

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY BOARD
Committee Room 3A - Town Hall
14 November 2017 (6.00pm - 7.10pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Conservative Group John Crowder, Robby Misir, Viddy Persaud (Vice-Chair), +Carol Smith, +Frederick Thompson, Linda Trew and Michael White

Residents' Group Barbara Matthews, Ray Morgon and Barry Mugglestone

East Havering Residents' Group' Gillian Ford (Chairman)

UKIP Group Ian de Wulverton and Lawrence Webb

Independent Residents' Group Graham Williamson

Labour Group

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Keith Darvill and Darren Wise.

+Substitute members Councillor Frederick Thompson (for Steven Kelly) and Councillor Carol Smith (for Dilip Patel).

Councillors Roger Ramsey, Phil Martin and David Durant were also present.

All decisions were taken with no votes against.

The Chairman reminded Members of the action to be taken in an emergency.

31 CALL-IN OF A NON KEY DECISION REGARDING THE MAYOR'S DRAFT TRANSPORT STRATEGY - LONDON BOROUGH OF HAVERING RESPONSE

The report before Members detailed the call-in of a Non-Key Executive Decision relating to the Council's response to the Mayor's Draft Transport Strategy.

A requisition signed by Councillors Ray Morgon and Graham Williamson had called-in the Non-Key Executive Decision (68/17) dated 26 October 2017.

The reasons for the requisition were as follows:

“This was due to a failure to specifically highlight and raise concern at the Mayor’s proposed car-free and lite (new) developments for all of London, including suburban boroughs such as Havering and a call for the Mayor to push forward with work on the suggested Belvedere-Rainham crossing which would fatally undermine the well-being of the new Beam Park Development.”

During the debate Members asked for and received several points of clarification which were provided by the Leader of the Council, the Council’s Director of Neighbourhoods and the Council’s Transport Planning Team Leader.

Firstly Members looked at the Mayor’s proposed car-free and lite new developments for all of London.

The general feeling from Members was that as an outer London borough Havering did not benefit from the higher levels of infrastructure that inner London boroughs did and had concerns regarding the proposals that future development in the borough would be considered with reduced or no parking provision.

Members advised that the parking provisions that had been included in Havering’s Local Plan were being maintained in the London Plan and that the information in the Mayor’s Draft Transport Strategy appeared to contradict this.

The Leader of the Council/Director of Neighbourhoods commented that Havering’s response should focus on those matters that are of most relevance/concern to Havering. The recommended response reflected this approach.

The key point was that whilst the draft Mayor’s Transport Strategy (MTS) highlighted the importance of transport in the section ‘New Homes and Jobs’, this was not adequately reflected in the document as far as Havering was involved. As drafted, it was a major concern that the MTS did not include Mayoral commitments to the provision of strategic transport infrastructure to support the growth envisaged in Havering during the next 15 years as set out in the Council’s ‘Vision’ and its strategies especially the Havering Local Plan.

Members were aware that Havering’s new Local Plan was clear that timely and appropriate infrastructure provision should underpin the development identified over the plan period. The section of the Local Plan dealing with ‘Connections’ identified a number of key strategic transport interventions

which would support the delivery of the homes and jobs in the Plan. These include improved north-south connections, remodelling Gallows Corner and looking at scope to make changes to Romford's Ring Road. The MTS would only be consistent with the Mayor's approach to planning for and accommodating 'good growth', if the MTS identified these.

The Council had highlighted these improvements with the Mayor (and his Deputies) already in several discussions and meetings. From the responses, the expectation was that these would be reflected in the MTS. Officers considered that in the Council's response, the Mayor should be asked to reconsider the approach in the MTS to ensure that this was addressed.

The MTS claimed to take a spatial approach to transport and planning in that it said that the differences between Central, Inner and Outer London were noted and recognised with specific policies and proposals. Officers considered, however, that in practice, it failed to deliver on this and the specific circumstances of Outer London (including Havering) were not addressed realistically nor satisfactorily.

Members were advised that In July 2015, a new partnership called *Local London* was formed by six Local Authorities (Barking and Dagenham, Enfield, Havering, Newham, Redbridge and Waltham Forest) designed to give North East London more strength in negotiations over funding and powers.

Local London had prepared a position statement on the draft MTS and Havering had been fully involved as this had been developed. The position statement covered Havering's key strategic transport objectives. The statement had also provided another opportunity to raise relevant issues directly with the Mayor.

Having regard to the above comments, it was recommended that Havering's response should primarily focus on the need for the Mayor to reconsider his strategy so as to better reflect a commitment to identifying the infrastructure that would support Havering's growth.

Members were advised that the recommended response reflected advice and comments received as a result of discussions held with senior TfL staff who had recently met with senior Havering officers and the Leader of the Council. The recommended response also reflected comments made by Deputy Mayor for Transport Valerie Shawcross that Havering's response should give prominence to key strategic transport objectives.

Members noted that discussions between senior officers and senior TfL staff would be ongoing as they created stepping stones in recognising Havering's needs and would benefit holistic place shaping and the critical need for relevant infrastructure.

Secondly Members looked at the proposed river crossing from Rainham to Belvedere.

Officers advised that in recent years there had been a number of consultations undertaken by TfL on proposed further east London river crossings specifically in 2012, 2013, 2014, and most recently in 2016.

Havering had consistently supported the principle of additional river crossings in east London in order to support the significant numbers of jobs and homes planned for east London over the next 15/20 years.

The MTS showed that there was continued support for the Silvertown Tunnel. However the Mayor would only give consideration to further east London river crossings following delivery of the Silvertown Tunnel and the Lower Thames Crossing.

The Council had consistently argued that TfL should undertake further feasibility work as a priority to avoid very undesirable uncertainty and blight on the future of the important regeneration sites in the areas adjoining a Belvedere- Rainham crossing and its facilities as well as the ongoing activities of existing facilities such as CEME and existing businesses. The Council had also said that this work should include detailed appraisals of the potential impact of a crossing on the land holdings and potential development areas being promoted by the GLA and Havering.

Havering had also consistently stressed that any crossing between Rainham and Belvedere should be a local facility and that Havering would need to be satisfied that the operation and management of the crossing would be able to restrict its use to only local traffic. Highways England were currently progressing a new Lower Thames Crossing which would provide a further link across the River Thames between a new junction on the M25 in Havering (between junctions 29 and 30) and the A2 in Kent and the Council had argued that this crossing would be more appropriate for strategic traffic.

The Havering proposed response to the MTS requested that the Mayor included a commitment within his strategy to undertake detailed feasibility work to look into the scope of a river crossing between Belvedere and Rainham. The Council would expect the detailed feasibility work to address the issues that Havering had raised in its earlier consultation responses. At this stage the Council was asking for the Mayor to undertake feasibility work rather than specifically commit to delivering a crossing at this location.

As a host borough the Council would be involved in any feasibility work that was carried out and would have an opportunity to review any assessments that were undertaken. Havering would inevitably ask that this work considered the wider impact it would have on the surrounding areas including the Rainham and Beam Park Housing Zone. A view would be taken by the Council following this as to whether or not to formally support an additional crossing between Belvedere and Rainham.

As was currently the case with the Lower Thames Crossing, officers would keep Ward Councillors regularly updated as the project developed and make them aware of any feasibility work that was carried out.

Following the debate, the two requisitioners withdrew the call-in and it was **RESOLVED** that the matter be dismissed.

Chairman