

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

PETITION CONSIDERED BY THE CULTURE AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 11TH NOVEMBER 2024

Dear Andrew and Charlotte

Please find below the response of the Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee to your petition.

PETITION TO EXTEND THE DARTMOUTH PARK LOW TRAFFIC NEIGHBOURHOOD (LTN) CONSULTATION DEADLINE

The petition requested that the Council extend the consultation period for the scheme, conduct proper consultation and provide an explanation of the purpose and objectives of the scheme.

In considering the petition, the Committee at its meeting on 11th November 2024 heard from Andrew Sulston (Chair Highgate Society) and Charlotte Alderson (a local resident) who expressed their concerns over the limited time period taken to engage with all stakeholders, the apparent lack of a well-designed plan based on robust data which would lead to long term congestion and pollution in surrounding areas impacting many lower income households. Agreeing with the Transport Secretary's view that LTNs should be implemented with local community support and asserting that the Council's delivery of the co-design phase was inadequate, they asked that the Committee either recommend that the Council re-run the co-design or that the phase 3 consultation period be extended from the standard four weeks to twelve weeks.

The Committee also heard deputations from David Metz, Jeremy Leach, Chair of London Living Streets, Stephen King, 4 Roads Group and Graeme Blythe parent of a local primary school pupil (who were broadly in support of the Council's proposals for the Dartmouth Park Area LTN). The Committee also heard from Councillor Lorna Russell who noted that it was a complex scheme that would bring about significant change to the area and therefore felt it was critical that time be taken to get the scheme right taking into account data, evidence, and the views of residents and local groups.

In their response to the petition officers stated that "engagement and consultation were a highly valued part of the Council's Healthy Streets scheme development. The views of residents, businesses and stakeholders were used to gauge the overall level of support or objection to a proposal and also impact on revisions of plans/designs, for example to either improve the scheme or respond to issues that Officers may not have been aware of.

Officers advised that the views of the borough's communities played an important part in the decision-making process, alongside relevant data and policies, which all helped to create the final scheme". As such in November 2021 Camden's Cabinet

approved the Council's approach to consultation and decision-making for healthy streets transport schemes. Officers highlighted how the Dartmouth Park Area Healthy Neighbourhood project aligned with the Council's adopted approach to engagement and consultation for a 'large' scheme of this type. It was also noted that prior to the current scheme, similar proposals were under consideration by the Council and requested, for a number of years (since 2017/18) by stakeholders across the Highgate Ward.

During the discussion Committee members sought clarity from the petitioners on the number of responses from residents that they would regard as adequate, given that the report highlighted that 2,000 responses had been received during the engagement phase. Officers were asked how responsive the Council was to feedback from the data and real-life experience from the trials, as this was fundamental in getting the detail of the scheme right, and whether the phase 3 consultation could be extended as suggested by the petitioners from 4 weeks to 12 weeks.

In response the petitioners advised that the feedback received from the people they had talked to was, that it was a complex scheme and the Council had not appeared to have considered alternative measures. No explanation was given of why alternative traffic management measures were dismissed. There needed to be an improvement in the quality of the engagement.

In response to Committee members questions, officers and the Cabinet Member for Best Start for Children and Families advised that, they agreed that a flexible approach was the right way in developing such schemes, taking on board information and data from trials and changing some of the locations of the traffic restrictions that came up from public feedback as had occurred in other schemes put forward by the Council such as the Queens Crescent and Arlington Road Schemes.

The consultation period was defined as a minimum of 4 weeks, this had been extended on previous schemes in the past and officers would be willing to consider extending the length of the period of consultation for this scheme which was not set in stone.

In considering the petition, the Committee thanked the petitioners for attending the meeting and highlighting their concerns with the engagement process issues and

RESOLVED: That officers should:

- Commit to extend phase 3 consultation as much as realistically possible so that everyone who wished to contribute could contribute at a proper stage of the process.

If you are not satisfied with the response you have received then you have the right to appeal to a scrutiny committee of the Council by notifying the Council's Committee Services Manager (Vicky Wemyss-Cooke via email: vicky.wemyss-cooke@camden.gov.uk) within 20 working days of receiving this response.

Regards

Sola Odusina

Principal Committee Officer – Clerk to the Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee

Below are the detailed next steps if you are not satisfied with the outcome of your petition.

1. If the Petition Organiser is not satisfied with the outcome of the consideration of the petition, s/he may appeal to a scrutiny committee (or, if the complaint relates to the actions of a scrutiny committee, to another scrutiny committee) by notifying the Committee Services Manager of their appeal within 20 working days of the petition having been considered by a Council body or a response having been received.
2. Within 5 working days of receipt of intention to appeal, the Monitoring Officer will determine if the grounds to appeal are reasonable. Where the appeal relates to a decision or response by the Monitoring Officer, the Executive Director Corporate Services will determine the appeal. Reasonable grounds will include, but are not limited to:
 - The Chief Officer response or body did not provide sufficient reasoning for their decision;
 - The decision/response suggests the Chief Officer or body misunderstood or did not consider the petition in full;
 - The decision was disproportionate to the issue raised by the petition;
 - An unjustified procedural irregularity in the way the petition was considered.
3. Matters which are not reasonable grounds for appeals include, but are not limited to:
 - The Petition Organiser is unhappy with the decision / response, for which clear, justifiable reasons have been given;
 - A course of action has been agreed but not implemented, unless the decision was to implement it immediately;
 - The Petition Organiser wishes to introduce new or different information.
4. If the appeal is accepted, the Committee Services Manager will, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer, determine the relevant scrutiny committee to hear the appeal and will notify the Petition Organiser accordingly. The appeal will be considered in line with the rules of hearing deputations and petitions at scrutiny committees set out in Part 4 of the Constitution.

5. The scrutiny committee may not override the decision made by the officer or body that has made the original decision, but may either:
 - make recommendations, which must be considered by that officer or body; or
 - confirm that they agree with the original decision-maker.
6. There will be no further right of appeal.