

# **MINUTES OF MEETING CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY 11 JULY 2023, 6.30-8.30PM**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Peray Ahmet (Chair), Mike Hakata, Emily Arkell, Zena Brabazon, Dana Carlin, Lucia das Neves, Ruth Gordon and Sarah Williams**

**ALSO ATTENDING: Councillor John Bevan, Councillor Nick da Costa, Councillor Tammy Hymas and Councillor Matt White**

### **1. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair referred to the notice of filming at meetings and attendees noted this information.

### **2. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Chandwani and Councillor Jogee.

### **3. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Williams declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of items 7, 9 & 10 and advised that in accordance with Part 5 Paragraph 4.2 of the Council's Constitution, she would be withdrawing from the meeting whilst those items were considered.

Councillor das Neves also declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of items 7, 9 & 10 and advised that in accordance with Part 5 Paragraph 4.2 of the Council's Constitution, she would be withdrawing from the meeting whilst those items were considered.

### **5. NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH REPRESENTATIONS**

None.

### **6. MINUTES**

## **RESOLVED**

To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2023 as a correct record.

*Clerks note: The Chair varied the order of the agenda to move item 7 to be taken after item 9 on the agenda. The minutes follow the order of the meeting.*

### **7. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

None.

### **8. INTERIM REVIEW OF LTN EXEMPTIONS PROCEDURE**

*Clerks note: Councillor das Neves and Councillor Williams left the meeting at the start of this item.*

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport, and Deputy Leader of the Council, introduced the report which set out feedback on the interim review carried out of the available exemptions and related process for the three trial Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in the Borough (Bounds Green, Bruce Grove West Green, and St Ann's). The report set out various changes to the exemptions process.

Councillor Brabazon commented that the LTN inclusion group had been a really positive exercise, and membership had covered a range of organisations and representative groups.

In response to questions from Councillor da Costa, the following was noted:

- The Council were very committed to ensuring that residents were fully engaged with, particularly those with health conditions and disabilities. A survey had been carried out with carers, and workshops held with Disability Action Haringey. As the scheme progressed, further engagement was carried out with other groups via the LTN inclusion group. It was important that no additional obstacles were added to the lives of people already facing obstacles in terms of mobility around the borough.
- One of the main additions to the exemptions process was to ensure that all Blue Badge holders would have access to all LTNs in the borough.
- At the current time, it was felt that the proposed additions to the process would have a bigger impact than to allow exemptions for taxis.

## **RESOLVED to**

1. Note the summary of feedback received in respect of the Council's existing Low Traffic Neighbourhoods Exemption Criteria and Applications Process.
2. Agree that, in addition to exemptions already contained within the Council's Low Traffic Neighbourhoods Exemption Criteria and Applications Process, that supplementary exemptions will be applied to the three trial LTNs (Bounds Green, Bruce Grove West Green and St Ann's) as follows:

- a) Allow all Blue Badge holders with a valid Blue Badge and whose main address is within the Borough of Haringey to register one motor vehicle for exemption from the three trial LTNs (but only traffic filters which have the Except Permit Holder sign).
  - b) Allow SEND transport organised by the Council to be exempt from diagonal traffic filters in the three trial LTNs.
  - c) With permission of the Council, authorised by the Assistant Director for Direct Services, allow any vehicle to be exempt from specified camera enforced traffic filters in the three LTNs.
3. Authorises the Head of Highways and Parking to make the necessary experimental traffic orders to give effect to the recommendations.
  4. Note that any representations made during the statutory objection period associated with the experimental traffic orders referred to in recommendation 3 will be presented to Cabinet, alongside a final monitoring report, when a decision will be sought on whether to make the provisions of the experimental traffic orders permanent.

### **Reasons for decision**

As part of the interim review of the three trial LTNs that the Council has implemented, a review has been carried out on the available exemptions and related processes.

Having regard to feedback from stakeholder, and to advance equalities as far as possible, additional exemptions are proposed for the benefit of Blue Badge holders residing in Haringey and for the benefit of SEND pupils using transport.

An additional exemption to allow any vehicle to be exempt with permission of the Council will provide the council with flexibility to grant exemptions in exceptional circumstances.

The LTN exemptions have not yet been assessed (and could not have been assessed) with the changes now being proposed and that the ETOs as now proposed would be a genuine and novel experiment.

## **9. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

### **Deputation 1**

Victoria Ward presented the deputation to Cabinet. The key points of the deputation are summarised as follows:

- LTNs were not in the Labour manifesto and nobody voted for them. It was claimed that before LTNs were introduced, 56% of residents did not want them and that, since then, the administration had failed to bring the public along with them on this journey.
- LTNs were based on DfT data that was withdrawn, due to a catalogue of errors. The Cabinet Member had advised residents that it was all about the data. However, the deputation party contended that every piece of data that had

- been used in support of LTNs had been discredited. Cabinet was asked to read the data and to understand it before pushing ahead.
- It was put forward that at a meeting in February, the Leader and Cabinet Member dismissed those opposing LTNs as alt-right and climate change deniers. This was a wholly unfair characterisation and showed contempt for residents.
  - The interim report sought to simply support the policy, rather than interrogate it
  - The main justifications for LTNs were summarised as; a comprehensive consultation, to reduce pollution, to help people live active and more healthier lives and to reduce collisions. It was suggested that all of these had failed and that rather: There had been a negligible impact on pollution; cycling had reduced since LTNs were created; there was no data available around collisions but that traffic had increased on roads.
  - The other key justification given for introducing LTNs was around to reduce rat running. It was suggested that the success of this goal was undermined by poor data for the following reasons:
    - The baseline was taken after the introduction of the Enfield Bowes LTN, so traffic on boundary roads had already increased
    - The technology used did not count cars travelling under 10km per hour, none of the sitting traffic is counted and the detail behind this has not been released
    - The way cars were counted for the baseline inflated the number of cars registered inside the LTNs prior to the change, which was admitted in the report but dismissed.
    - Even if the car count was down, it was suggested that the Council did not track how far those cars are travelling. Ms Ward advised that she travelled 4.4km further every time she left the house, so the car count was meaningless
- It was commented that the increase in traffic on boundary roads had directly led to a reduction in the number of buses and increased journey times.
  - Government funding for the schemes had been dropped, they were widely acknowledged as being badly implemented and counterproductive. It was commented that the Transport Secretary told councils on Sunday to withdraw unpopular schemes.
  - The Council had received 2.5k formal objections to the scheme and public opposition to the scheme was reflected in reduced a vote share at recent bye-elections.
  - The deputation party requested that Cabinet look at the data in detail, not just the summary, and that they did not just nod the report through. The deputation party also requested a meeting with the Director of Environment and Resident Experience, as it was not felt that the experience of residents was reflected in the report.

The following arose in discussion of the deputation:

- a. The Leader clarified that the decision to proceed with LTNs was taken by Cabinet, prior to the 2022 election and that the election took place against a background of LTN having been agreed.
- b. The Leader clarified that the meeting referred to was a Labour party meeting and that the topic of conversation at this meeting was not LTNs.

- c. The Cabinet sought clarification over the fact that residents have fed back that LTNs had improved road safety and whether the deputation party were concerned about the risks to road safety of re-directing traffic through residential roads. It was suggested that in general, areas with LTNs had halved the number of road injuries. In response, the deputation party advised that all roads in Haringey were residential and that LTNs had simply moved the problems from one location to another. The deputation party agreed that they would be in favour of more speed restrictions in built up areas but advocated that road safety also had to be balanced with other considerations such as women feeling unsafe at night in roads with LTNs.
- d. The Cabinet raised the issue of air pollution, and the inequality that existed with air pollution disproportionately affecting the most deprived areas, in which 60% of residents did not own a car. The deputation party were asked whether they agreed that strong action needed to be taken on air pollution. In response, they advised that they did not agree that LTNs reduced pollution and that there was no evidence to support this. The deputation party also set out that the use of percentages in this context was problematic due to the fact that the east of the borough was significantly more populated than the west. The Deputation party set out that because the Council had done very little engagement, it felt like it was telling people what was good for them rather than asking them.

Cllr Hakata, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport provided a response to the points raised by the deputation party. A summary of this response is set out below:

- a. The Cabinet Member advised that the network of LTNs was agreed as part of the Walking & Cycling Action Plan, which had engendered a strong sense of people for and against even at that early stage.
- b. In response to suggestions that there was no problem, the Cabinet Member asserted that there definitely was a problem in terms of road deaths, social isolation of young people and pollution. It was suggested that even most drivers in the borough would agree that there was a serious problem around congestion in the borough.
- c. It was commented that if the water people drank was as dirty as the air they breathed, people would not drink it. Public Health England have advised that poor air quality was the number one public health crisis in the country.
- d. Inrix have advised that that London is the most congested city in the world and that on average drivers sat for 156 hours in traffic in a year and that this was up from 148 hours in 2021.
- e. The Cabinet Member also highlighted obesity issues in the borough as well as the impact of congestion on health and mental health. The Cabinet Member set out that he categorically did not agree with the idea that people were not sitting in traffic before LTNs. Congestion was a long-standing issue.
- f. In relation to the data, the Cabinet Member advised that they had only been using certain data up until now and that the amount of data available was going to increase. Up until now, the only data source had been ATCs (rubber tubes) and these had recorded every vehicle travelling over them at every speed. VivaCity cameras would also be used going forward which were 24hr AI multi-modal cameras recording traffic at junctions. Bus data from TfL was also available for use and this, crucially, was not collected by Haringey but by TfL.

- g. The Cabinet Member identified that the bus cameras had shown that, apart from a very small number of locations, there had been a significant improvement in traffic and that journey times had gone back down to pre-LTN levels, and in some cases to better than pre-LTN levels.
- h. The Cabinet Member asserted that the Council had done a huge amount of consultation in relation to LTNs, possibly more than any other set of schemes, and that it would continue to engage with residents going forward.

## **Deputation 2**

Tara Hawkins presented the second deputation on how the LTN schemes have negatively and detrimentally affected businesses and customers.

Tara Hawkins contended that the Council were not acting in accordance with their pledge to support businesses and were causing the destruction of business as a direct result of the implementation of LTNs introduced last year.

The deputation further contended that the scheme was an ill-thought-out arrangement, and no businesses were involved in its consultation.

The deputation asked that Cabinet reflect upon how businesses take years and decades to build up, and that business owners invest significant amounts of time, energy and money in developing and expanding their business.

She explained that in order to achieve growth businesses, seek to attract markets located further afield and the introduction of the LTNs had significantly disrupted this business model resulting in a reduction in revenue. Customers and suppliers had to navigate circuitous/complex routes to get to shops adding to their journey times, together with managing the increase in traffic, parking restrictions, and fines. This had resulted in customers not coming to the area.

The deputation highlighted that survey results conducted by a Dental practice in the Bounds Green LTN between April – May of this year and which had produced the following data:

- More than 50% of the clients visit by car.
- Nearly 40% travel from more than 4 miles away
- 60% travel from outside of the borough
- 86% said LTNs would not make them change their mode of transport.

There were further LTN impact statements referred to from business owners in the borough.

- A Driving Instructor - who was no longer able to accept many new pupils due to traffic.
- A Café Owner in Myddleton Road with a 50% reduction in business, after having expanded who was unable to pay bills and had to get a charity involved to deal with the legal side of this.

- A Tottenham Business Owner who had seen a 40% reduction in business after working hard for 15 years we spent building customer based which has vanished because of the LTN Scheme.
- The deputation felt that none of the reasons for implementing the introduction of the LTNs stood up to scrutiny. These were implemented soon after covid restrictions ended which was then followed by the cost-of-living crisis, and businesses had not been given any chance of recovery.

The deputation felt that the experimental scheme had seriously impacted people's livelihoods for the worst. In conclusion, the deputation felt that there was nothing to support the continued presence of LTNs in the borough, apart from the funding that the Council was collecting in fines. The deputation called on the Cabinet to remove all LTN's as they are causing huge economic damage.

In response to question from Cllr Brabazon, Tara Hawkins explained that she had to move her business from Myddleton Rd to Crouch End because as soon as the LTN were introduced her business sales had reduced by 50% and in particular she had lost customers from Haringey.

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment, and Transport and Deputy Leader of the Council responded, focussing on the data collected and the experience of business in the LTN areas in Haringey and wider, in London, where semi pedestrianisation and pedestrianisation schemes had been brought in. The following was outlined:

- Data analysed on business transactions and footfall across the town centres in the borough, both in and outside LTN areas, showed all were experiencing an economic downturn due to cost-of-living crisis and energy prices. They all followed the same trajectory with dips and recoveries, but essentially all were following the same pattern.
- Reference to a business area in Waltham Forest and Hackney Church Street which had implemented their LTN schemes much earlier than Haringey with similar objections but which were now a thriving high streets. The traders in these areas had previously had similar concerns to those expressed in the deputation.
- Contested the understanding that trade to businesses emanates from car journeys. There were studies and surveys that conveyed that traders overestimate the number of people coming to their businesses by car and underestimate the number that are coming by foot. Most residents were searching for local provision such as dentists that they could reach on foot.
- It was important for residents to access their local provision such as dentist and not be competing with customers outside of the local area for access.

In conclusion the data on footfall and card transactions did not indicate a greater impact on business activities in LTN areas compared to the other businesses in non LTN areas.

### **Deputation 3**

Cathy Stastny presented the third deputation. The main points of the deputation are summarised as follows:

- The dedicated group to discuss the exemptions procedures were not made clear to members of the Joint Partnership Board, nor were the procedures collectively agreed to.
- Whilst the new process would exempt all Blue Badge holders, it was stated that not all disabled people held Blue Badges and even those who did, were at the centre of a network of people supporting them, who would not benefit from any exemptions to the scheme. It was felt that exemptions should apply to all people working with and caring for people with disabilities.
- The LTNs caused more traffic and slower journey times, and it was contested that this caused people to breathe more polluted air than before.
- LTNs has been scrapped across the capital, the Government had stopped funding all projects which involved the creation of car free zones, which meant that Council would now have to spend money on this scheme.
- The residents did not want LTNs and urged the Cabinet to end this scheme and work with residents to find equitable public transport led solutions.

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment, and Transport and Deputy Leader of the Council responded to the deputation:

- It was important to keep in mind the purpose of the LTNs – air pollution was one of the worst impacts of motor traffic and the most vulnerable people in the borough needed to be protected.
- The schemes had already shown improvements in the borough and would continue to work to discourage people from taking unnecessary car journeys and clear the roads for people who depended on car travel.

The Leader thanked all parties for attending.

### **10. INTERIM REVIEW OF PHASE 1 LTN'S**

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport, and Deputy Leader of the Council, introduced the report which set out the results of an interim review of the three trial Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs), which were implemented in 2022.

In response to questions from Councillor Hymas, the following was noted:

- There was not a 'do nothing' options in terms of the climate agenda. The schemes would be monitored carefully and it was hoped that improvements would continue to be made. It would be a disservice to the borough not to expand the schemes, if the trial areas continued to deliver on their aims.

In response to questions from Councillor da Costa , the following was noted:

- There had been a reduction in speeding on roads, and this would continue to be monitored.
- A full data set on air quality would be available after 12 months of monitoring. However, borough trends showed a 13% increase of air pollution on the roads



and roadsides, but within LTN areas, the roadside and ambient readings had been much lower.

**RESOLVED to**

1. Note the results of the interim LTN reviews summarised in Sections seven (Bruce Grove West Green LTN), eight (St Ann's LTN), nine (Bounds Green LTN) and detailed in Appendix A1, A2 and A3 (Monitoring Data), Appendix B1, B2 and B3 (Feedback) and Appendix C (Business Perception Surveys) and Appendix D (Footfall and Mastercard Spend Data).
2. Agree the following physical changes to the Bruce Grove West Green LTN:
  - Remove traffic filter at Linley Road, permitting motor vehicle access in both directions.
  - Permit motor vehicle access on The Avenue in westbound direction, eastbound to remain restricted.
  - Remove traffic filter in Moorefield Road (revert road to one-way), permitting motor vehicle access.
  - Introduce a 7.5 tonne weight limit on Downhills Way and Belmont Road with camera enforcement.
3. Agree the following physical change to the St Ann's LTN:
  - Move the traffic filter at Avenue Road approximately 10 metres north, removing 4 parking bays to form a turning space.
4. Authorise the Head of Highways and Parking to revoke and make all necessary new ETOs to give effect to recommendation 1 and 0 which will trigger a further statutory objection period of 6 months.
5. Authorise the implementation of changes to the Bruce Grove West Green LTN, subject to the statutory requirements associated with 1 and 0 and 0 following the preparation of detailed designs.
6. Note the new ETOs will be made to remain in effect for the maximum duration of eighteen months but aiming to decide on the future of the LTNs well in advance of reaching this.
7. Note that any representations made during the statutory objection period associated with the experimental traffic orders referred to in recommendation 1 and 0 will be presented to Cabinet in 2024, alongside a final monitoring report, when deciding whether or not to make the traffic orders permanent.
8. Note that, after consideration of the available options, no interim physical changes are recommended to the Bounds Green LTN.

## **Reasons for decision**

The interim review considers the analysis of the data collected and feedback received on each LTN. This includes the legal obligation to consider all formal objections raised on an ETO before determining whether to make the provisions of the TMO permanent. This has led to a number of physical changes being proposed for Bruce Grove West Green LTN and one change for St Ann's LTN.

Although no physical changes have been recommended for Bounds Green LTN, it is important to report on the details of the analysis undertaken on the data and feedback which informed the changes considered, but not recommended.

In accordance with the decision by Cabinet in December 2021, any key decision regarding changes to the LTN would be reported back to the Leader, Cabinet or an individual Cabinet member.

In view of paragraph 3 and to ensure transparency on the impact of the LTN trials to-date, this report is brought to Cabinet for approval.

The reason for recommendation 2 and 3 is discussed in paragraphs 7.76 to 7.78, and 8.73 to 8.75 and Appendix G. It is important to note the LTNs have not yet been assessed (and could not have been assessed) with the changes now being proposed and that the ETOs as now proposed would be a genuine and novel experiment.

The reason for recommendation 4 to 6 is to enable the Council to implement the changes recommended in paragraphs 2 and 3 in accordance with provisions contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act, 1984 (as amended).

## **Alternative options considered**

### Do nothing

The aim of the ETOs, which have been in operation for over eight months and can run for a maximum duration of 18 months, is to genuinely undertake an experiment to see if the scheme is working in practice and having the desired outcomes. The December 2021 Cabinet report stated the outcomes desired and made it clear that, if the trial LTNs were implemented, there would be a period of review of the feedback and the monitoring data before taking a decision on whether to make alterations, revoke the ETO or make the trial changes permanent.

A decision on whether to make the trial schemes permanent or revoke the ETOs can be taken before the current traffic orders expire in 2024. However, given the scale of changes delivered, it is appropriate to review the information held to date, both in terms of feedback including formal objections received in the first six months of the statutory objection period and the various data monitored and obtained to date. This is so that the Council can understand if the objectives of the scheme set out in the December 2021 Cabinet report are starting to be realised, whether there are any negative impacts, and consider if any solutions can be implemented now to mitigate these whilst still aiming to meet the objectives of the scheme.

This review has been undertaken and summarised in this report with more detailed information contained in the appendices.

Given that the review has led to the recommendations to make changes to two of the three trial schemes now, the option of doing nothing now for these two schemes has been rejected.

For the Bounds Green LTN, although no physical changes are recommended in this report, it is appropriate for reasons of transparency that the information used to inform this decision is contained in this report.

#### Alternative changes to the LTN designs

A broad range of options have been considered, as detailed in the Options Appraisal (Appendix G). Some of these options are recommended for implementation and others are not, for reasons provided within the body of this report.

With over 80 km of roads within and on the boundary of the three LTNs, there are several changes that could be made to the road network. However, the options considered within the Options Appraisal have been led by the results of the Monitoring Reports (data and feedback) and demonstrate that the Council is listening to all feedback.

### **11. SCHOOL STREETS 2023/24- SCHOOL STREETS WITHIN 3 LTN'S**

*Councillor das Neves and Councillor Williams returned to the meeting at this point.*

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport, and Deputy Leader of the Council, introduced the report which reported on the impact of six School Streets within the three Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, and sought approval to make permanent all Experimental Traffic Orders associated with the six School Streets.

Councillor Brabazon added that she was pleased to see the reference to Jane Jacobs in the report, and added that if children were getting a safer journey to school, there was nothing to dislike about School Streets.

In response to Councillor das Neves, it was noted that the schools were fully in support of the proposals. School drop offs and pick ups were much better than before, and both parents and teachers were happy with the implementation of School Streets.

In response to questions from Councillor da Costa , the following was noted:

- The air quality data for Seven Sisters school had been normalised in relation to other baseline data used for air quality.

**RESOLVED to**

1. Note the outcome of the trial of six School Streets, as detailed in the Monitoring Report (Appendix A).
2. Consider the objections made in respect of each School Street (Appendix B) and officer responses to the objections raised (Appendix C).
3. Approve the making permanent of all ETOs associated with all six School Streets show in the plans (Appendix A3), subject to the outcome of any statutory traffic order procedure.

### **Reasons for decision**

School Streets are a key priority for the Council, as set out within the School Street Plan<sup>1</sup>, the Walking and Cycling Action Plan<sup>2</sup> and the Corporate Delivery Plan 2022-2024<sup>3</sup>.

The reasons for recommendation 3.3 are based upon the evidence collected during the ETO period and the positive benefits that the School Streets have delivered, as discussed in Section 7.

### **Alternative options considered**

Do nothing - i.e. to let the experimental traffic orders lapse.

The Council would therefore fail to deliver on the motion passed by Full Council in March 2019, which set out a commitment to deliver School Streets at primary schools across the borough.

Failure to retain these School Streets would be contrary to the objectives set out in the Transport Strategy, the Climate Change Action Plan and the Walking and Cycling Action Plan.

Extend the length of the experimental period before a decision is made.

This option was rejected because, if time runs out on the ETO, the default position is that the order lapses and is no longer enforceable. Alongside this, there is evidence from other School Streets projects that little would change or be gained within an extra 6-month time period (where possible).

## **12. CLINTON ROAD CLOSURE**

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport, and Deputy Leader of the Council, introduced the report which reported on the impact of the trial prohibition of motor vehicles in Clinton Road, N15, at the junction with West Green Road which was introduced under an experimental traffic order (ETO) in March 2022, and sought approval to make the traffic orders permanent for the prohibition of motor vehicles in Clinton Road at the junction with West Green Road.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/ie/IssueDetails.aspx?IIId=71809&PlanId=0&Opt=3#A166280>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.haringey.gov.uk/parking-roads-and-travel/roads-and-streets/haringey-streets-people/haringey-s-adopted-walking-and-cycling-action-plan>

<sup>3</sup> [www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/final\\_corporate\\_delivery\\_plan.pdf](http://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/final_corporate_delivery_plan.pdf)

## **RESOLVED to**

1. Note the outcome of the trial prohibition of motor vehicles in Clinton Road at its junction with West Green Road (see plan in Appendix A); and
2. Consider the objections received to the experimental traffic order (ETO) and officer's response to themes raised, as set out in Section 8 of this report.
3. Approve the making of a permanent traffic management order (TMO) subject to the outcome of any statutory traffic order procedures.

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The reason for recommendation 3.1 is to ensure Cabinet has all the information necessary to reach a decision on how to proceed with respect to this experimental scheme which came into operation in March 2022. The six-month statutory objection period has ended, and the 18-month trial period (maximum period allowed under legislation) will expire in September 2023.

The reason for recommendation 3.2 is to ensure compliance with Regulation 23 of The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. In particular, the order making authority must consider all objections made and not withdrawn prior to making an order that gives permanent effect to an experimental order.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

### **Do nothing - i.e. to let the experimental traffic order lapse**

This option was rejected as the performance of the experimental scheme is effective in meeting the objectives of traffic reduction and tackling anti-social behaviour. Do nothing will result in removal of the scheme infrastructure and therefore likely return of the issues experienced with anti-social behaviour.

Failure to retain an effective motor vehicle restriction would be contrary to the objectives set out in the Transport Strategy, the Climate Change Action Plan and the Walking and Cycling Action Plan.

## **13. 2022/23 FINANCE UPDATE AND PROVISIONAL OUTTURN**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Local Investment introduced the report which set out the provisional outturn for 2022-23 for the General Fund, HRA, DSG and the Capital Programme compared to budget. It provided explanations of significant under/overspends and included proposed transfers to/from reserves, revenue and capital carry forward requests and any budget virements or adjustments.

In response to questions from Councillor da Costa it was noted:

- Officers were already working ideas for future savings. It was important to note that savings did not necessarily mean cuts, and officers were looking at delivery of services to ensure that value for money achieved in all aspects.
- All capital programmes needed to be viable, and viability would be tested against increased interest rates. However, at the same time, the Cabinet would

also need to discuss priorities in terms of capital projects, so some projects would go ahead and others not, depending on those priorities.

- Further discussions needed to take place in terms of voids.

### **RESOLVED to**

1. Note the provisional revenue and capital outturn for 2022-23 as detailed in the report;
2. Approve the capital carry forwards in Appendix 3;
3. Approve the appropriations to/from reserves at Appendix 4;
4. Approve the budget virements as set out in Appendix 5;
5. Note the debt write-offs approved by officers in Quarter 4 2022-23 as set out in Appendix 6;

### **Reasons for decision**

A strong financial management framework, including oversight by members and senior management is an essential part of delivering the Council's priorities and statutory duties.

It is necessary at year end to resolve the treatment of related balance sheet accounts, in light of the experience during the year and knowledge of the Council's future position and requirements.

### **Alternative options considered**

The Director of Finance, as Section 151 Officer, has a duty to consider and propose decisions in the best interests of the authority's finances and that best support the delivery of the agreed corporate delivery plan outcomes whilst maintaining financial sustainability.

This report of the Director of Finance has addressed these points. Therefore, no other options have been presented.

## **14. AGREEMENT OF VOLUNTARY UNDERTAKING WITH REGULATOR FOR SOCIAL HOUSING**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning introduced the report which set out the additional step of entering into a Voluntary Undertaking with the Regulator for Social Housing, following the self-referral in 2023. The report looked to demonstrate the Council's commitment to ensure that it was working openly and transparently with the RSH with the aim of achieving full compliance and discharge of the Notice.

In response to questions from Councillor da Costa it was noted:

- There had already been significant work to produce tangible outcomes in terms of repair works. There would now be a single point of contact for residents, rather than having a number of operatives dealing with the same issue.
- There would be criticisms, but a lot of work had been started to address issues and learn from the past to make improvements.

- In regard to the fire risk assessment backlog, the backlog had been cleared and processes would be put in place to ensure that there would be no future backlogs.
- At the point of self-referral, there were over 8000 properties that did not have a valid electrical safety certificate. This had been reduced to 398 properties, and this number was mainly due to operatives being unable to access the properties.

### **RESOLVED to**

1. Note the content of the Voluntary Undertaking attached as Appendix 1.
2. Delegate authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with Director Placemaking and Housing, and the Head of Legal and Governance to enter into a voluntary undertaking with the Regulator for Social Housing, and to agree any subsequent changes
3. Note that on 18 April 2023, Cabinet agreed that annual assurance statement updates will be provided to Council which will include updates on the Regulatory notice.

### **Reasons for decision**

It is essential that as a landlord the Council provides a good service to tenants and leaseholders, and as a minimum complies with all regulatory and statutory duties. Residents need to be assured that the Council is committed to improving its services, that it has a clear plan to do so, and is holding itself accountable.

Section 125 of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008 allows a social housing provider to present to the RSH a Voluntary Undertaking which requires Cabinet approval.

### **Alternative options considered**

Alternative options include not approving a Voluntary Agreement with the RSH however the RSH does have a range of enforcement tools that may be used to ensure compliance against each of the regulatory standards, and if the Council cannot demonstrate a willingness to work in partnership with the RSH or their response is considered inadequate, the RSH may take enforcement action. Therefore, offering a Voluntary Undertaking to the regulator is the recommended option.

## **15. PARKS & GREENSPACES STRATEGY ADOPTION**

The Cabinet Member for Culture, Communities and Leisure introduced the report which sought approval for the adoption of the Parks and Greenspaces Strategy.

Councillor Hakata commended the report, and paid tribute to the Council's Conservation Manager who had compiled the biodiversity action plan.

Councillor Gordon added that this strategy was testament to the way this administration had prioritised open green spaces, and pushing forward protected spaces.

In response to questions from Councillor da Costa it was noted:

- Consultation in Priory Park was ongoing, and a lot of enquiries had been received in relation to locking the tennis courts.
- In terms of the woodland plans, it was expected that first drafts would be ready by Autumn 2023.

### **RESOLVED to**

1. Adopt the Parks and Greenspaces Strategy and the other plans identified in para 1.3.
2. Delegate authority to the Assistant Director Direct Services, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Culture, Communities and Leisure, to agree any minor amendments to the documents and to agree and publish an annual action plan.
3. Agree that a formal review of the documents, objectives, and progress towards achieving the aims of the Parks and Greenspaces Strategy is reported to Cabinet every five years following adoption.

### **Reasons for decision**

Previous strategic documents have all expired and therefore this means the borough has no agreed strategy for the management, improvement and enhancement of the parks and greenspaces in the borough.

The documents have the support of many stakeholders who collaborated with the Council to identify the priorities, needs and aspirations which are embodied in the new Parks and Greenspaces Strategy and its supporting plans, policies, and standards.

The Parks and Greenspaces Strategy is aspirational, seeking to make the parks and greenspaces in the borough truly inclusive for the whole community in Haringey. If achieved, then everyone will have the opportunity to benefit from the uplift in their wellbeing, have spaces that have adapted to climate change and enjoy a quality experience for all.

Funding and sustaining the outcomes hoped for in this strategy will always be a challenge in the current local government climate. However, as has been witnessed in Haringey on numerous occasions, starting from a position of collaboration can achieve much greater outcomes.

### **Alternative options considered.**

The only other option would have been to not produce a new strategy or the supporting plans. This would have weakened the Council's position. There would be no clear policy framework within which Councillors and officers could work. Decisions and opportunities would have to be weighed against their merits and not in relation to



the agreed strategic aims and objectives. Without a strategy, the Council is in a weaker position to bid for external funding.

## **16. ROUGH SLEEPING STRATEGY**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning introduced the report which sought approval of the Rough Sleeping Strategy.

In response to questions from Councillor da Costa it was noted:

- Majority of people rough sleeping in the borough had unclear immigration status, with no recourse to public funds. It was believed that this had been exacerbated by the cost of living crisis, with many working cash in hand and living in unsecure accommodation.
- Officers were carrying out a lot of work around the 'hidden homeless' and this covered LGBTQ+ people, woman and other minorities. The strategy made reference to this work.

### **RESOLVED to**

1. Approve the Rough Sleeping Strategy attached at Appendix 1.
2. Note the significant resident and stakeholder co-production undertaken throughout 2021 and 2022. Specifically, to note that the commitments and activities within the strategy were co-produced by residents with lived experience of homelessness, council staff and partners using a participatory democracy approach, which included a public legislative theatre event in January 2022, facilitated with support from Arts and Homelessness International.
3. Note the public consultation and amendments made to the draft strategy following Cabinet Member Signing
4. Note the following:
  - We will commit to developing a delivery plan to sit underneath the Strategy which will set out how we will work with partners to deliver on the commitments, and that this will specifically include how we will work with partners in mental health and probation to prevent rough sleeping
  - We will ensure that the delivery plan includes a robust communication strategy and will also set out how the aims articulated in the Strategy will be scrutinised over its lifetime
  - We will update the graphics shown in the Strategy prior to publishing to ensure they represent the diversity of the borough
  - We will ensure that an accessible version of the Strategy is made available prior to publishing following approval of content at Cabinet

### **Reasons for decision**

Rough sleeping is one of the most harmful and visible consequences of an unequal society. People affected by it are disproportionately victims of abuse and exploitation, more likely to die prematurely and less likely to secure their legal rights and fair access to health services. In 21-22, 268 people slept rough on the streets of Haringey; the cost-of-living crisis, ongoing impact of Covid-19 and a challenging national policy environment means this figure is likely to increase in the coming years.

Haringey's current Rough Sleeping Strategy was written in 2018. A new strategy is required to reflect the significant reduction in rough sleeping achieved in the previous strategy period, and to restate our ambition to end rough sleeping and articulate the commitments and activities needed to do this.

The Rough Sleeping Strategy is not a statutory requirement and therefore a statutory consultation is not required. However, the Council is committed to enabling all residents to actively participate in strategy development, as such, a comprehensive consultation took place to seek the views of those who had been involved in the development of the strategy.

#### **Alternative options considered**

Not to develop a new Rough Sleeping Strategy. This was rejected because, although developing a Rough Sleeping Strategy is not a statutory requirement, it is an important mechanism for securing shared understanding and borough-wide commitment to tackling this crucial issue.

### **17. TOTTENHAM HALE PLACEMAKING: CO-DESIGNED TRANSFORMATION PLANS FOR DOWN LANE PARK**

The Cabinet Member for Council Housebuilding, Placemaking and Development introduced the report which set out the proposals for Down Lane Park following the decision made by Cabinet in June 2023 to transform the park into a destination park at the heart of the neighbourhood.

Following consideration of exempt information at item 24 it was:

#### **RESOLVED to**

1. Note the co-designed masterplan, works packages and programme budget of £9.1m for the Down Lane Park Improvement Programme, and the proposed delivery approach comprising Phase 1 being delivered under permitted development (which will be the subject of the GRS funding agreement) and submission of a planning application for the wider masterplan in autumn 2023.
2. Accept £750,000 Green and Resilient Spaces Funding from the Mayor of London to support the delivery of Phase 1 of the Down Lane Park Improvement Programme, and associated community development workstreams, as part of a total programme budget of £9.1m; and delegate authority to Director of Placemaking and Housing to enter into the Funding Agreement and to approve any future variations to the Funding Agreement.

3. Approve the variation of the existing contract with Levitt Bernstein Associates Ltd, in accordance with CSO 10.02.1(b), so as to increase the value of the contract, by an additional £456,880 + VAT so that the total contract value will be £954,539 + VAT for the delivery of all phases of work.
4. Delegate authority to Director Environment and Neighbourhoods to approve the Management and Maintenance Plan for the Park prior to completion of each phase of works on site.

### **Reasons for decision**

#### **Approve receipt of £0.75m Mayor of London Green & Resilient Spaces Funding**

The Green and Resilient Spaces Funding for this project is a major investment by the Mayor of London in the park and the Tottenham Hale neighbourhood as a whole. The fund supports large-scale, ambitious projects that future-proof the capital from the climate emergency and the programme was awarded the highest possible grant of £750,000.

This funding will unlock a range of deliverables set out in Appendix 2 alongside a package of Community Development activities to be delivered by the Council's community partner, Living Under One Sun (see para 6.7).

The £750,000 GRS funding will supplement the wider programme budget (at Appendix 1) establishing a full budget for the park improvement programme of £9.1m. This will enable the project to progress towards full, rather than piecemeal and longitudinal, delivery of the Council and the community's vision for the park.

#### **Increase the fee for Lead Designer to reflect increased delivery budget**

Levitt Bernstein Associates have built a good working relationship with the community on this project and have the necessary ability and experience to listen and respond accordingly, which is fundamental in building trust and securing positive outcomes from a co-design process. They have been an integral part of the co-design process for 18 months and have been exposed to discussions throughout which must be fully considered and reflected in all stages of the design process.

Their current fee covers the masterplan development for the whole park and the delivery of a first phase of works. Approval of the uplift in their fee, to reflect the full programme budget of £9.1m, will enable them to continue to work on all phases of the programme through to completion of all works on site.

#### **Progressing to delivery**

A decision to accept £750,000 grant funding from the Mayor of London will enable the Down Lane Park improvement programme to secure the funding awarded and proceed towards delivery of Phase 1 with the appointed design team (Levitt Bernstein Associates). It is a requirement of the GLA that 'a majority' of the £750,000 grant funding is defrayed by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2024, requiring delivery to start on site no later than

December '23/January '24. This requires clarity around the funding, resource and direction of the project now in order to meet these timescales and de-risk delivery of the park improvement programme. A breakdown of the Phase 1 works is provided at para 6.6.

The Community Development outcomes (described at para 6.7) must be delivered within the funding timeline (by March 2025). Any delay to signing the Funding Agreement and commencing this workstream will directly impact on the window of time for delivery of these vital outcomes secured for Tottenham Hale's community.

### **Alternative options considered**

Three options were considered:

**Do nothing.** This is not recommended as it would fail to secure the £750,000 Mayor of London grant funding for this project and the resource required to develop the design through to delivery. This would stall the project from realising the full potential to transform the park and risk eroding the positive relationship built with local residents and park users around this project.

**Not extend the fee for Levitt Bernstein.** This is not recommended. It would result in only the first phase of the project being delivered under the existing contract. It would also require a new procurement exercise to be run for the later phases of design work which would add cost and cause delay to delivery on the ground. The working knowledge and goodwill that has been built up by Levitt Bernstein through the co-design process to date would be lost with no immediate comparable resource available to step in and ensure continuity and timely delivery.

**Note the masterplan and secure the funding to deliver Phase 1 and extend the fee for the design team to enable full delivery of the programme.** This is the recommendation of this report.

## **18. SUPPLY, INSTALLATION AND MANAGEMENT OF CYCLE STORAGE FACILITIES**

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport, and Deputy Leader of the Council, introduced the report which sought approval to award a contract to the preferred bidder for a total value of £908k+VAT to supply, install, manage and maintain cycle storage facilities in the borough on behalf of the Council.

In response to questions from Councillor da Costa, the following was noted:

- It was difficult to be specific on the number of cycle hangers that would be installed, but officers would seek to maximise the amount as much as possible through single traffic management orders.

Following consideration of exempt information at item 25 it was,

**RESOLVED to**

1. Approve the award of a contract to the preferred Bidder, pursuant to a call-off from a framework agreement set up by Waltham Forest Council, as allowed under CSO 7.01(b), for three years with an option for a two-year extension exercisable at the Council's sole discretion, to supply, install, manage and maintain cycle storage facilities in the borough.

### **Reasons for decision**

Encouraging more people to cycle is a vital part of Haringey Council's plan to tackle congestion, improve air quality, promote physical activity and improve accessibility. The Council is committed to the promotion of cycling as a serious mode of transport.

One of the barriers to taking up cycling by residents' is the lack of safe place to store their bicycle. This contract is being awarded to address this barrier by ensuring that more cycle storage units are installed on and off-street at suitable locations across the borough for residents' use.

The scope of work required includes supplying, installing, managing, and maintaining cycle storage facilities and associated equipment.

### **Alternative options considered**

A do-nothing approach was considered but this was rejected as it would be against the Council's commitment to providing more secure cycle storage units (cycle hangars) on and off street, for residents' use.

## **19. LEISURE REVIEW**

The Cabinet Member for Culture, Communities and Leisure introduced the report which set out the Council's intentions to undertake a review of Haringey's leisure services and provision across the borough.

In response to questions from Councillor , the following was noted:

- The Monitoring Officer's view was that the exempt report would not be released to the Leader of the Opposition. She stated that the relevant scrutiny committee would have options open to it in terms of reviewing the report.

**The recommendations were contained in the exempt report.**

## **20. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

### **RESOLVED**

To note the minutes of other bodies.

## **21. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

### **RESOLVED**

To note the significant and delegated actions.

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

None.

**23. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED**

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as items 24, 25 and 26 contain exempt information as defined under paragraphs 3 and 5, Part 1, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

**24. EXEMPT - TOTTENHAM HALE PLACEMAKING: CO-DESIGNED TRANSFORMATION PLANS FOR DOWN LANE PARK**

The exempt information was noted.

**25. EXEMPT - SUPPLY, INSTALLATION AND MANAGEMENT OF CYCLE STORAGE FACILITIES**

The exempt information was noted.

**26. EXEMPT - LEISURE REVIEW**

The exempt information was noted.

**27. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....