



## **MINUTES OF THE RESOURCES AND PUBLIC REALM SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

### **Monday 15 April 2019 at 6.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Kelcher (Chair), Councillor Kansagra (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Nerva, Gill, Gbajumo, Kabir and Mashari

Also Present: Councillors McLennan, Krupa Sheth and Tatler

#### **1. Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members**

Apologies were submitted by Councillor S Butt.

#### **2. Declarations of interests**

For purposes of transparency, Councillor Nerva advised that he was a registered supporter of Tottenham Hotspurs.

#### **3. Deputations (if any)**

None.

#### **4. Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED: that the minutes of the meetings held on 14 March 2019 and the and 3 April 2019 be agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

#### **5. Matters arising (if any)**

The Chair advised that as agreed by the committee at the last ordinary meeting, a letter had been sent to the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board. The response would be shared once received.

#### **6. Chair's Report**

The committee considered the Chair's report which set out details regarding the selection of topics for the current meeting and work undertaken by the committee outside of public meetings.

Councillor Nerva expressed his thanks to the Chair and officers for arranging the meeting with the Communities and Local Government Parliamentary Committee, highlighting that this had been a really useful and interesting exercise.

RESOLVED: that the Chair's report be noted.

## **7. Economic Impact of Wembley Stadium**

The Chair welcomed Chris Bryant (Head of Operations, FA), Jake Wilson (Senior Manager, Deloitte) and Tom Hammond (Assistant Manager, Deloitte) to the meeting, noting that the committee had before them the report prepared by Deloitte Sport Business Group on behalf of the Football Association on the Economic Impact of Wembley Stadium for 2017/18 event season. The committee subsequently received a short presentation highlighting the key findings of the report for the Brent area.

During the presentation, Members were advised that there had been a record 58 events held at Wembley Stadium during 2017/18. The usual number of events was around 32. These events had attracted 3.8 million spectators, including 350k from overseas and high numbers of first-time visitors. The report stated that the Wembley Stadium events had delivered a major economic boost to Brent and that Tottenham Hotspur's residency had further increased the local economic impact, accounting for over one third of the total economic impact from events in 2017/18. At least 1,800 full time equivalent jobs were supported due to events at the stadium in this period and there had been £190m gross expenditure in local businesses in Brent on accommodation, tickets, food and drink, retail, groceries, travel and other expenditures. Overall the local economy of Brent had been boosted by £150m due to Stadium events. Spectator perceptions had been surveyed and consultations held with key stakeholders including Brent Council, local businesses and local residents' groups. Spectators had been largely positive about the Stadium and Brent. Local residents had in particular expressed concerns around issues with noise, antisocial behaviour and littering. The FA was working with the council and other organisations to address these issues.

The Chair thanked the representatives of the FA and Deloitte for the presentation and invited questions from the committee.

Several queries were subsequently raised. Members questioned whether the economic impact could be broadened to include areas outside the immediate vicinity by discouraging car use and directing public transport users to surrounding tube stations. It was queried how the FA encouraged visitors to use public transport and concern was expressed regarding the impact on neighbouring boroughs which did not have event day enforcement in place. It was further queried whether the views of residents from the neighbouring borough of Harrow had been surveyed for the report. Questions were raised regarding the consultation and feed-in of the FA into kick-off times and the consideration given to ensuring viable public transport routes out of Wembley following events. Members sought details of parking and other transport provision made for disabled customers attending events at the Stadium. Queries were also raised regarding consultation between the FA and the council regarding low capacity events and event day parking.

The committee sought clarification regarding the £150m total economic impact figure for Brent, whether this included expenditure in the Stadium itself, and for those areas outside of the Stadium, whether any further detail could be provided about those benefiting most from this economic boost. It was subsequently queried whether any economic risk assessment had been completed to assess the harm that event days could cause to some of the more outlying businesses. Members questioned what had been learnt with regard to maximising the economic benefit of

future events as a result of the use of the Stadium by Tottenham Hotspur and what the council could do to maximise opportunities to engage spectators in additional activities around Wembley.

Members further questioned whether the Stadium was a London Living Wage employer and if not, whether the FA would be willing to meet with the London Living Wage organisation. Members queried what proportion of the 1,800 jobs supported by Wembley Stadium events paid the London Living Wage or were zero-hours contracts. The committee then questioned how the Section 106 funds from Tottenham Hotspur's residency at Wembley had been used and sought an update on enforcement against pirate (illegal) car parks operating on event days.

Discussing the Stadium's community outreach activities, the committee questioned whether these could be targeted at hard to reach groups, particularly those activities for children and young people. In concluding their questioning, members queried how work experience and employment programmes provided by the Stadium were advertised and what the eligibility criteria for these were.

In response to the committee's questions Chris Bryant advised that the FA strongly advertised Wembley Stadium as a public transport destination, with all spectator communications promoting public transport. Limited parking was provided by the Stadium to meet hospitality obligations. The provision of travel cards to spectators did incentivise public transport but could be a costly and complicated solution. The FA would be very willing to engage in a broader discussion regarding a transport review for the Stadium, with appropriate representation from the Head of Transport at the FA. Members further heard that the process of determining kick-off times for football matches at the Stadium was complex and involved a large number of parties, including the FA. The timings were often largely dictated by commercial broadcast times.

Councillor Tatler asserted that further work could be undertaken to explore opportunities to broaden the economic impact for local businesses by encouraging different transport routes and via the Town Centre Managers, considering how to make these areas attractive to passing spectators. Furthermore, late kick-off times could be seen as opportunities to promote overnight stays in Wembley

Chris Whyte explained that the council had a significant role in the transportation planning for events, both on a case by case basis and in terms of the overall strategy. Within this process, consideration was given to the full journey length for spectators across all transport networks including motorways and rail links. There was a frequent use of private taxis by spectators and spaces had now been created for these cars to park to ensure they were less obstructive, alongside specific road blocks to better protect local neighbourhoods from associated parking pressures. The stadium did make provision for disabled spectators to access the stadium. Tony Kennedy advised that the council liaised closely with the FA regarding anticipated capacities and advance sales for events and confirmed that the Wembley event day parking scheme would not be implemented for capacities under 28,000 people.

Jake Wilson confirmed that £150m economic impact on Brent did not include expenditure by spectators within the Stadium grounds. The report did not detail the specific areas or businesses which benefited from this boost, or indeed experienced

a decrease in business on event days as this had not been part of the remit of the report. Consultation had however, been undertaken with local businesses, including those on spectator footfall routes and those elsewhere. Chris Bryant confirmed that further detail could be requested for any future reports of this nature. Councillor Tatler advised that Tottenham Hotspur's residency at Wembley had afforded the council a better understanding of the nature of club football against other kinds of events. The residency of the club had brought economic benefits to Wembley but other types of events were known to confer a greater economic boost. The council was currently undertaking research around areas for growth and projections had shown that Wembley could have a shortfall in hotel accommodation – this was therefore an issue that was being explored further. More broadly, there were a number of developments that aimed to build on the existing offer for visitors to Wembley including the creation of a Business Improvement District for Wembley. Wembley had been identified in the Mayors London Plan as an area of opportunity and the Town Centre Management team were exploring ways to capitalise on that status.

Chris Bryant advised that the FA was not London Living Wage accredited but did work with contractors to encourage payment of the London Living Wage and would look into a meeting with the relevant organisation. Jake Wilson explained that the 1,800 jobs figure was a widely used statistical measure based on the average Gross Value Added contribution of the Wembley Stadium events. It was not therefore possible to determine the wages paid for these positions nor the contract arrangements from the data currently available.

Chris Whyte (Operational Director, Environment Services) outlined the various uses of the Section 106 funds from the Tottenham Hotspur's residency at Wembley which included: event day activities of street cleaning, enforcement and licensing; installation of new CCTV on routes to and from the Stadium; installation of litter bins; new signage to support parking enforcement; and, funds to support the transport management plans for event days. There remained a sum left over and this would be put towards further improving street signage in Wembley. With regard to pirate parking sites in the borough, enforcement had driven the number down to as low as two recently, though the figure had most recently stood at nine. New sites were established regularly and continual enforcement activity was necessary to meet this challenge.

Chris Bryant confirmed that any suggestions that members' may have with regard to targeting outreach activities would be welcomed by the FA. In addition, every effort was made to distribute thousands of event tickets to Brent's residents and numbers distributed to the local community had increased significantly in recent years. However, it should be noted that the appeal of some events was not always particularly strong. Details of work schemes provided by the Stadium could be circulated to members.

### Data Requests

During the discussion, members requested that the following information, which was not available to be shared at the meeting, be circulated to the committee subsequently:

- Full details of the Section 106 funds from Tottenham Hotspur's residency at the Stadium and how these had been utilised by the Council.
- Details of the work experience programmes provided at the Stadium, including eligibility criteria and information on how these opportunities were advertised.
- Confirmation of whether residents in the neighbouring borough of Harrow were consulted.

RESOLVED:

The Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee recommended:

- i) That the Strategic Director Regeneration and Environment and Lead Member for Regeneration, Highways and Planning ensure that a summit is arranged to discuss ways to increase the number of spectators travelling to Wembley using public transport to over 90 per cent, with all the relevant parties including Transport for London, the Football Association and the Council.
- ii) That the terms of reference for the next iteration of the report on the economic impact of Wembley Stadium be agreed with the council and include the following information requested by the Community and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee:
  - a. An assessment of how different sized businesses are affected by Wembley Stadium events, including a risk assessment for smaller businesses;
  - b. Sample details of the types of jobs supported by events at the Stadium and whether these are London Living Wage positions and/or are offered as zero-hours contracts.
- iii) That the Strategic Director Regeneration and Environment, in conjunction with the FA ensure that a creative approach is taken to managing and utilising the Wembley event day parking scheme, particularly with regard to events with low ticket sales.
- iv) That the FA meet with representatives of the London Living Wage organisation.
- v) That a meeting be arranged between the FA and officers within the Children and Young People department to maximise the impact of Stadium outreach activities on hard to reach groups and to discuss targeted distribution of unsold event tickets to these groups.

## 8. Tackling Illegal Rubbish Dumping on Non-Council Land

Councillor Krupa Sheth (Lead Member for Environment) introduced the report detailing the challenges faced by the council when dealing with illegal dumped rubbish non-council land. Simon Finney (Head of Neighbourhood Management) was also in attendance to address the committee's queries. Members heard that the Council's approach to tackling illegal rubbish dumping both on Council and non-council owned land consisted mainly of a three pronged approach: education &

engagement, to address people's behaviour; enforcement, including reactive and proactive enforcement and investigative activity; and, clearance of the land. With regard to the latter element, the council's clean-up remit did not extend to non-council owned land and the responsibility for keeping private land clean and tidy rested with the owner. As a consequence, the council utilised powers under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act to issue Community Protection Notices (CPNs) requiring the owner to clear their land. This legislation also permitted the council to clear the land through works in default with a subsequent land charge added to the property or through a court order when owners were not responsive. In a minority of cases, it could be difficult to determine ownership of land. In such cases officers would work closely with Neighbourhood Managers and the community to try and address the issue through voluntary clean ups or by other means. For some sites, these challenges could not be resolved and the council had a small budget set aside to clear these and subsequently focus enforcement activity to prevent further rubbish dumping. Simon Finney emphasised that the investigative process which sought to establish the perpetrators of illegal rubbish dumping was the same for both council-owned and privately owned land.

The report before the committee also explored: the use of technology to underpin an intelligence led approach; developments regarding extended producer responsibility; and, the council's use of waste tagging. Addressing the issue of illegally dumped mattresses, it was concluded that any methodology to track mattresses to ensure owner responsibility would need to be supported by legislated processes to be effective. However, it was anticipated that strides made towards extended producer responsibility would have an impact on the overall volume of illegally dumped mattresses in Brent.

The Chair thanked the Lead Member and Officers for the introduction to the report and subsequently invited questions from the committee.

Members queried whether the use of Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPOs) had been explored to address those small pockets of land where persistent illegal rubbish dumping occurred. It was queried how the council addressed issues with domestic properties, whether the council encouraged a zero tolerance approach, and how the council engaged with communities on this matter. Members sought further details of the work regarding Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and landlord licensing with respect to the issue of illegal rubbish dumping. It was queried how members of the public could identify who owned land. The committee highlighted the importance of clear pictorial guides illustrating the council's policy to assist the public in understanding when the council could intervene. Questions were raised regarding the support available to private landowners to prevent illegal rubbish dumping on their land, and to shop keepers regarding illegal rubbish dumping in alleyways behind the commercial premises. It was further queried whether the council monitored whether advice and guidance provided to private landowners was acted upon. Members queried whether land where ownership could not be identified could be gifted to residents to develop communal spaces where appropriate. An update was sought on the communal skips pilot programme. Further information was requested on how closely the council was working with the National Bed Federation. In concluding their questions, Members asked whether the council had responded to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs consultation on reforming the UK packaging producer responsibility system and if this response had been made publically available.

Responding to the issues raised, Simon Finney advised that the use of CPOs to obtain private-owned land where illegal rubbish dumping was a persistent problem had not specifically been explored. However, the council in the past had purchased areas of land where for instance the state of the land represented a health hazard and alternative means to rectify the problem had been unsuccessful. The council relied on Land Registry records to identify ownership and this was available to members of the public via the government's Land Registry webpages. The council had explored re-securing land where ownership was unclear or sat with the Crown to support residents in bringing these areas back into community use again. In such cases, consideration would be given to development options, current condition and likelihood of deterioration.

Simon Finney further explained that there was set criteria to determine whether a garden constituted an 'untidy garden' for the purposes of enforcement action. Where the criteria were met rigorous action could be taken by the council's enforcement team, which would inspect the premises and issue a CPN or pursue further action through a court process if the owners remained uncooperative. It was understood that this information was made publically available to residents via the council's website, but subsequent confirmation of this would be provided to the committee. Members reiterated that it was important that this was provided in a clear way and where possible, was supported by examples to illustrate the thresholds for enforcement action.

Members were further informed that the Environment Enforcement Team worked closely with the Housing and Landlord Licensing Teams and there was considerable engagement with landlords, directly and via Veolia's (the council's public realm contractor) education and engagement team. Chris Whyte (Operational Director, Environment) confirmed that issues could be more prevalent in HMO properties where residents were required to share bins and there could be high turn-over of tenants. Councillor Krupa Sheth advised that the Neighbourhood Managers and Town Centre Managers worked with shop owners to tackle issues affecting alleyways. Simon Finney added that the Environment Enforcement Team also undertook a lot of work on alleyways which could be hotspots for illegal rubbish dumping. Whilst CCTV was a strong tool, considerable effort was still required to identify the perpetrators. The council actively encouraged alley gating schemes where appropriate and did also have cameras that could be easily installed for surveillance to aid enforcement. Councillor Tatler emphasised that due to the disparate nature of ownership of alleyways, the support provided to residents in addressing illegal rubbish dumping in these alleyways was very much shaped by the circumstances of each case. Chris Whyte added that the advice provided to private landowners often related to securing the area of land with a fence or other barrier to make access difficult and installing cameras. Simon Finney explained that where the council had issued a CPN to a landowner, one of the requirements was for that land to be kept clear and that appropriate protective measures were needed to achieve that. The environmental enforcement team worked closely with landowners in such circumstances and could demonstrate successful outcomes.

Discussing the community skips pilot, Simon Finney confirmed that this had not yet been completed and confirmed that in line with the committee's request, a full assessment could be provided once completed. Initial findings had shown that enthusiasm had waned a little as the pilot proceeded and there was a risk of

undermining both the council's bulky waste programme and the promotion of the message to re-use items. The programme would be expanded to other areas to further explore its reception and use by residents.

Simon Finney explained that the Environmental Enforcement Team had liaised with the National Bed Federation when undertaking research to support the report before the committee. This was a very useful association to have built links with and their approach to the challenges around recycling beds also focused on producer responsibility. Amar Dave (the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Environment) confirmed that the council would respond to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs consultation on reforming the UK packaging producer responsibility system and would make the response publically available.

During the discussion, Members requested that the following information, not available to be shared at the meeting, be circulated to the committee subsequently:

- a review of the community skips pilot, to be provided to the committee when available.

RESOLVED:

The Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee recommended:

- i) That the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment, together with the Lead Member for Environment, ensures that the council actively promotes the enforcement action that can be taken by the council with respect to private land, promotes a zero tolerance approach in such circumstances and provides clear information to the public, illustrated with pictorial examples, regarding thresholds for enforcement action.
- ii) That the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment ensure that officers identify disused areas of crown land in Brent, vulnerable to illegal rubbish dumping, as a first step to exploring potential improvements to the areas.
- iii) That the Environmental Enforcement Team formally monitor the uptake of advice provided to private landowners.
- iv) That the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment ensure a response is made to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs consultation on reforming the UK packaging producer responsibility system, to highlight the particular problem of illegal dumping of mattresses, and that response be made public to ensure residents are made aware of the council's position.
- v) That the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment, ensure that a meeting is arranged with the National Bed Foundation to discuss being part of their proposed pilot.



9. **On Street Parking Management of larger vehicles and an update on Electric Vehicle Charging**

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor Tatler (Lead Member for Regeneration, Highways and Planning) introduced the report detailing the use of on-street parking management processes and updating members on the four electric vehicle charging point (EVCP) implementation programmes currently underway.

The report highlighted that the council regulated and charged for on street parking to: manage demand from residents, businesses and visitors; assist the smooth flow of traffic; reduce the number of vehicle trips, particularly at peak times; and encourage the uptake of sustainable travel options. Demand for parking in Brent was very high and there were currently 40 controlled parking zones in the borough – approximately 35% of the borough. The Wembley Stadium Protective Parking Scheme (WSPPS) covered a further 35% of the borough. The remaining 30% of the borough did not have area wide parking controls. In April 2017 the council introduced a revised carbon emissions-based residents' permit scheme to encourage residents to purchase low emissions vehicles. Furthermore, following consultation in 2016, the council was due to implement a reduction in the maximum weight of 3.5t for resident parking permits.

With regard to delivering the EVCP network, the report set out that the council's approach was informed by the locations of registered electric or hybrid vehicles, as well as the need to have minimum impact on the ever increasing pressure for parking. There was not a single overarching delivery programme for charging infrastructure and therefore, the different types of charges (Source London, Rapid Chargers and GULCS lamp column) were being implemented under an overarching strategic umbrella by Highways and Infrastructure and Transportation Planning, ensuring all types of electric vehicle users could access the charging network.

In the subsequent discussion, members: questioned the risk of the EVCP technology becoming obsolete over the contract period; sought an update on the usage of the charging points to date; and queried if any modelling had been undertaken with regard to air quality and electric car usage in the borough. Comment was sought on the ways in which the council could encourage the scrappage of diesel cars and promote the use of electric vehicles. Members questioned whether various commercial opportunities, such as the provision of finance or working directly with producers to promote particular vehicles, had been considered. It was further queried whether the local authority could implement a carbon levy on carbon intensive local businesses via for example, powers granted under the Localism Act, to subsidise a local scrappage scheme. It was emphasised that the council should be promoting their role in providing the EVCP network for the borough and consideration should be given to the application of the council logo to the charging points. Members questioned whether the providers of the charging points used electricity from renewable sources. Members sought an estimate on the length of time from resident request to installation of an EVCP and questioned whether any consideration had been given to further lowering the minimum weight for vehicles eligible for resident permits. Members raised concerns about commercial vehicles being parked in residential areas and questioned what could be done to address this issue. In concluding their questioning, members sought assurance that any council owned vehicles were electric.

In response, Councillor Tatler advised that primarily it was the responsibility of the business owner to ensure that their product was future proofed and that the technology remained relevant to consumers. The council also included within the agreements with the providers the issue of future-proofing the EVCPs. Conversations were also underway with the providers to place the council logo on the charging columns to promote the council's investment in delivering the EVCP network in the borough. Furthermore, the council was also working on placing the council logo on the Zip car fleet. An associated communications plan for the new charging points, including an article in the Brent magazine and also covering the app which needed to be used to access the EVCPs, was in place.

Councillor Tatler further confirmed that an assessment of the possible options for encouraging the scrappage of diesel cars and the promotion of electric cars, would be provided to the committee following the meeting, including use of powers under the Localism Act. A scrappage scheme for micro businesses was currently in place and the Mayor of London was due to be announcing a scrappage scheme for people on lower incomes. Councillor Tatler cautioned that it was important to be mindful of the impact of placing further pressure on businesses in some sectors.

Tony Kennedy (Head of Highways and Infrastructure) advised that it was not known whether the providers of the EVCPs used renewable sources of electricity and this would subsequently be confirmed to the committee. Information would also be provided to the committee on the usage of the EVCPs, where available. Work could be undertaken to provide the committee with an estimate of the improvements to air quality that could be achieved with an increased use of electric cars, over petrol and diesel cars in the borough. Councillor Tatler emphasised that the council was being politically and strategically ambitious in this area and was keen to tackle challenges head-on. The delivery of the EVCP network was still at the early stages and in six months' time the council would be better placed to evaluate the impacts of the programme.

Tony Kennedy further explained that following the request for a charging point, a resident could expect to wait between four and six months before installation, depending on the grants available. Amar Dave (Strategic Director, Regeneration and Environment) explained that this was a rapidly changing field with more and more car manufacturers confirming a move to electric vehicles in the next few years, as well as other companies developing technologies to retrofit existing vehicles. It was anticipated that from 2021 there would be a noticeable increase in the use of electric vehicles in London and Brent would be at the forefront of supporting the EVCP network.

Discussing the minimum vehicle weights permitted for residents parking permits, Councillor Tatler confirmed that the fee increased for cars above 2.5 tonnes and significantly, there were a number of different fee categories depending on engine size and car emissions. The focus of the scheme was very much to deter the most polluting vehicles. Addressing concerns regarding commercial vehicles being parked in residential roads in the borough, Tony Kennedy emphasised that the Controlled Parking Zones were an effective management tool, but where these did not exist, it was difficult to address this issue. Councillor Tatler added that it was necessary to take a nuanced approach to this matter as for some self-employed residents, such vehicles supported their livelihoods. Tony Kennedy explained that the council did not have its own fleet of vehicles and the fleet of home to school

transport vehicles shared with harrow was not electric. However, this contract was due to expire in 2023 and consideration would be given to this issue in preparation for the necessary recommissioning. Councillor Tatler highlighted the carbon offsetting fund, which was drawn from developers via the planning process. Currently the size of this was quite small but the council was exploring how best to use these funds, with consideration being given to ideas such as planting more street trees, installing green walls and solar panels.

During the discussion, members requested that the following information, which was not available to be shared at the meeting, be provided to the committee subsequently:

- Confirmation of whether the council's EVCP providers use renewable sources of electricity.

RESOLVED:

The Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee recommended:

- i) That the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment and the Lead Member for Regeneration, Highways and Planning, ensure an options appraisal is undertaken on how the council can encourage diesel scrappage and support residents in the start-up costs of changing to electric vehicles, and that this appraisal include consideration of commercial opportunities for the council.
- ii) That the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment ensure information is provided to the committee on the usage levels of EVCPs in the borough.
- iii) That the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment note the committee's view that when the council next procures a fleet of vehicles these should be electric vehicles.
- iv) That the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment and the Lead Member for Regeneration, Highways and Planning, ensures the council explores what powers the council has to introduce a carbon levy on local businesses.

#### 10. **Any other urgent business**

None.

The meeting closed at 8.22 pm

M KELCHER  
Chair