

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

At a meeting of the **CULTURE AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** held on **MONDAY, 22ND JANUARY, 2024** at 6.30 pm in Committee Room 2, Town Hall, Judd Street, London WC1H 9JE

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE PRESENT

Councillors Awale Olad (Chair), Camron Aref-Adib, Sharon Hardwick, Matthew Kirk and Izzy Lenga and Gio Spinella

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ABSENT

Councillors Nina De Ayala Parker, Rishi Madlani and Stephen Stark

ALSO PRESENT

Councillors Danny Beales (Cabinet Member for New Homes, Jobs and Investment)
Councillor Adam Harrison (Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden).

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda for the meeting. They are subject to approval and signature at the next meeting of the Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee and any corrections approved at that meeting will be recorded in those minutes.

MINUTES

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Nina De Ayala Parker, Rishi Madlani and Stephen Stark who was substituted by Councillor Gio Spinella.

2. DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF STATUTORY DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS, COMPULSORY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND VOLUNTARY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS IN MATTERS ON THIS AGENDA

Councillor Kirk declared that he used lime bikes and water in relation to items 7 and 8 on the agenda.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS (IF ANY)

The Chair announced that the meeting was broadcast live by the Council to the Internet and could be viewed on the website for six months after the meeting. After that time, webcasts were archived and could be made available on DVD upon request. Those who were seated in the room or participated via Teams were

deemed to have consented to their contributions being recorded and broadcast and to the use of those sound recordings and images for webcasting and/or training purposes.

4. DEPUTATIONS (IF ANY)

The Chair informed members that three deputations had been received and accepted, copies of the deputation statements were included in the supplementary agenda.

The first two deputations were from Frank Lampen and Tony Travers respectively and related to item 7 Thames Water and would be heard when that item was reached on the agenda.

The third deputation related to item 8 Dockless Bike Hire Scheme and a paper on mode choice, sustainability and the environmental impacts of shared micro mobility. One of the authors of the paper Professor Kay Axhausen was present to answer any questions the Committee might have on the paper. In addition, Hamish Birchall was also attending remotely to ask questions on this item. This would also be considered when the item was reached on the agenda.

5. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DECIDES TO TAKE AS URGENT

There was none.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED –

THAT the minutes of the meeting held on 14th December 2023 be signed as an accurate record.

7. UPDATE FROM THAMES WATER

Consideration was given to the report of Thames Water.

Consideration was also given to the deputation statements referred to in Item 4 above.

The following responses were given by the deputees to members questions:

- In terms of engagement and the compensation offered by Thames Water to residents impacted by the flood on Belsize Road, there was a lot of engagement when the incident happened with a representative and van present on site. In relation to compensation a lot of the residents claimed through their insurance company.
- The questions and issues raised with Thames Water were around how long it took to get the water shut off, the focus of the group now was around the response since the flooding of evaluating what needed to be done to prevent a recurrence in the future.
- What residents and the South Hampstead Flood Action Group were requesting was that Thames Water and the Council had a coordinated and comprehensive approach. Looking at all the different things that had happened in the area which were all connected causing erosion and was likely to lead to more pressure on the pipes leading to more flooding in the area. There does not appear to be a coordinated approach between the different organisations.
- Thames Water seemed to be looking at the number of leaks rather than the devastating impact on residents.
- In terms of obtaining flood insurance for the area this was a major issue. It was a bit of the luck of the draw with some people unable to sell their flat because purchasers had not been able to get insurance for their flat.
- In terms of the 2022 flood there had been a lot of satisfaction with Thames Water sorting out repairs and compensating people for the damage.
- What was worrying people was the need to pay out £20,000 to reinstate their flat and the constant fear that the flooding might happen again.
- What residents were asking from Thames Water was a full and accurate response rather than assertions on soil composition and traffic in reports which local residents and their expert advisers believe were inaccurate.
- With regards to contents insurance there were some residents in the area that could not afford contents insurance and when their property was flooded lost everything .and almost lost their lives.
- In terms of whether the Council had the power to implement proposals such as lane rental charges, TfL had the lane rental charge powers, there were fines for over running projects with a number of London Boroughs fining Thames Water for this.
- The idea was for this to act as an incentive for Thames Water to comply with the regulations and make life easier for residents, there was also a huge demand on Council officers time to check everything.
- The aim was if there were penalties for work undertaken out of hours and powers for councils to step in and complete reinstatements and charge costs to the utility companies this would act as an incentive to reduce such failures from the utility companies.
- Residents were asking that Thames Water continued to monitor areas where the vulnerable pipes were located and the ground around the pipes.
- With regards to the challenges faced by residents south of Euston Road and areas of Goodge Street and Mortimer Road there had been 25 separate leaks in the last 2-3 years. There had been 100 to 150 road openings in the quarter

square mile and it would be interesting to hear from Thames Water how that number could be reduced.

The Director of Environment and Sustainability and the Street works Authorisation and Compliance Manager made the following comments in response to the deputations and members questions:

- Camden continued to work with the South Hampstead Flood Action Group and Thames Water to mitigate surface water flooding in the area.
- The Council had commissioned a ground penetration survey along Belsize Road to scan for void space under the ground that could affect underground utility. This would help to provide information to support maintenance of the infrastructure.
- The Council was also working on the delivery of two sustainable drainage system schemes in the area, Priory Terrace and Goldhurst Terrace which was funded by Thames Water, the Council and local community infrastructure levy funds respectively.
- These schemes aimed to mitigate some of the surface water issues that had been discussed by the deputees.
- With regards to specific planning points raised around permitted development rights and Article 4, the government granted permitted development rights to what was considered to be small scale development without the need for planning permission.
- The government had also sought to expand permitted development rights to homeowners which meant that local authorities had less control over developments of that nature.
- Where works were permitted development, the local authority could regain control over these by showing Article 4 directions. The Council had already imposed a number of Article 4 directions that were relevant to this discussion.
- In the borough Article 4 removed permitted development rights for the excavation of basements which meant that all basements required an application for planning permission of which the impact of the development of any permission was considered on geology and hydrology and ensured that the scheme would not adversely affect drainage or cause damage to the water environment.
- South Hampstead already had an Article 4 Direction in relation to installing paving in front gardens which was connected to the creation of off-street parking, which was not supported by the Council's policies and planning permission was required for those type of works.
- Belsize had similar article 4 preventions on paving of front gardens in addition the Council's emerging local plan which was currently at the consultation stage considered flood risk, sustainable drainage systems and the risk of flooding from any source requiring flood risk assessment. The Council welcomed comments on the local plan, there was a link to the app on the Council's website where residents could leave their comments.
- With regards to the lane rental proposals, Camden was part of the New London Lane Rental Strategy Group. The Council had only been granted the

powers to have lane rental recently by the Department for Transport (DfT) and a group had been set up to establish a borough lane rental scheme for London.

- This was a London wide scheme rather than just Camden which local authorities would join to mirror the TfL scheme. The working group consisted of Camden, TfL, Kensington and Chelsea, Enfield and Lambeth.
- The group had been working with the DfT and TfL to establish a framework for the governance of the scheme that would be acceptable by the DfT.
- The draft scheme had gone out for consultation to all stakeholders for 6 to 8 weeks and would then go to DfT for final approval. There were a lot of legalities involved. The intention was for this to work the same way as the permit scheme worked which would give local authorities London wide more powers with utility companies.

Simon Moore – (London Water System Planning Manager Thames Water), Michael Benteke (London Stakeholder Engagement Manager Thames Water) and Emily Hedger (Systems Planner Thames Water) were present to respond to the deputations and Committee's questions. They provided the following information:

- Thames Water had looked through and would continue to consider the proposals in the deputations in more detail and were committed to having a follow up conversation with the deputees.
- The organisation would come back with a response to all the issues raised in the deputations.

Action By: London Stakeholder Engagement Manager Thames Water, and London Water System Planning Manager Thames Water

- The thoughtful and constructive approach the deputees had taken was appreciated.
- An update had been provided in the Thames Water report in the agenda on the network performance issues highlighted a year ago at the Scrutiny Committee meeting.
- The report also provided a further update on where Thames Water was with the major replacement network programmes in Camden and some of the performance issues.
- In terms of the unstable ground in Belsize Road and how this was affecting Thames Water assets this had been touched on in previous calls with the deputees in the past week. Therefore, in relation to the work the organisation had done and the data collected they had not seen any evidence which was why the void survey would be critical in providing an understanding of what was going on in the area.
- The organisation was aware and appreciated the strength of feeling locally, when the issues with the burst water pipes occurred in the area Thames Water commissioned experts to investigate to understand the issues and cause of the failures in the area. The environment appeared to be an area which was hostile to buried cast iron pipes.

- Although there had not been any direct monitoring of the pipes, however in terms of performance of the pipes, and numbers of bursts in the area, from experience if the issue were ground movement there would be an expectation that a lot more pipe bursts would have occurred in the area if this were a major factor.
- It was important for the void survey of the area to be carried out, the outcome of which was waited on with great interest.
- Thames Water did have concerns with the 15-inch pipe which was not uncommon in London.
- This mains pipe on Belsize Road was being monitored by the organisation and was on the long list of schemes to be considered for replacement once the team were aware of how much money it would have.
- There was 2000 kilometres of large trunk mains around London with 27,000 kilometres of distribution mains in London. This was a large network managed by Thames Water which required using a rational logical data driven approach to try and ensure that the expenditure of the network was spent fairly as well as providing the best benefit to its customers.
- This included trying to bring down leakages as quickly as possible, reducing the number of bursts across the network and supply interruptions to customers.
- This was being looked at in terms of investment as a business and the 5-year investment cycle.
- Replacing water mains was a real priority for the organisation and therefore a large submission had been put forward to replace about 500 kilometres of pipes.
- The 42-inch mains pipe appeared to exhibit a different mode of failure, this was a much newer pipe, here there appeared to be more of a local issue around ground movement due to climate change factors.
- There appeared to have been something unusual that happened in that area and the whole section had been replaced as part of the repair of that pipe.
- In terms of insurance and responsibility for the flooding caused by a burst main, Thames Water would take responsibility for that and would not expect customers to go to their insurers without contacting Thames Water. This appeared to be what had happened with most customers.
- In terms of compensation, Thames Water did not pay direct compensation, however within settlements there was payment for hardship that took this into consideration and the intention was that everyone entitled was paid fairly. Old or damaged items were replaced with new items.
- In terms of Insurance companies pulling out from insuring households within high-risk areas of flooding, this was a huge issue within the industry, which was being experienced globally, unfortunately Thames Water was not in a position single handedly to change this.
- Thames Water had raised this issue directly with the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) as a serious issue to be looked at as well as a joint letter signed by several local authorities asking that the government look into this issue.

Invited to comment on the Thames Water response, the deputees noted that:

- a lot of what had been said by Thames Water representatives was what had been heard before, however they looked forward to receiving a detailed response to the points and issues raised.
- It was good news that the void ground penetration surveys were happening.
- The issue for residents was that they did not have a point of access to the people at Thames Water making the decisions when things went wrong.
- There was a need to convey back to the Head Office how they could better engage with the Council and residents.

In response Thames Water's London Water System Planning Manager commented that he worked at the Head Office in Reading, although there were people in far more senior positions in the business helping to shape the plan, he was head of London Planning trying to build a plan for London. He had attended the meeting to talk about where the organisation was with the plan and to receive first-hand knowledge of local issues.

In terms of future plans the organisation could not commit to anything until it knew how much money would be allocated. Camden had two thirds of its pipes replaced, the organisation was aware that there were areas of Camden which had not yet had its pipes replaced where there were issues of poor performance and the aim was to ultimately replace all the pipes in the area. Thames Water was happy to commit to continue to engage with Camden and come back in a year's time to provide an update on the long-term plan.

The Chair thanked the deputees for attending the meeting and their deputations informing them that the Committee expected a full response from Thames Water to the issues raised.

Action By: London Stakeholder Engagement Manager Thames Water, and London Water System Planning Manager Thames Water

Committee members made the following comments:

- Given what was happening, the current privatisation proposals did not appear to be a sensible approach to take and it was hoped that this would change in the future.
- Given all that had been discussed it was worrying that Camden was still not viewed by Thames Water as a priority area.
- How could Thames Water be trusted to invest properly in the improvements required across its network, when the true facts were not forthcoming in how much profit the company was making.

In response to Committee members questions, Thames Water representatives, advised that:

- Risk mitigation of basement flooding was a top priority for Thames Water as well as the impact of supply interruptions to large areas and environmental impacts of flooding.
- Thames Water had submitted an enhancement case which sought permission to spend over and above its regulatory capital to improve basement flooding mitigation. It was hoped that this would be approved as part of the next business plan.
- Consequences and impacts of flooding were assessed from a model point of view and considered with local operational teams. Having meetings in the local areas also helped as it provided an in-depth picture of the situation in the area.
- The replacement of pipes in the borough had reduced flooding to around a quarter of the bursts previously seen.
- Most of the mains repairs carried out in Camden were through proactive activities found working through the fixed program on the network where leaks were located and repaired.
- In terms of the comparison with the local boroughs, the London Water System Planning Manager could not say for sure why these boroughs were selected, other than to say that they were selected by the team over the past year and were in relatively close proximity to Camden. However, this did not mean that the replacement program had finished it was still ongoing with a lot more work still to do.
- To complete the programme of replacement work would require Thames Water prioritising its money, water bills going up, investors increasing their investments in the business which they were committed to continue to do and also realising that it took time to complete.
- In terms of solving the flooding in an area and London, a London Water Strategic Group comprising Thames Water, London Councils, Environment Agency and the GLA had been set up at the end of 2022. The long-term approach was to obtain funding streams and to develop a London wide strategy working with local community groups to look into the issue of flooding in the capital.
- As already mentioned, the primary criteria for looking at an area was burst per kilometre of pipe.
- The number of leakages in the Belsize Road area did not make it stand out from a purely data driven approach.
- Thames Water would take away the information provided this evening and determine whether it pushed the Belsize Road area ahead of other pipes across the network.
- Thames Water was developing a Public Value Framework approach for its decision-making criteria which took into account extra things that benefitted the environment and the community that was not just money and data driven.
- Ultimately all the pipes would get replaced over a period of time, age was only one factor when considering pipe replacement, performance of the pipes in terms of bursts and leaks was a major factor.
- All the pipes could not be replaced at once, they had to be replaced in the right order and would take a long time. Thames Water was looking to replace

300 to 400 kilometres of highest risk trunk mains pipes even at an accelerated rate this would not be completed until 2050.

- There was also a deliverability issue because of the impact of replacement on London streets, with not more than 2 or 3 trunk main schemes being replaced at a time because of the traffic impact.
- In terms of the statement made by Thames Water's Operations Director at the Scrutiny meeting attended in February 2023 about the company making a loss of £11m whereas the press reporting the company making a profit of £400m, the company had not refuted this in the press.
- This would need to be clarified, however the £11m loss referred to related to cash available to the company while the £400m referred to gearing and valued worth of debt.
- It was important to point out that with regards to the proposals in Professor Travis document, rather than generate friction between the organisation and the Council which the proposals appear to encourage it would be helpful if Thames Water, the Council and other utility companies could continue to work together and build on the relationship established.

Thames Water officers were thanked for attending the meeting noting that the Committee expected a detailed response to the issues raised in the deputation.

RESOLVED –

THAT the report be noted.

8. DOCKLESS BIKE HIRE SCHEME - PROGRESS UPDATE AND PARKING MANAGEMENT

Consideration was given to the report of the Director of Environment and Sustainability.

The Committee noted the written submission of Hamish Birchall on sustainability concerns regarding the e-scooter and e-bike hire trial and noted that Professor Kay Axhausen was present to answer questions on his paper about mode choice, sustainability and the environmental impacts of shared micro-mobility.

Professor Kay Axhausen gave the following responses to Committee members questions:

- He was not aware of the work done by Steer and could not therefore comment on how they arrived at 8% mode shift from cars.
- The starting point for discussion about transport modal shift in London was the London Area Transport Study which conducted a big survey of transport in London.
- The Zurich study of the environmental impact of shared micro mobility was based on intensive observation of the impact of shared systems because

each person using each vehicle could be tracked using a GPS tracking survey. It was possible for Camden to conduct similar observation perhaps jointly with other boroughs by spreading the cost.

- The learning from the study was that it could not be assumed that shared systems would result in a beneficial environmental impact, the modes replaced, vehicles used and mode of operation needed to be looked at to determine the carbon impact.
- Local authorities could improve its policies in this area by looking at local numbers derived from the London Area Transport Study and in collaboration with TfL looking at the mode choice behaviour for the boroughs, so they had an idea whether the numbers provided by the operators were realistic.
- In central London, a lot of the shared systems appeared to be driven by tourists and an option would be to look at the alternative impact of a tourist on the tube or on a bus and then also consider the behaviour of the local community.
- Linear transport studies should provide a clearer picture of what to expect.
- The numbers provided by the operators appeared to be high, this would need to be cross checked and verified, the paper by Steer might be a good point to start from.
- It should not be surprising that the data had indicated that mass deployment of e-bikes had little impact on car use, given that shared bicycles were mostly used as last mile, first mile modes and could not replace the car because these were not trips undertaken by car.
- What was different was where people acquired their own e-bike or scooter which was available when and where they needed it and was a different policy. Ownership of privately owned bikes and scooters was probably more worthwhile than having big reliance on shared systems.
- In terms of whether the figures quoted from the Dockless Bike providers about carbon emissions saved and fewer motor vehicle trips were plausible these would have to be considered in appropriate context before determining if these were plausible figures.
- It was important for the Council to monitor the progress E-Bike Hire firms made on their life cycle analysis by requesting properly verified and audited numbers and not just accepting unverified figures, so that the numbers could be considered in a bigger context and determine whether they made a positive contribution to the CO2 balance.

Alex Berwin (Head of Policy, Human Forest) and Hal Stevenson (Lime) provided the following responses to members questions.

- At the moment Human Forest had a buffer in place of 30 metres diameter around the parking bays which was to account for any GPS drift.
- This was set up as a trial as Human Forest only started operating in Camden at the beginning of May/June 2023. It would be reduced to 10 metres diameter to determine if this solved the problem of e-bikes being piled up outside parking bays.

- Human Forest workshops received alerts when there was an accumulation of Human Forest e-bikes in an area. The team would go out to rectify the situation, the response time was about 50 minutes.
- Lime tried to get to any location where dockless bikes were obstructing within an hour. It had 250 people working across London, of which at least 15 were in Camden and able to respond to complaints when made.
- The accumulation of bikes piling up outside of parking bays were definitely things that could be improved and Human Forest would actively look into improving these.
- From the Lime perspective parking compliance had gone up from under 70% to 95%, in terms of managing compliance of e-bikes becoming obstructive due to oversaturation in agreed locations, in the short-term Lime had committed to employing more van drivers to drive around the borough to remove e-bikes obstructing pavements.
- It was very clear on the app that the red zone was where bikes could not be parked.
- A long-term solution would be to have more parking locations spread across a wider area so that there was more capacity and places for people to park the e-bikes.
- In terms of Lime pricing for e-bike journeys, the first 10 minutes were free, then it cost 23pence per minute and 25pence to park in a bay. Human Forest had different options for one off users and regular users, such as a bundle costing £3.99 as well as monthly subscriptions costing £1.50 a day where you could have two 30-minute trips.
- Human Forest tried to make the service as accessible and affordable for people as possible for those commuters that wanted to switch to using the bike.
- Part of the revenue share generated, Lime put back into the borough to reinvest in active travel and cycling schemes.
- Lime needed to make sure it was pricing its services in a way that was affordable, accessible, sustainable and financially viable.
- The hacking issue had been fixed with the exception of a few bikes that Lime were unable to retrieve.
- Lime rolled out a hardware and software update across the whole of the London fleet that was put into place at the end of October 2023.
- This had been a huge factor in improving parking of dockless bikes in Camden and across London.
- On drink riding both e-bike companies had similar measures in place such as sobriety test.
- Of the 200,000 trips a month, 5% of those that did not end up with the e-bike parked properly had warnings and or fines attached to them.
- If there was an issue with any of the e-bikes, there were clear contact details as well as a QR code where a team could be contacted to respond to any issues raised.
- There were also conditions and clear instructions requesting that patrons check the bike thoroughly before using.
- There was an app available where any issues with the bike could be reported.

- Both Lime and Human Forest worked with the Council to promote the use of helmets when riding e-bikes. Discounts on trips were provided if a photograph was taken showing the customer wearing a helmet.
- The Police and other Enforcement agencies had raised security concerns about having closed compartments storing helmets because there was the potential to put other dangerous things in compartments, particularly given parking locations proximity to major transport infrastructure.
- The other issue was that for health reasons riders did not like using shared helmets.
- Lime had its own in-house specific fleet of vehicles which transported the bikes. The fleet was transitioning to a fully electric fleet.
- Both operators also had apps where any issue with the bike could be reported.
- Human Forest sent a lot of educational emails to customers reminding them about how to use the bikes and to park responsibly. There was generally high compliance not only in Camden but across the whole of London.
- Human Forest had also produced artificial intelligence into the app which could detect if a bike was parked inappropriately and this had improved parking compliance.
- Camden had some of the highest parking compliance in London, the scheme had come a long way from when it was initially introduced.
- The key performance indicators were quite rigorous, with Human Forest also reaching a 95% compliance rate. The company was always seeking improvements but did not believe that increasing the KPI would fix a lot of the issues.
- Similarly latest compliance figures from Lime were 95% which the company had shared on a monthly basis with officers and were happy to share with the Committee in an easily understandable form.
- Lime used similar technology to Human Forest and operated in more boroughs, having parking agreements with 15 boroughs.
- 9 of the boroughs had the same parking rules as Camden and were located in central London which was progress from the previous situation.
- Lime also operated in a number of outer London Boroughs which required customers to leave bikes in marked locations such as the high street or a transport hub outside the tube station or if in a residential area able to leave the bike as long as it was not left obstructively.
- Lime was holding itself to the standards it had been able to deliver and had no intention to let this slip.
- The figure for mode shift from cars London wide was 8%.
- Lime could work with Human Forest and Council Officers to provide borough specific evidence to the level of mode shift and the wider sustainability impact of e-bike shared micro mobility. Lime were happy to commit to this.

Action By: Lime and Human Forest/Principal Transport Planner

- Lime would have liked to have had the opportunity to discuss the study with Professor Axhausen, it appeared however that the Professor had acknowledged that since the study had been written shared providers had

made changes and improvement to e-bike hardware that negated the findings from the study relating to the vehicle's life span.

- Lime's GEN 4 bike which was deployed in Camden and across London had a certified life span of 5 years. This could be verified and shared in some form with the Committee.
- The Committee's main concern in May last year was around parking compliance this had improved, however there appeared to be concern around the sustainability impact, if there was more Lime could do to address that it was something it could work towards.
- Human Forest would continue to encourage customers to use the parking bays, it would also look to reduce the parking bay buffer and monitor this to ensure compliance increased.
- Measures Human Forest used to enforce compliance included fines and suspension leading ultimately to banning customers for non-compliance.
- Human Forest had banned 2 people since it started to provide its services in Camden.
- Lime had a similar policy to Human Forest, had banned more people mainly because it had operated in Camden over a longer period.
- Lime's biggest focus now was to reduce overcrowded parking locations as these were creating more obstructions.
- In the short term more resources were being deployed to move large numbers of bikes causing obstruction. In the long term the solution would be to work with the Council to identify and fund the implementation of more bays.
- Another solution, although previously receiving a mixed reception and rejected was to access existing bike racks for parking of e-bikes. This could be an effective way of solving the parking problem.
- Use of GPS on bikes in some instances was an effective tool to prevent some behaviour and in other contexts was inappropriate and could create serious safety concerns. For example, it would never be accurate enough to stop a customer riding on the pavement because of the close proximity to the road.
- Some of the benefits of shared service were that the hardware and the maximum speed was limited to 15.5mph in the UK.
- However, if residents were able to provide a time and a place where the pavement ride occurred this could be investigated and the user could be identified.
- The operators cared about the issues raised by Councils and residents around parking management of dockless bikes, each operator had full responsibility for management of its fleet.
- Unfortunately, a small number of people behaved anti-socially in relation to the bikes and e-scooters.
- Climate change and global warming was having a massive impact on cities like London one of the causes of which was transport emissions. Cities like London were car dominated and an aim was to reallocate that space to reduce these emissions.
- Lime had a fleet of 1000 and Human Forest 750 which had been agreed with Camden, the amount of parking space provided was not sufficient for the

number of bikes. There was the need to provide more space for the existing bikes to accommodate the level of usage.

- The bike operators had a very clear SLA with Camden to collect bikes being left outside the parking bays within an hour, on average for Human Forest the bikes were collected within 15 minutes.
- With regards to hazards of bikes becoming trip hazards as a result of weather conditions such as high winds yesterday evening, the operators had teams out the entire day repositioning the bikes causing obstruction due to the weather. As indicated the operators had clear service level agreements with regards to parking compliance and collection of vehicles causing obstruction it was required to meet.
- The level of regulation and oversight provided in the contract with the Council exceeded what was in the Dockless Code of Conduct document.

Answering a further question from Hamish Birchall on the availability of carbon life cycle analysis data from Lime and Human Forest, Hal Stevenson (Lime) and Alex Berwin (Human Forest) commented that:

Human Forest would be publishing its next sustainability report in the next couple of weeks. Human Forest scheme was fully climate neutral and transparent about emissions which was verified by independent experts. Lime had nothing to hide on sustainability and reported annually on their productions.

The Chair asked that both operators made the information on carbon life cycle analysis data available as requested.

Action By: Lime and Human Forest

The Director of Environment and Sustainability, the Transport and Travel Planning Manager and Principal Transport Planner made the following comments in response to members questions:

- Both operators operated a no parking zone in the borough, although it worked slightly differently.
- Since the last report to the Committee in May 2023 Dockless hire parking compliance had improved.
- The Council carried out a mystery shopper exercise with regards to parking compliance and similar results in terms of compliance were achieved for both operators.
- The Council had put some bays on a high priority list because of increased demand and the more likelihood of overflow. The operators were asked to monitor these more carefully, the Council also monitored these through mystery shopping and an Enforcement Officer.
- The responsibilities of the Enforcement Officer did cover the operators' compliance with the contract but also looked at other local environment issues such as highway obstructions and other things the Council received complaints about.

- The Council used the Enforcement Officer to look at wider complaints and how it could create revenue to invest back into services to improve local communities.

A Committee member queried whether officers were rigorously and properly examining the carbon case for the Dockless Bike Hire Scheme (DBH) and whether the concerns raised about the life cycle assessment and mode shift to shared micro mobility had been considered.

The Chair asked that officers provided a written response to the Committee member.

Action By: Principal Transport Planner

The Committee thanked the operators for attending the meeting.

RESOLVED –

THAT the report be noted.

9. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CABINET MEMBER FOR NEW HOMES, JOBS AND COMMUNITY INVESTMENT

Consideration was given to the report of the Cabinet Member for Investing in Communities, Culture and an Inclusive Economy.

Responding to questions Councillor Danny Beales (Cabinet Member for New Homes, Jobs and Community Investment) made the following comments:

- The civic space in Kingsgate Community hub was being explored to be used as a similar model to Highgate Road. It was to be used as a space used by a range of community organisations and would be financially sustainable, self-financing.
- Regis Road was owned by 14 different landowners of which Camden was one. A provisional agreement had been reached with U-Capital to purchase the site subject to a number of conditions one of which was the delivery of new affordable homes, replacement of Council facilities and the re provision of the Recycling Centre. It was envisaged that there would be continuity of the recycling centre provision.
- With regards to HS2 and Euston, the Council had met with the local community to understand the impact of the pause. The Council was working with partnership organisations to facilitate the delivery of temporary meanwhile uses on sites. For instance, there has been discussion with sports organisations to run outdoor sports, pop up outdoor space to promote business activities. The Council also continued to discuss with the government the need to ensure it honoured its commitment to Camden.
- The Kings Cross Construction Skills Centre was running apprenticeships providing opportunities to learn new skills and also working with local schools.

The Cabinet Member was thanked for attending the meeting and his response to questions.

RESOLVED –

THAT the Annual Report of the Cabinet Member for New Homes, Jobs and Community Investment be noted.

10. WORK PROGRAMME

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Supporting Communities.

The Committee discussed the Work Programme, with a member suggesting that Royal Mail be included on the Work Programme to discuss issues with post-delivery in the borough.

The Principal Committee Officer indicated that he would check whether this was within the Committees terms of reference.

Action By Principal Committee Officer

RESOLVED –

THAT the Work Programme be noted.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

There was none.

Having applied committee procedure rule 19(a) at 9.25pm, the meeting ended at 9.39 pm.

CHAIR

Contact Officer: Sola Odusina

Telephone No: 0207 974 6884

E-Mail: sola.odusina@camden.gov.uk

MINUTES END