

# MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY, 18TH DECEMBER, 2018, 6.30 pm

## PRESENT:

**Councillors: Sygrave, Eldridge Culverwell, Scott Emery, Adam Jogee (Chair), Julia Ogiehor, Reg Rice, Matt White and Barbara Blake**

### 38. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted the information contained therein'.

### 39. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

### 40. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair advised that there was a late item of urgent business around Green Flags, which would be dealt with at Item 11.

### 41. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In relation to Item 11, Cllr Culverwell declared that he was the Vice-Chair of the Friends of Finsbury Park.

### 42. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

### 43. MINUTES

The Committee were advised that the Council had been successful in a bid to the Mayor's Fund to establish a detached youth work team and to set up youth work apprenticeships. The Cabinet Member advised that a briefing to all Members would be provided on this. **(Action: Cllr M. Blake).**

The Panel were also advised that the Tottenham Futures project had secured funding from the Big Lottery Fund, which would ensure its continuation for at least three years.

Public consultation was underway with the Young People at Risk Strategy, due to be approved by Cabinet in March 2019. The Cabinet Member advised that he was

looking to speak to some of the young people interviewed by the Godwin Lawson Foundation, as part of their report on Youth at Risk, as part of the wider engagement process for the Young People at Risk Strategy.

The Panel noted that a launch event to establish a foundation for Tanesha Melbourne-Blake was due to take place on 20<sup>th</sup> December at Bruce Grove.

The Cabinet Member advised the Panel that a number of recent incidents had taken place in and around Wood Green. The Cabinet Member advised that this would feed into the ongoing work around Wood Green and efforts to establish a youth hub in the area.

In response to a request for an update on the Gangs Matrix, the Cabinet Member advised that he was part of an external reference group which met with Police and MOPAC colleagues. The group received a report from the Information Commissioner's Office which was highly critical of the Metropolitan Police. A response to that report was due from the Police as the next step. The Cabinet Member noted some concerns about the mapping process for the Gangs Matrix and that this was less successful than a similar process for community supervision of prisoners on licence.

The Panel requested further information in relation to apprenticeships and sought assurances about when a paper would be brought back to the Committee. The Panel also raised concerns with the recent incident outside the Vue cinema in Wood Green and requested that further information be provided. The Panel suggested that more work needed to be done to understand the reasons for the perceived increase in these type of incidents. The Panel also requested further information on the youth hub, including whether there would be a catchment area and what could be done to overcome postcode barriers. The Cabinet Member agreed to bring a presentation to the next meeting to update the Panel on the above issues raised in relation to young people. **(Action: Cllr M Blake/Clerk).**

In relation to the previous minutes, the Panel chased an update on CS1 and also around the island bus stop near the corner of Wightman Road and Turnpike Lane. **(Action: Clerk).**

The Panel requested further information in relation to the alternative savings considered as a result of the shortfall in achieving income targets for bulk waste. In response, officers advised that for some of the recycling rates that Veolia did not achieve, the money was used to cross-subsidise some of the issues on bulk waste. Officers advised that the budget item later in the agenda would look at how the Council could develop and refine this for the coming municipal year.

## **RESOLVED**

- I. That the minutes of the meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2018 be agreed as a correct record.

#### 44. UPDATE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SCRUTINY REVIEW ON CYCLING

The Panel received a progress update for noting on the Scrutiny Review into cycling undertaken by a previous iteration of the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel in 2016. The final report was approved by Cabinet on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2016. The Panel had previously received a progress update on the recommendations in January 2018. The report was introduced by Neil Goldberg, Transport Planning Officer and was included in the agenda pack at pages 9-73. The following was noted in discussion of the report:

- a. The Panel noted that, there had been a reduction in the provision of bike hangers across the borough and queried whether this was a budgetary issue. The Panel commented that perhaps there was some capacity to charge users for bike hangers. In response, officers advised that demand out-stripped supply and acknowledged that this was primarily a budget issue. Officers also acknowledged that they were looking into a range of funding options including charging and asking for corporate sponsorship.
- b. The Chair reiterated that a separate schools charter should be developed for Haringey and suggested that this was something the Panel could pick up with the Cabinet Member outside of the meeting. **(Action: Chair)**.
- c. The Chair also raised concerns with abandoned bikes chained to lampposts and urged that they should to be removed as swiftly as possible. Officers agreed to feed this information back. **(Action: Neil Goldberg)**.
- d. Panel members fed back that a number of community representatives had cautioned that the annual bike ride with Councillors had not happened for some time. In response, officers agreed to pick this up and ensure that it took place in future. **(Action: Neil Goldberg)**.
- e. The Panel enquired whether the east/west cycle route would be expanded into Tottenham. In response, officers advised that the future cycle route two would run from Tottenham Hale to Finsbury Park and that they were working with TfL to finalise this. There was also an opportunity to finalise a route from Northumberland Park to Finsbury Park. Officers advised that, in future, there was the potential for a lot more cycle traffic through Wood Green and that this would provide the Council with an opportunity to improve infrastructure in the area
- f. The Panel raised concerns about whether the Transport Forum was adequately engaged with residents in the east of the borough. In response, officers acknowledged that in recent meetings there had been significantly more residents from the west of the borough but advised there were transport groups in place across Haringey.
- g. In response to a question, officers agreed to feedback on what the technical definition of a corner was in relation to parking restrictions and whether there were any measurements used in the definition. **(Action: Neil Goldberg)**.
- h. The Panel raised safety concerns with the introduction of contraflows in relation to cyclists, as well as motorists and pedestrians. In relation to a question about consultation responses and how these were factored into proposed transport schemes, officers advised that they listened to feedback from residents and that consultation responses were part of the consideration process undertaken by the Cabinet Member.

- i. The Cabinet Member thanked the Panel for their comments and provided some further feedback on the priorities for her portfolio. The Cabinet Member advised that the administration was looking at different ways to fund cycle routes, commenting that they were subsidised for the first three years. The Cabinet Member noted with interest the point about whether a charge could be introduced for bike hangers with an exemption for those that could not afford it. The Cabinet Member also advised that she would take on board the point about inclusivity within the transport forum. The Cabinet Member also suggested that perhaps the Council could assist residents with the cost of purchasing bikes.

## RESOLVED

That the Panel noted the progress made to date in achieving the recommendations agreed by Cabinet (Appendix 2 of the report).

## 45. AIR QUALITY

The Committee received a report which provided an overview on the current and proposed future actions concerning air quality. Copies of the existing Air Quality Action Plan along with a table of measures proposed as part of the draft Air Quality Plan for 2018-2023 were attached to the report as appendices. Ian Kershaw, Regulatory Services Manager introduced the report as set out in the agenda pack (pages 73-171). In discussion of the report and appendices, the following points were raised:

- a. In response to a question, officers advised that Haringey was part of a London-wide network for air quality and that significant amount of learning from best practice from other boroughs was undertaken.
- b. In response to concerns about the level of air quality in Crouch End, given its low-lying position within the borough, officers advised that they did not have exact figures for Crouch End specifically but that no areas within the Borough exceeded European guidelines or standards for air quality. Officers advised that air quality was not generally monitored in specific geographic locations, instead measurements were taken to monitor both hotspots, which tended to be main arterial roads, as well as background levels of air quality. Officers also cautioned that the design of high streets could have a significant impact on air quality, such as the presence of two/three storey buildings on either side of Green Lanes.
- c. In response to a question about whether the levels of air quality monitoring had been reduced in recent years, officers advised that static monitoring levels had remained the same for at least the last two years and that there certainly had been no reduction in budgets for that area.
- d. In response to a query about whether an overall reduction in public transport usage was monitored, officers advised that monitoring was carried out by the Mayor's Office and that this would include analysis of any modal shift. Officers agreed to get this information from TfL, draw out the information for Haringey and would circulate to the Committee. **(Action: Neil Goldberg)**.
- e. The Panel queried whether the air quality action day was limited to two half-day sessions. In response, officers advised that the action day was mainly focused

- on vehicle idling outside of schools but that a range of other activities were undertaken as well.
- f. In response to a query about the outcome of the air quality business engagement project in Crouch End, officers advised that they were still pulling together the evaluation on this but acknowledged that there was a low level of take up from local businesses.
  - g. Officers stressed that that role of the Air Quality Action plan was to set out how the Council as a whole and its partners were going to improve air quality levels.
  - h. In relation to a question around vehicle idling and the development of no-idling zones, officers acknowledged that this was something that was being looked at and that it was anticipated a policy would be brought forward, early in the new year.
  - i. The Panel sought clarification about why TfL had stopped monitoring for PM10 and PM 2.5 particles given their impact on public health. In response, officers advised that levels no longer exceeded European standards across London and that this was why TfL no longer monitored them.
  - j. The Panel acknowledged that the Air Quality Plan for 2018-2023 was still in draft format but requested that the format be amended to make it easier to follow. The Panel suggested that the format should reflect the previous Air Quality Action Plan.
  - k. The Panel raised concerns with the effect of smoke from charcoal ovens in restaurants in and around Green Lanes. In response, officers acknowledged these concerns and advised that the service was looking at the possibilities for expanding the existing smoke free zone.
  - l. The Panel highlighted the impact of street trees on air quality levels and their role in carbon capture. The Panel expressed concern that trees were not being replaced as a result of budget cuts. In response, officers advised that trees were still replaced and that there was a dedicated team who looked at this. In response to concerns about specific examples of where trees had not been replaced, officers cautioned that there may be specific reasons why trees were not replaced such as an unsuitable location or due to the time of year. Officers agreed, that if Panel members wanted to email examples of where trees had not been replaced that they would look into those and get back to the Panel. **(Panel Members/David Murray).**

## **RESOLVED**

- l. That the Panel noted the contents of the report and current draft Air Quality Action Plan.

## **46. BUDGET SCRUTINY**

The Committee received a report along with the 5 year draft budget/Medium Term Financial Strategy (2019/20-2023/24), the previous year's budget recommendations put forward in relation to Priority 3 and the 2019 (new) budget proposals. In addition to this, the proposed areas of capital spend for Priority 3 were sent out as an addendum report which was circulated with the agenda pack. The Panel also received feedback from the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel on 17<sup>th</sup> December, in relation to the savings proposal around an additional HMO licensing scheme (PL1). David Murray, Assistant Director for Environment and Neighbourhoods introduced the report.

The Cabinet Member for Environment advised the Committee that in developing the budget proposals with officers that she was keen to ensure that the implications for any saving put forward were fully understood. The Cabinet Member advised that it was important to understand the wider costs of implementing each saving and whether there may be unintended consequences. The Cabinet Member emphasised that the proposals put forward were realistic.

In addition to making savings, the Cabinet Member outlined that there were also revenue raising opportunities within Priority 3 which, it was hoped, had been utilised in these proposals. In light of the challenging financial picture, the Cabinet Member set out that she and officers were committed to making the savings targets but were also looking to preserve core services.

The following points were raised in discussion of the report and its appendices:

- a. The Committee sought clarification around the structural funding gap in 2020/21 of £18.4m that was identified in the report. The Committee also sought clarification on how this was possible if the Council had a legal duty to set a balanced budget. In response, officers advised that there was a legal obligation to set a balanced budget for next year i.e. 2019/20 and that the budget gap for next year was £6.5m. Officers acknowledged that closing a £6.5m gap was a significant challenge. The Committee was advised that the budget as currently presented was draft and that the £6.5m gap would need to be met by the time the final budget was agreed by Full Council in February.
- b. Officers advised that the government had released the provisional settlement agreement for local government and that this suggested an additional circa £1.2m of additional grant funding which would be used to plug some of the budget gap. A robust budget challenge process was underway, involving senior officers, to identify the remaining £5m-5.5m shortfall before February.
- c. In response to a question about the impact of the proposed savings on services within Environment and Neighbourhoods, officers advised that focus had been on looking at how services could be provided in a different way whilst maintaining quality standards. One example given was around LED lighting where standards could be maintained whilst also generating savings. Another area of focus outlined by officers was looking at how to generate efficiencies from some of the big contracts. Officers reiterated that they had been robust in their attempts to ensure that the savings put forward were achievable and sustainable.
- d. The Committee commented that where the budget proposals put forward were based on income generation, such as the additional HMO Licensing, that this should be made clearer. **(Action: Kaycee Ikegwu).**
- e. The Committee queried why there was no income forecast in the first year for the additional HMO Licensing scheme proposal. In response, officers advised that it was a five year licence and that there was an inevitable bedding-in period during the first year. Officers had made a decision to profile the income at £400k per year starting in year two. It was envisaged that revenue levels would build during years one and two and would likely reduce in later years as compliance was achieved.
- f. In response to a question, officer confirmed that revenue from HMO licensing was ring-fenced. However, there were currently staff in the Housing

- Improvement team being financed through the General Fund, which would be offset to allow a saving to the Council as whole.
- g. The Committee requested that any additional HMO licensing scheme be tenant focused and that the Council monitor whether this has any impact on eviction rates. In response, officers acknowledged these concerns and reassured the Panel the impact on tenants was built into the evaluation and monitoring processes.
  - h. The Committee expressed concerns with the proposal to cease funding for the police partnership team (PL11). It was suggested that this seemed to be entirely contrary to priorities identified in the new Borough Plan. The Committee commented that, as part of the consultation process for the Borough Plan, fear of crime was identified as the biggest concern for residents in the east of the Borough and the second biggest concern for residents in the west of the Borough. It was suggested that this saving would have a disproportionate effect on the east of the borough as it is where the police team were mostly utilised. It was also suggested that this could be contrary to the agenda of the Fairness Commission.
  - i. In relation to PL11, the Committee raised concerns that without Council funding this team would cease to exist. The mitigation stated that issues would be passed to local SNTs, however the Panel felt that the whole point of the team was to deal with issues that can't be dealt with by local SNTs. The Committee suggested that the £200k saving would have a significant impact and would likely incur costs elsewhere.
  - j. Panel members queried about Council Tax precept that goes towards the Metropolitan Police and questioned why the Council was having to contribute to further additional funding towards police resources. In response, officers acknowledged these concerns and advised that discussions in relation to how the impact on local policing resources would be mitigated were ongoing. The Committee was advised that the partnership team was funded through a BOGOF scheme announced by MOPAC and that there was some suggestion that this could be withdrawn. Officers were waiting for further confirmation on this.
  - k. In response to a question around parking income, officers advised that all parking revenue was ring-fenced and could only be spent on transport related activities.
  - l. The Committee raised concerns with the proposal for an additional HMO licensing scheme (PL1), questioning how feasible the income targets were year-on year. The Committee suggested a proposal should be put forward in relation to viability of the income levels proposed.

In light of the above discussion, the following budget recommendations were agreed:

- a. The Panel recommended that Cabinet reconsider the proposed saving in relation to flexible police resources. In particular, consideration should be given to whether this would have a disproportionate impact on the east of the borough, which had a higher number of victims of crime. Cabinet should also consider whether this proposal was reflective of the fairness agenda. The Panel also felt that this saving proposal was contrary to the priorities identified in the new Borough Plan around tackling crime. Fear of crime was one of the main issues identified by residents as part of the consultation in response to the new Bough Plan. PL 11.

- b. The Panel sought firm assurances from Cabinet that the additional HMO licensing scheme would be tenant focused and that the Council would monitor whether there was any impact on tenants, such as eviction rates and homelessness. PL1
- c. The Panel were concerned about how the Council would ensure that the stated income levels for the additional HMO licensing scheme were met. The Panel requested further information how the Council would meet the stated income targets, including a breakdown of the financial profiling. PL1

## **RESOLVED**

That the Panel considered and provided recommendations to Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the 2019-20 Draft Budget/MTFS 2019/20 to 2023/24 and savings proposals in relation to Priority 3.

### **47. WORK PROGRAMME AND DRAFT SCOPING DOCUMENT FOR SCRUTINY REVIEW**

The Panel considered the Environment and Community Safety work plan as well as a draft scoping document for a Scrutiny Review around plastic waste. There were no amendments proposed to the work plan.

The Panel requested that the scoping document be circulated via email and Panel members would feedback comment to the clerk. **(Action: All)**.

### **48. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

The Panel received a verbal update from David Murray, AD for Environment and Neighbourhoods around green flags. The following points were noted:

- a. 20 out of 22 of Haringey's green parks had been mystery shopped in two batches. The Panel noted that this was a fairly unprecedented level of scrutiny.
- b. Within the first batch, 9 of the 11 parks reviewed met the required standard for green flags. Within the second batch, officers were contesting a number of the gradings awarded and the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods had met with the Keep Britain Tidy Group (KBTG) to discuss concerns on a number of issues. KBTG have subsequently responded and officers are following up on that response.
- c. The first batch of mystery shopping reports were available on the Council's website. Officers advised that, following the conclusion of Purdah, they would be sending out the reports from the second round of inspections that were not being disputed to Friends of Parks groups and local Ward Councillors, as well as publishing them on the Council's website. Officers advised that they would look to conclude conversations with KBTG on the disputed investigations before publishing them.
- d. Officers were working on the issues flagged for improvement and the two green flags that had been taken down had since been reinstated.
- e. Improvements identified for Finsbury Park would be factored into the plans for the 150 year anniversary of the park next year.
- f. The Cabinet Member advised the Panel that the Council was committed to being transparent with residents and was committed to working closely with the

Friends of Parks groups. The Cabinet Member also set out that she was committed to driving up standards in parks and open spaces and would work with Keep Britain Tidy Group to achieve this.

The following was noted in response to the discussion of the update:

- a. The Chair thanked officers for their update and suggested that there may be some learning for the future around being as proactive as possible in terms of information sharing and setting out the reasons behind the delay in publishing the reports. Officers acknowledged these concerns and advised that they were continuing to work with the Cabinet Member to ensure an open dialogue with residents.
- b. Members of the Panel expressed frustration about the slow information flow from the Council around parks and litter, particularly during the busy summer period. Officers acknowledged these concerns and advised that changes had been made to the cleansing schedule of parks in response to the issues that arose during the summer. Officers reiterated that work was ongoing with the Cabinet Member to improve communications with residents and to do so in a timely manner.
- c. The Panel enquired about the level of litter collected in parks which was recycled. In response, officers agreed to come back to the Panel with this information. **(Action: David Murray).**

#### 49. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The future meeting dates were noted as:

7<sup>th</sup> February 2019.

11<sup>th</sup> March 2019.

CHAIR: Councillor Adam Jogee

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank