and Enforcement procedures are clarified and more effectively enforced - as set out in paragraph 62.*

Proposed and Current Actions:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Original Timetable</b>	<b>Progress Update</b>
Adopt and implement recommendations of borough tree strategy in respect of planning and enforcement issues	From October 2014	From September 2014
Improve skills and knowledge of planning enforcement officers in relation to the identification of dead and diseased trees on development sites	By December 2013	By December 2013
Summary information on Tree Preservation Orders to be available online	By March 2014	By March 2014
Increased cooperation and liaison between the intradepartmental tree officers in relation to planning issues.	Current & ongoing	Current & ongoing Increased direct working between Greenspaces and Highways sections on highways tree management issues since April 2013
Provide online advice to encourage developers and applicants to seek and secure competent	By April 2014	By April 2014



professional arboricultural advice where necessary		
Review policies and procedures in relation to trees and crossover applications and amend as necessary.	By September 2013	Traffic & Highway Services will be reviewing its policies and procedures imminently and is keen to protect the location of existing trees, including vacant tree pits. This move will involve potential changes to the Council's crossover policy and as such will need to be clearly communicated to members and residents before being endorsed during the 2014/15 financial year

**Recommendation 4:**

*That the local community are encouraged to become involved in caring for the Borough's trees – as set out in paragraph 63.*

Proposed and Current Actions:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Original Timetable</b>	<b>Progress Update</b>
Support and promote Merton Tree Wardens and residents and friends groups on tree related matters	Current & ongoing	Current & ongoing  Tree wardens remain very active in the borough on a range of practical & administrative fronts
Support learning and development needs of tree wardens and friends on relevant tree matters	Current & ongoing	Further training undertaken in relation to OPM identification
Improve the understanding of the public and local authority officers on the value,	By December 2013	By December 2013

benefits and needs of trees via the Council website		
Improve information available to ward members on local tree works in their areas	By March 2013	Information dissemination working satisfactorily
Instigate educational outreach work with local schools on trees and tree planting projects	From September 2013	Schools involvement planned for tree planting schemes in winter 2013/14

**Recommendation 5:**

*That accessible information is provided – as set out in paragraph 64.*

Proposed and Current Actions:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Original Timetable</b>	<b>Progress Update</b>
Provide better information on trees, tree works and tree planting projects on the Council website and to local community forums	By December 2013	From December 2013  On target.  There are plans to promote details of winter 2013/14 community tree planting projects on the Council's website and via the local media when these details are confirmed  Traffic & Highway Services is currently updating its web content in relation to highway trees and verges and this will be live and online by the 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2014
Provide summary of tree strategy and key Council policies and procedures in relation to trees online.	By December 2014	By December 2014  New information on satellite & digital television reception in relation to trees has

		recently been posted on the Council's website
--	--	---

**Recommendation 6:**

*That Cabinet review how tree planting and maintenance is financed – as set out in paragraph 66.*

Proposed and Current Actions:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Original Timetable</b>	<b>Progress Update</b>
Commitment to woodland creation and improvement of the urban forest via an ongoing capital input: annual tree planting programme in open spaces and street scene	Current & ongoing	<p>Current &amp; ongoing</p> <p>Funding allocations for tree planting projects for parks and the street scene in winter 2013/14 have been agreed. Planting locations are currently in the planning stages.</p> <p>Traffic &amp; Highway Services continues to plant new street trees, however much of this is dependent upon funding from the London Mayor. It is extremely important that as new trees are planted the corresponding revenue budget is increased to allow the local authority to fund ongoing maintenance</p>
Ensure that any capital investment in the tree stock does not end with the planting of the tree but that tree establishment costs beyond the first year are integral to the project capital funds or that associated growth in revenue budgets is provided	By April 2013	Ongoing maintenance requirements are increasingly factored into the financial aspects of tree planting initiatives. All Merton Council funded planting projects in 2013/14 will have such provision, for example. Further work is required in respect of externally funded initiatives however,

		<p>where the focus, alas, remains more firmly upon tree planting and not after-care</p> <p>It is vital that funding is provided for the maintenance of trees otherwise there is little point providing capital money to plant new trees</p>
<p>Ensure that all tree losses are quantified in monetary terms using, at present, the CAVAT method, and that these asset values are utilised in practice</p>	<p>From April 2013</p>	<p>Progress continues in surveying and inspection with Ezytreev, which provides monetary values with the aim of providing an annual assessment of loss values for parks &amp; schools trees, resources permitting</p> <p>The introduction of cyclical inspection for highways trees via Ezytreev will permit the generation of monetary values</p> <p>It is anticipated that a planned inspection regime for highways trees using Ezytreev will formally commence on the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014. At present field tests are being undertaken to ensure the local authority is ready to move to this form of inspection in the new financial year</p>
<p>Provide ongoing tree asset (total stock) valuations to determine loss/gain in the</p>	<p>From April 2013</p>	<p>This is work is ongoing.</p> <p>Complete reports can be generated for</p>

<p>resource and indicate direction of travel</p>		<p>schools tree stock.</p> <p>Approximately 50% of reports can be generated for parks trees with extrapolated estimates for the total.</p> <p>Reports can be generated for Wimbledon Park Ward for highways trees following survey this year with extrapolated estimates for the total</p>
<p>Continue to support and participate in the training, information exchange and networking activities available through the London Tree Officers' Association and other professional organisations</p>	<p>Current &amp; ongoing</p>	<p>Current &amp; ongoing work.</p> <p>Merton hosted an LTOA seminar earlier this year and officers continue to attend workshops and provide input to the LTOA's work and to other professional arboricultural organisations as required</p>
<p>Encourage participation and maximise contribution of trained community volunteers in field survey in respect of biosecurity threats, including Oak Processionary Moth (OPM)</p>	<p>Commenced July 2012 and ongoing as required</p>	<p>Community volunteers participated in summer 2013 OPM survey efforts and the borough's tree wardens fulfil a vital role in tree planting projects and information dissemination/collection.</p> <p>Resource limitations preclude significant volunteer involvement above and beyond current levels</p>
<p>Consider what additional resources may be required to extant and future biosecurity</p>	<p>Currently under review; actions ongoing in relation to OPM and likely to remain so in the foreseeable future</p>	<p>Greenspaces' arboricultural team's input via the relevant LTOA steering group has been instrumental in</p>

<p>threats and secure these where necessary</p>		<p>securing the provision of central government funds for OPM treatment throughout London.</p> <p>Many other biosecurity threats are emerging and, generally, a rapid response will be required when threats arise, including any necessary funding</p>
---	--	---



## Committee: Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel

**Date: 16 October 2013**

Agenda item: 9

Wards: All

### **Subject: Update on Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel task group reviews**

Lead officer: Ben Sherlock

Lead member: Cllr Russell Makin

Contact officer: Ben Sherlock ([ben.sherlock@merton.gov.uk](mailto:ben.sherlock@merton.gov.uk) tel. 020 8545 3864)

---

#### **Recommendations:**

- A. That the Panel consider any further performance management they wish to undertake and establish outcomes they wish to note from the reviews.
- 

#### **1 Purpose of report and executive summary**

- 1.1. To provide an update on the progress made on the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny task group review topics since their conclusions in 2011 and 2012.

#### **2 Details**

##### **CLEANER TOWN CENTRES (2010-11)**

- 2.1 Street Scene and Waste team reported to the Scrutiny panel in April 2012 on the outcomes of this scrutiny review.
- 2.2 The latest version of the action plan (with progress updated as of April 2012) is in Appendix 1.
- 2.3 The team has since moved on from the original action plan, although the recommendations have been incorporated into on-going work.

##### **HOUSEHOLD WASTE MANAGEMENT (2010-11)**

- 2.4 In August 2013 the head of Street Scene and Waste added comments on the progress made on the action plan that was approved by Cabinet and noted by the Scrutiny Panel in 2011-12.
- 2.5 The approved action plan with comments is attached in Appendix 2.

##### **TREES (2011-12)**

- 2.6 In January 2013 Members received the Executive Response and Action Plan for their Task Group Review of Trees undertaken as part of the Panels 2011/12 work programme.
- 2.7 Many actions' timescales do not start until Sep/Dec 2013 or well into 2014 and so there is no formal updated action plan (see action plan attached as Appendix 3).

- 2.8 The Panel agreed in January 2013 to performance manage delivery of the Action Plan every 6-9 months as part of the work programme, so the next update is due in September 2013.
- 2.9 Actions to be completed by end of August 2013:
- Establish a cross-divisional and interdepartmental steering group involving relevant officers and other key stakeholders to oversee production of tree strategy (By April 2013)
  - Identify resources to support process (By June 2013)
  - Corporately, to utilise the improved data and analysis for the better management of the borough's tree assets (From January 2013)
  - Combine benefit and value data with i-Tree canopy assessments (From January 2013)
  - Improve information available to ward members on local tree works in their areas (By March 2013)
  - Ensure that any capital investment in the tree stock does not end with the planting of the tree but that tree establishment costs beyond the first year are integral to the project capital funds or that associated growth in revenue budgets is provided (By April 2013)
  - Ensure that all tree losses are quantified in monetary terms using, at present, the CAVAT method, and that these asset values are utilised in practice (From April 2013)
  - Provide on-going tree asset (total stock) valuations to determine loss/gain in the resource and indicate direction of travel (From April 2013)
- 2.10 The Panel may wish to check up on the above actions at the update.
- 2.11 All other actions are not yet due or were already underway in January 2013.

### **3 *Alternative options***

- 3.1. To leave the performance management of the task group reviews to officers.

### **4 *Consultation undertaken or proposed***

- 4.1. Officers approached and asked for progress updates (latest updates attached at Appendix 1 and 2).

### **5 *Timetable***

- 5.1. To be considered at the Panel meeting on 16 October 2013

### **6 *Financial, resource and property implications***

- 6.1. None that were not considered at the time of the reviews.

### **7 *Legal and statutory implications***

- 7.1. None that were not considered at the time of the reviews.

**8        *Human rights, equalities and community cohesion implications***

8.1.     None that were not considered at the time of the reviews.

**9        *Crime and Disorder implications***

9.1.     None that were not considered at the time of the reviews.

**10       *Risk management and health and safety implications***

10.1.    None that were not considered at the time of the reviews.

**11       *Appendices – the following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report***

1: Action Plan for Cleaner Town Centres

2: Efficient Household waste Management

3: Action Plan arising from the Scrutiny Review of Trees, 2011-12

APPENDIX 1

Scrutiny Task Groups: Cleaner Town Centres Action Plan

Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
1	Education is required to alert the public to the nuisance of litter, the cost to the council and local residents of clearing it up and the penalties that can result	The anti-litter campaign has been given Gold campaign status by Merton Communications for 2011-12 within the overarching Cleaner service campaign. These have included 16 public engagement exercises on the street between April through to October 2011 and a prominent poster campaign across the borough. We were a partner with Keep Britain Tidy and The Chewing Gum Action Group for a month long Bin-it campaign targeting chewing gum litter. We received paid for advertising throughout the borough and participated in 5 road shows across the borough. In total 35 public
2	We recommend that following the savings proposal to cut the full-time post to support education programmes in schools, consideration should be given to encouraging schools to run programmes themselves. This should include assessing how effective the lessons are and looking into the most effective format of teaching (i.e. drama groups, junior wardens etc).	A theatre group will visit 43 primary schools between April 2011 to March 2012 to deliver a production that covers enviro-crime issues including graffiti and litter. A golden broom award has been launched in all Merton primary schools in October 2011, rewarding the class, which made the most effort each week, and taking account of an initial assessment of the streets in the local area. 10 schools have signed up to date. Talks are also given throughout the year junior warden groups in schools, raising awareness of local litter, graffiti and recycling issues and arranging community litter picks. Currently working with the schools that have opted in for golden broom and looking to promote to other schools through case studies

Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
		to encourage other schools to sign up for school year 2012/13.

Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
3	<p>We recommend that use of the NI195 (Detritus Measure) is reviewed – chasing a further improvement in this measure has, it is felt, led to an unnecessary diversion of resources away from litter collection etc. Consideration should be given to what is a good score in this measure rather than necessarily seeking to be ‘best in class’. This will provide more resources for other more visible street cleansing issues.</p>	<p>We no longer have to report NI195 results to Central Government. However we have opted to continue to measure our performance in conjunction with The Tidy Britain Group. The targets set are local targets to ensure we maintain a good standard of cleansing. Dealing with litter is a priority for residents and this is where the main resource will be committed. We continue to use the Local Environmental Quality Survey (LEQS) to monitor our cleanliness levels and this will enable Merton to compare our standards to other Local Authorities. However we do use additional information to direct our resources to areas that need attention particularly in relation to litter which remains a priority for our residents.</p>
4	<p>We recommend that Cabinet review the specification of vehicles such as the Mini Johnson, so that items that are rarely used are not routinely provided.</p>	<p>We had delivered four new compact mechanical sweeper vehicles during the summer. These vehicles will be fitted only with the necessary equipment. We have retained four small vehicles which are fitted with appropriate equipment, the vehicles are a mix of two slightly smaller vehicles so they have better access to areas where pavements are narrower.</p>

Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
5	Street cleansing waste needs to be collected when seen. Too often it is left in a green bag for days waiting to be collected and acts as a source for other rubbish and fly tipping	We introduced as from 1 April 2011 a new street cleansing strategy which included new response teams; one of their responsibilities is to clear the green sacks produced by the solo sweepers which are left at specific drop off points. The introduction of the dedicated response teams has improved our ability to collect green sacks produced on the same day.
6	We recommend that more solo cleaners should be introduced in residential streets. This should be in conjunction with better promotion of who the 'local street sweeper' is. Businesses should also be provided with their street cleaner contact details so that they can contact them (where possible) whilst on their round. This will improve the community value of the street cleansing team. Matching the skills of the solo cleaners to the 'patch' would enable those with excellent interpersonal skills to improve communication between business owners and council officers.	As part of the new operational strategy introduced from 1 April 2011 we have increased the number of solo sweepers from 22 to 48. It would not be practicable for Businesses to contact the street cleaning staff direct as this could put undue pressure on the operative. All staff have undertaken customer service training and refresher training is being organised. Businesses can contact Merton via the Contact Centre or on line for local issues. The solo sweepers introduced have daily interaction with Businesses and local residents. We have received a number of compliments from residents about the good work our staff are doing.

Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
7	<p>We recommend that more consideration needs to go into planning approval for the '90 degree' shop signs and uneven shop frontages as they cause street fronts to look untidy when in large numbers. This issue could be resolved via the enforcement function/Core Strategy and specific planning policies.</p>	<p>Would need to be considered as part of review of town centres as development occurs. Many non-illuminated 90 degree shop signs do not actually require approval (advert consent) and this makes it impossible to control the proliferation of such signage. Shop front design guidance exists, and could be refreshed as part of the Design SPD. The SPD will be presented to Cabinet on 16th January 2012 and a consultation will follow where this proposal can be presented for consideration. The SPD is anticipated to be ready late 2012. It wont resolve any existing signage issues until shop owners renew their signage, or as part of a targeted</p>
8	<p>We recommend that work should be undertaken with the borough's larger retailers and Chamber of Commerce to see if training could be given to smaller retailers on shop window dressing. A pilot partnership scheme could be set up with the larger retailer working with small businesses from other parts of the borough (to avoid competition).</p>	<p>There have been a number of attempts and programmes that have sought to address the training of retailers. Could be considered as part of the implementation of the Economic Development Strategy (under town centre management) subject to funding being available. It is unlikely that there will be general funding under town centre management for window dressing but Merton is submitting a bid to the Mayor's Outer London Fund R2 for support to regenerate Mitcham town centre. Part of the bid proposal is to work with the London Sustainability Exchange who provide point of sale support and time-</p>



Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
9	<p>There is a rather fragmented approach to interaction between the council and local businesses at present. If the council were seen to have clear responsibilities that were efficiently carried out, businesses could then be encouraged to take more pride in their area and become involved in local initiatives.</p>	<p>Business Forums in Mitcham, Morden, Colliers Wood and Raynes Park are now being facilitated by the Chamber on behalf of the Council. The Wimbledon Business Forum continues as part of the Wimbledon Town Centre Management initiative and the vote for WTC to be established as a Business Improvement District (BID). The proposal was successful and the BID was officially launched on 1 April 2012 for a five year period. Merton is looking to introduce a Street Champion scheme across the borough to encourage both residents and businesses to maintain and take pride in and ownership of the local environment. Street Champion scheme launched March 2012 - already gained 50 members. A high profile campaign will look to increase the number of street champion volunteers. Officers will work with these volunteers to arrange community clean ups etc. Will work with the newly formed Wimbledon BID to encourage businesses to come on board. Merton has commissioned the Merton Chamber of Commerce to manage "Merton Means Business". This service is to aid, assist and support businesses at any stage and is free of charge. There are both one-to-one and networking sessions with an accredited business advisor. In November 2011 the council recruited a dedicated Business Growth Officer whose role includes networking businesses to get involved locally, especially in town centres and industrial estates.</p>

Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
10	<p>We recommend that consideration be given to a civic award for Best Shop Premises to be run at times of local/national celebration, where residents can vote for their favourite in each town centre. On consultation, business representatives felt that this would be better than an annual 'forced' competition in the first instance.</p>	<p>Under consideration as part of the Merton Business Awards. The next round of Awards will take place in September 2012.</p>
11	<p>We recommend that in future, (dependent on funding) the design and running of capital assistance grant schemes should be run working closely with the chamber of commerce and other small and local business groups.</p>	<p>Detailed criteria will be developed and consultation will be undertaken with business groups and the Town Centre Business Forums. There are 11 categories including "Best Independent Retailer" and "Merton's Favourite Business". Residents are able to nominate in any category. This concept could also be built into marketing and promotional activity in our town centres, particularly Mitcham and Colliers Wood where specific funding has been earmarked for regeneration.</p>
12	<p>We recommend that when litter/recycling bins are ordered in the future, the design should have a much larger hole to allow pedestrians to place refuse fully in the bin.</p>	<p>This has been done. The first batch of 76 dual litter and recycling bins for Mitcham had the smaller apertures. Since then all procurement 100 bins for Colliers Wood, Morden and Wimbledon have the larger apertures. Further to the new bins with the larger apertures being located in Colliers wood and Morden we are now locating these bins in</p>

Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
13	<p>We recommend that as the current time between reporting a problem and its being acted on appears somewhat slow, an investigation should be carried out into the different communication systems in place and consideration given to the investment of technology which will allow street sweepers to quickly report issues. All members of the team need to be given the role of 'eyes and ears' of the council, doing more than just street sweeping but also reporting fly tips, pot holes, uncollected street cleansing waste etc. A link also needs to be established from when a report of waste, dirty streets etc is recorded to action being taken.</p>	<p>Currently each member of staff has been allocated with a mobile phone and are able to report issues immediately they are seen. We are investing in enhanced IT support for the CRM system to enable mobile working and messages being passed directly to and from frontline teams. The current plan is that the new technology will become available to Merton staff from mid-2012. The Council is reviewing its Customer management systems with a view to improve communication flow and the recording and response to customer concerns. The project will involve improved links between the back office and frontline services and the use of mobile working.</p>
14	<p>We recommend that consideration should be given to putting in additional conditions in the commercial waste contracts stating when commercial waste should be collected, or instead promote the idea that shops in an area coordinate their commercial waste arrangements to minimize disruption on the footways.</p>	<p>The existing Commercial contracts include the agreed day or days of collection and timings. Businesses should only present their waste on the agreed days and ensure that the waste does not cause disruption on the footways. This is actively encouraged by the Councils Commercial Waste Officers and Enforcement team. We are developing a new street cleaning strategy which will consider time bandings for the presentation of commercial waste in town centres and lead to</p>

Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
15	We recommend that better publicity of the success of enforcement of littering/flytipping should be encouraged via My Merton as we acknowledge that local media is unlikely to cover this. More publicity to residents on the number of fines issued and the amount of money collected should be conveyed to reiterate the point that littering is an offence.	The summer 2011 edition of My Merton featured an article on enforcement prosecutions. There have been recent success in gaining coverage in the local press and radio media resulting from Merton press releases. We continue to promote enforcement prosecutions

Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
16	<p>We recommend that enforcement of Aboards and Newspaper Stands should be increased – shops increasingly encroach the pavement with several A- boards and other stands selling fruit, newspapers etc outside their shop. Retailers need to be informed that it is not acceptable to let these encroach onto the pavement, especially where there are several outside of the same business.</p>	<p>It is not clear what is meant by Newsstands and this would need to be defined clearly. If they are the actual holders of the papers/magazines then they are regulated by street trading legislation. It is often the case that slim stands are located within 300mm of a shop window and they tend not to encroach on the footway. Outside of that they are subject to the same licensing conditions as other forecourt licences. There are exemptions for certain types of newsstand and vendors. Advice would need to be sort from Legal Services on interpretation of the legislation and the individual circumstances of each case considered. Similarly the London Benchmarking Group on Street Trading would need to be consulted to ensure a joined up approach to enforcement across London and also for their views on the legal position. All forecourt trading on the public highway is subject to licensing, many premises however have private forecourts that may appear to be part of the highway when in fact this is not the case. Street Trading Service is comprised of one officer and he is already working to capacity 6 days per week.</p>

Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
17	<p>We recommend that, to assist with the problem of cigarette and chewing gum litter, all office premises and bars should be requested to attach a cigarette bin to their buildings and should inform their staff to use it. Particular areas, such as Hartfield Road, have a particular problem with this. The chewing gum boards on lampposts should be replaced with the attachable boxes for both gum and cigarette ends. Regard should be given to the Cleaner Neighbourhoods Act legislation and further education campaigns. Investigation is also needed to review special coatings for pavements to reduce chewing gum nuisance.</p>	<p>Businesses are encouraged by the Engagement &amp; Enforcement Team to deal with cigarette ends more responsibly, under their “duty of care”. The Chewing Gum Action Group – a national body promoting good practice on chewing gum disposal – in conjunction with Keep Britain Tidy has chosen Merton as a partner for their 2012 campaign starting next Spring. Trials are taking place nationally on biodegradable chewing gum. The replacement of the boards on lampposts for chewing gum with boxes, requires further investigation. Considerations include: _ In 2012 we have the Queen’s Jubilee and the Olympics - security consideration. _ Consultation with residents _ Product trials _ Financial feasibility study _ Budget _ Operational management Pavement coatings to prevent chewing gum sticking to pavement costs in the region of £6 per sq m. In particularly problematic areas this will be factored into the costs of the public realm improvements. In Wimbledon town centre an extra strong bedding material was used for the pavements. This provides better cleaning potential, such as the ability to jet wash. At the end of Destination Wimbledon project a deep clean will take place.</p>



Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
18	We recommend that a better form of partnership needs to be established with commercial property agents so that they provide comprehensive information to new leaseholders on what is expected of them, contact numbers for assistance and details of their town centre manager etc.	Will be considered as part of the Council's Inward Investment programme / Economic Development Programme if funding is allocated towards town centre management in the future. Cabinet decision in 2010 led to the cessation of town centre management in Morden, Mitcham and Colliers Wood.
19	We recommend asking officers to review the system of checking staff performance.	Staff performance is managed in line with the Council's performance management framework which includes regular 1to1s, and appraisals. This is supported by regular checks on day to day performance outcomes. Supervisors have undertaken Street Cleansing and Street Scene Supervisory skills. A number of team leaders are also undertaking this training. We continue to manage staff performance in line with the Councils performance management framework. The day to
20	We recommend that consideration needs to be given to whether the current location of the market is the best place or whether other locations such as 'on-street' would be more successful.	The Mitcham Market was relocated to the newly created market square following wide consultation with local residents and businesses including the market traders. The Market Square enables the market to function as a market. There is no evidence that the relocation of the market to the market square affected trade neither is there evidence to return on on-street trading would boost trade. Merton is submitting a bid to the Mayors Outer London Fund R2 for regeneration and public realm improvements to Mitcham. Part of the proposal is funding to enhance the market place by providing additional stall, better facilities for the stall holders and a project co-ordinator

Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
21	The electronic notice board needs to be repaired and moved as it cannot be seen at its current location.	There is a continuing IT problem with the notice board which has meant that the notice board cannot be used. Therefore there is an argument that the notice board should be removed. Investigate ownership of the Board (think this is the Met Police) and if the Board is ever in use. The Chamber have asked if it is possible to reinstate following interest from Mitcham Community Forum.
22	We recommend that consideration should once again be given to the outsourcing of the town centre manager role. Outsourcing to a professional provider may yield dividends which are greater than the cash cost. The Town Centre Manager should be a more clearly defined co- ordination/hub role. A sense of teamwork needs to be fostered between the Town Centre Manager and the Street Cleansing Team and contact details for all parties should be shared.	The contract for Town Centre Management was market tested but due to the Council's overall financial position Cabinet decided not to proceed with the letting of the contract. The future of any Town centre Management post would be subject to the Council's overall financial position and is not seen as a high priority. As part of the Outer London Fund bid for Mitcham the Council is proposing a sum be allocated



Number	Recommendation	Action and Timescales
23	We recommend that residents should be asked if they want to get involved in improving their local town centre. Town centre residents groups could be set up with the support of the council and town centre manager.	It is considered that there are sufficient resident groups in existence covering the town centers that no action needs to be taken to form new groups give the Council's limited resources. Some community groups are setting up their own replacements for Community Forums and the Localism Bill encourages the introduction of neighbourhood forums/groups to get local people involved in planning matters. See Street Champion initiative above.
24	We recommend that town centre regeneration needs to set realistic short, medium and long-term objectives, which are more imaginative than massive capital investment.	Town centre regeneration proposals were set out in the Regeneration Strategy, presented and approved by to Cabinet on 28 November 2011. We have already delivered projects over the last 2 years: _ Mitcham (St Marks Road, Market Sq) Morden (Abbotsbury Road re-paving and de-cluttering. Morden News refurbishment) _ Raynes Park (Enhancement Plan) _ Wimbledon (Destination Wimbledon) _ Colliers Wood (re-paving and cycle hub at CW tube station) _ Leopold Road (Re-paving and Shopfront improvements) _ Grand Drive (Re-paving and de-cluttering) _ Wimbledon Chase (re-paving and decluttering) _ Borough-wide pedestrian wayfinding signage Morden and Mitcham are restricted due to
25	We recommend that a schematic diagram of all the different groups should be produced, showing the link from the decision makers to the forums and, if necessary, rationalisation needs to happen	To take this forward an officer will need to be allocated this role. It would need to be led by Corporate Services who already have established links with the thematic partnerships and subgroups.

APPENDIX 2

Scrutiny Review on Efficient Household Waste Management and the Environment – Updated Action Plan

No.	Recommendation	Action	Comment
1	We recommend that the Director of Environment and Regeneration review how the refuse collection and street cleaning crews communicate with each other in order to ensure that street cleaning takes place immediately after refuse collection.	Agreed on need to ensure a high standard of internal communications between refuse/recycling collection and street cleansing teams, particularly since street cleansing is no longer scheduled to automatically occur after collection. See 19 September 2011 report to Cabinet detail, also on IT developments.	Ongoing. Picked up as part of Service Transformation Plans relating to mobile working.
2	We recommend that waste minimisation should be one of the guiding principles to be taken into account by Cabinet when taking decisions about the collection, management and disposal of household waste	Agreed. The waste hierarchy is detailed in the 19 September 2011 report to Cabinet and will continue to be adhered to when Cabinet are making waste management decisions.	Considered as part of any proposed service change.
3	We recommend that the Council should more actively encourage the re-use of household items in order to reduce waste. The Council could advertise the local “freecycle” website at the recycling and re-use centre and in council communications such as My Merton and the council tax leaflet.	Agreed. The Council pro-actively encourages re-use of household items, making use of its own publicity media and working closely with community groups to raise awareness.	Ongoing

<b>No.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Comment</b>
4	We recommend that the Council should advertise local reuse services such as companies that collect used light bulbs, batteries, small electrical goods etc.	Agreed. The Council publishes information about re-use companies/charities to inform residents and offer them a choice, making use of its own publicity media.	ongoing
5	We recommend that the Council investigate ways of promoting the re-use of items of bulky waste, including the possibility of a third party taking over the collection in order to increase the level of re-use.	Agreed. Reuse and recycling a larger proportion of the bulky waste stream is a South London Waste Partnership (SLWP) priority. However trials involving collection via a local charity have proved disappointing. The sorting of the waste stream, rather than collection, is key. See 19 September 2011 report to Cabinet detail.	We are currently looking into options for a collection service to be provided by a third party. In the interim arrangements have been made to separate potential reusable and recyclable items from bulky waste collected by in-house service
6	We recommend that Cabinet receive and carefully examine costings before taking any decision to complete the roll out of the food waste collection to the remaining 30,000+ households in Merton.	Agreed. This will be the subject of a separate report to Cabinet.	Completed. Roll out agreed by Cabinet.
7	We recommend that the Council work in partnership with Merton Priory Homes to continue to explore ways of maximising the collection of food waste from flats.	Agreed. The Council will continue to carry out the food waste collection trial which includes 360 properties managed by Merton Priory Homes. See also recommendation 6 above.	Ongoing work with MPH

No.	Recommendation	Action	Comment
8	Given our current rate of recycling, we recommend that the Council should continue to have a co-mingled recycling collection service in order to drive up the recycling rates.	Agreed	We continue to provide a commingled service. This will be reviewed following the revised EU Waste Framework Directive and associated government guidance on commingling.
9	We recommend that the Council should keep the recycling collection methods under review in order to identify the point at which the separate collection of individual components becomes financially advantageous. The Council should then change the service accordingly and should provide clear communication to residents, setting out the reasons for the change as well as the new collection requirements.	The SLWP continues to monitor the recyclables market, working with its recycling processing contractor (Viridor) to maximise value. Other recyclables not included in the SLWP contract are for example collected separately, such as textiles, for which the Council earns a direct income. See 19 September 2011 report to Cabinet detail on the risks here.	Ongoing
10	We recommend that the Director of Environment and Regeneration should continuously monitor the market and provide regular reports to the relevant Cabinet Member on the value of the raw materials obtained from the recycling collection.	Agreed. The SLWP Management Group will continue to monitor this and provide reports to the Joint Waste Committee (JWC). The relevant Merton Cabinet Member is a member of the JWC.	This is carried out as part of the SLWP functions. Regular review has resulted in commercial terms being renegotiated, delivering significant savings to the partner boroughs over the next 7 years.
11	We recommend that Cabinet should ensure that future contracts relating to the collection, management or disposal of waste are sufficiently flexible to enable the council to benefit from changing market conditions in relation to the value of raw materials.	Agreed. The Council will continue to work with the SLWP on these matters. See also 19 September 2011 report to Cabinet detail.	This is being developed as part of a revised SLWP commercial Strategy

<b>No.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Comment</b>
12	We recommend that the Council work with local supermarkets to encourage the stocking of clear plastic refuse sacks with a view to making the use of clear sacks a future requirement for the collection of landfill waste.	Not Agreed Members will need to consider the implications of this carefully. The price of available clear sacks is generally several times that of black sacks. Waste can also be hidden within other sacks or bags within a clear sack. Such a requirement may also not be enforceable. Not recommended in the current economic environment.	Not agreed
13	We therefore recommend that Cabinet should work towards establishing a common approach to the range of materials which can be recycled among the authorities within the South London Waste Partnership.	Agreed. The SLWP worked towards this approach in awarding its 2008 recyclable contract and will continue to do so in examining a future collection contract.	Ongoing
14	We recommend that the Council, Merton Priory Homes and other registered social landlords provide information to residents who live in flats with communal recycling bins telling them that they can put their recyclables in to an ordinary plastic bag and then throw the recycling bag into the bin.	Agreed. The Council will continue to provide information to residents that live in flats regarding what they can deposit in the recycling bins provided by the Council. See also 16 below.	Ongoing
15	We recommend that the Director of Environment and Regeneration keeps abreast of technological developments in order to identify opportunities for changing waste collection and disposal methods so that greater value for money may be achieved, as well as meeting environmental and waste minimisation objectives.	Agreed. The Council will continue to work closely within the SLWP on these matters.	Ongoing. Responsibility rests with the SLWP.



<b>No.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Comment</b>
16	<p>We recommend that the Council develops a communication strategy to encourage the public to re-use and recycle. This should be a complex strategy that targets different messages to different groups, based on the typologies identified by WRAP in its “barriers to recycling” report. Communication should include information on what happens to recyclable materials after collection and cost savings achieved through reducing the amount sent to landfill. Publicity and clear signage should also be put on containers, including cost information. Every opportunity should be taken to communicate re-use and recycling messages, including each issue of My Merton and the council tax leaflet.</p>	<p>Agreed. The SLWP’s first comprehensive Communications Strategy, and supporting Joint Waste Committee (JWC) in December 2009. A 2011-12 Communications Strategy, taking into account the results of local SLWP research conducted by Ipsos MORI in summer 2010, was agreed at the 24 March 2011 JWC meeting. As well as examining strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, it looks at target audiences, generic messages, communication channels, branding and protocols. Within this framework, Merton officers agree with the relevant Cabinet Member targeted local campaigns and content. A copy of Merton’s 2011-12 Recycling communications plan is enclosed at Appendix 2. This encompasses best practice and guidance from WRAP and maximises the use of available media.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>2012 – Metal matters campaign with funding from Viridor (waste disposal contractor), Alupro and LWaRB. Planned campaign for this Autumn being developed.</p> <p>Separate Incentivisation and Encouragement Programme being developed with funding provided by DCLG. To be launched later this eyar.</p>
17	<p>We recommend that all communication with the public should use words that are in common use. Communication materials from Kingston provide a good example of this approach.</p>	<p>Agreed. See 16 above. Kingston provide the SLWP communications lead for the Partnership.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

No.	Recommendation	Action	Comment
18	<p>We recommend that the Council continue to work with Merton Priory Homes, other registered social landlords, WRAP and other expert organisations to identify the most effective way of communicating messages to encourage their tenants to recycle and re-use.</p>	<p>Agreed. The Council will continue to work with the SLWP, Merton Priory Homes, other social landlords, WRAP and other expert organisations in identifying the most effective ways of communicating re-use and recycling messages to residents. See also 14 and 16 above.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
19	<p>We recommend that strong links should be developed between the waste collection service and the communications team so that communications becomes an integral part of the service. We would prefer this to be provided by a designated officer in the communications team. Alternatively work could be kick-started by buying-in expertise, for example from the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames who provide the communications lead for the South London Waste Partnership.</p>	<p>Strong links agreed. Waste communications budgets transferred to central Communications Team from late 2010-11. Aim is to enhance further the Waste Operations and Waste Services communications linkages by co-location of the relevant staff. See also 16 above for the Communications Lead for the SLWP provided by Kingston. Kingston chair the SLWP communications forum of partnership communications officers.</p>	<p>Ongoing. Full involvement with corporate communications</p>

<b>No.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Comment</b>
20	<p>We recommend that the Director of Environment and Regeneration considers the best way in which to use the collection crew as ambassadors for recycling. This would include identifying and leafleting households that are not participating in recycling (or only putting out small quantities). Leaflets could be left for those who mix recycling and landfill waste. A stepped approach could be taken whereby reminders at first and then warning leaflets are left, leading ultimately to non-collection when recyclable materials are put in with landfill waste. Results from the current trial of yellow and red cards to encourage residents to present their landfill waste sacks correctly should help to design the scheme.</p>	<p>Recycling crews carry contamination cards to encourage recycling and these have recently been improved. We also provide workshops for collection crews, to give staff the knowledge and ownership of their service with residents. Separately the Council provides house to house communications through My Merton, the annual waste 'Christmas Card', with the 6-monthly re-supply of food waste bags to 50,000 households, and door-knocking when resources allow. As a Waste Collection Authority, Merton has a duty to collect household waste and the aim is recycling through encouragement.</p>	<p>Ongoing. Linked to above Incentivisation and Encouragement programme</p>
21	<p>We recommend that the Council continues to collect landfill waste from plastic sacks and provides boxes for the collection of dry recyclables</p>	<p>With the scale of budget savings required, Members will wish to keep under review the options for waste collection, including waste containerisation requirements linked with any potential move to fortnightly collection (a potential suggested by the Task Group but not the policy of the current administration) and the implications of decisions on food waste collection (see 6 above) and future SLWP developments (see 15 above).</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>



No.	Recommendation	Action	Comment
22	We recommend that Cabinet investigate the feasibility of buying lids for the recycling boxes and running a trial in one part of the borough in order to evaluate whether this makes a difference to the quantity and quality of recycling material collected and to the amount of litter on the street. the feasibility of buying lids	Not Agreed. See 21 above. Apart from additional operational costs and envisaged replacement costs, the provision of lids limits the capacity of the boxes. This does not confirm to agreed objectives of increasing recycling and minimising waste to landfill.	Not agreed

### APPENDIX 3

#### Action Plan arising from the Scrutiny Review of Trees, 2011-12

##### Recommendation 1 (para 56)

That Cabinet lead on the development of a Tree Strategy for the Council. The Strategy should be aligned to the Borough's development aims, Local Development Framework, Core Strategy etc and Duty of Care consideration.

##### Proposed and Current Actions:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Timetable</b>
Establish a cross-divisional and inter-departmental steering group involving relevant officers and other key stakeholders to oversee production of tree strategy	By April 2013
Identify resources to support process	By June 2013
Agree timetable, scope and themes	By September 2013
Commission strategy	By October 2013
Progress review	From November 2013
First draft report	By March 2014
Final draft report	By June 2014
Report sign-off by key stakeholders and members	By October 2014

- 
- Recommendation 2 (para 60)
- That existing data collection and analysis should be established and strengthened.
- Proposed and Current Actions:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Timetable</b>
Implement 3-year cyclical inspection cycle within parks and open spaces	Current & ongoing

<b>Task</b>	<b>Timetable</b>
Implement 2-year cyclical inspection cycle for schools and other non-highway Council trees	Current & ongoing
Implement 3-year inspection cycle for Highways trees	Current & ongoing
Liaison with other London boroughs and partners, including via London Tree Officer's Association, to share information and data	Current & ongoing
Corporately, to utilise the improved data and analysis for the better management of the borough's tree assets	From January 2013
Conduct i-Tree canopy assessments for the borough.	Current & ongoing
Combine benefit and value data with i-Tree canopy assessments	From January 2013

- 
- Recommendation 3 (para 62)
- That Planning and Enforcement procedures are clarified and more effectively enforced.
- Proposed and Current Actions:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Timetable</b>
Adopt and implement recommendations of borough tree strategy in respect of planning and enforcement issues	From October 2014
Improve skills and knowledge of planning enforcement officers in relation to the identification of dead and diseased trees on development sites	By December 2013
Summary information on Tree Preservation Orders to be available online	By March 2014
Increased cooperation and liaison between the intradepartmental tree officers in relation to planning issues.	Current & ongoing
Provide online advice to encourage developers and applicants to seek and secure competent professional arboricultural advice where necessary	By April 2014
Review policies and procedures in relation to trees and crossover applications and amend as necessary.	By September 2013

- 
- Recommendation 4 (para 63)
- That the local community are encouraged to become involved in caring for the Borough's trees.
- Proposed and Current Actions:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Timetable</b>
-------------	------------------

<b>Task</b>	<b>Timetable</b>
Support and promote Merton Tree Wardens and residents and friends groups on tree related matters	Current & ongoing
Support learning and development needs of tree wardens and friends on relevant tree matters	Current & ongoing
Improve the understanding of the public and local authority officers on the value, benefits and needs of trees via the Council website	By December 2013
Improve information available to ward members on local tree works in their areas	By March 2013
Instigate educational outreach work with local schools on trees and tree planting projects	From September 2013

- 
- 
- Recommendation 5 (para 64)
- That accessible information is provided.
- Proposed and Current Actions:

Page 17 of 30

<b>Task</b>	<b>Timetable</b>
Provide better information on trees, tree works and tree planting projects on the Council website and to local community forums	By December 2013
Provide summary of tree strategy and key Council policies and procedures in relation to trees online.	By December 2014

- 
- Recommendation 6 (para 66)
- That Cabinet review how tree planting and maintenance is financed.
- Proposed and Current Actions:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Timetable</b>
Commitment to woodland creation and improvement of the urban forest via an ongoing capital input: annual tree planting programme in open spaces and street scene	Current & ongoing
Ensure that any capital investment in the tree stock does not end with the planting of the tree but that tree establishment costs beyond the first year are integral to the project capital funds or that associated growth in revenue budgets is provided	By April 2013
Ensure that all tree losses are quantified in monetary terms using, at present, the CAVAT	From April 2013

Task	Timetable
method, and that these asset values are utilised in practice	
Provide ongoing tree asset (total stock) valuations to determine loss/gain in the resource and indicate direction of travel	From April 2013
Continue to support and participate in the training, information exchange and networking activities available through the London Tree Officers' Association and other professional organisations	Current & ongoing
Encourage participation and maximise contribution of trained community volunteers in field survey in respect of biosecurity threats, including Oak Processionary Moth (OPM)	Commenced July 2012 and ongoing as required
Consider what additional resources may be required to extant and future biosecurity threats and secure these where necessary	Currently under review; actions ongoing in relation to OPM and likely to remain so in the foreseeable future

This page is intentionally left blank