

MINUTES OF MEETING Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Monday, 14th November, 2022, 9.30 pm

PRESENT:

**Councillors: Scott Emery, Sygrave (Co-Optee), Culverwell,
George Dunstall, Hymas, Simmons-Safo (Chair), Wallace and
Alexandra Worrell**

ALSO ATTENDING:

169. 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'.

170. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were noted from Cllr Adam Jogee, Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Jobs and Community Cohesion.

171. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

The Panel was advised that as Cllr Jogee was unable to attend the meeting, Agenda Item Nine would be withdrawn.

172. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

173. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

The Panel received a deputation on Low Traffic Neighbourhoods from Alexander Charalambous. The main points put forward as part of the deputation were noted as:

- Following the introduction of LTNs, two mile journeys that used to take ten minutes now took over an hour.
- LTN's had increased pollution as the closure of roads under the scheme had increased stationary traffic. Cyclists and pedestrians breathed in increased amounts of pollution as they moved past this traffic.
- Schools on 'sacrificial' roads were also seeing increased levels of pollution from standing traffic
- Local businesses were down anything up to 100%
- Cars are being drive additional unnecessary miles in order to skirt the LTN.

- It was suggested that those living on affected roads were being discriminated against. Previously, traffic congestion was evenly spread but now disproportionately impacted the poorer sections of our communities.
- The deputation speaker questioned the extent to which Haringey had carried out a fair consultation, given that that consultations were weighted to those inside the LTNs who were disproportionately a white British demographic and were the likely beneficiaries of the LTNs. However, these people have still submitted objections.
- 10,000 people in total had raised objections to date and the objections of disability organisations and special schools were ignored. Schools were disproportionately within sacrificial roads. The depute commented that LTNs had been done to residents rather than for or in consultation with.
- One of the justifications for LTNs was reduction in car traffic but, it was suggested that, Haringey had taken its data from a discredited report. In the ten inner London Boroughs that introduced them, LTN's had in fact increased the number of miles driven by cars in 2020 by an average of 11.4% compared with 8.9% for the two inner London boroughs who did not implement LTNs.
- There is no data to show that Haringey is monitoring carbon emissions, no baseline data before the LTNs, no documented plan to show Haringey is monitoring emissions during the LTN trial. Without this there is no objective basis with which to determine whether carbon emissions and air pollution have increased or decreased. The speaker suggested that if there were plans to monitor this then the Panel should be pushing for this to be publically available.
- A further justification for LTNs was increased physical activity but 65% of Haringey residents were physically active which was higher than the national average. How would this be measured and in what time frame?
- 71% of serious accidents in built-up areas happened on 30MPH or main roads but LTNs closed 20 MPH back roads and push that traffic on to these more dangerous roads. It was suggested that a far better idea would be to keep all roads open and make them all 20MPH. This would also help encourage active travel as all roads are safer.
- The community was not against the goals of the LTNs but no evidence was submitted to show how the schemes would meet their stated goals. It was suggested that data used by the administration was out of date and inaccurate.
- The spokesperson requested that the LTNs should be paused to allow a full and proper consultation to be carried out. Clear aims for the LTNs should be set out and measurements agreed. Discussions should be held with the community in order to agree how best to achieve the stated goals.

In response to the deputation, the Chair welcomed the detailed submission given by the speaker and commented that she felt it carried the weight of sentiment from the majority of the community. The Chair stated that she recognised that there were some significant constraints involved with the implementation of the LTNs and that she had similar conversations with her work colleagues at St Ann's hospital. The Chair advised that she would raise the deputation with the Cabinet Member and would provide a response in writing to Mr Charalambous, outlining the actions that would she would take forward on behalf of the scrutiny panel.

In addition to the above deputation, the Panel also received a large number of public questions on LTNs, which were submitted prior to the meeting. It was agreed before the meeting that written responses would be provided at the meeting for the first 15 questions that met the necessary criteria and excluded questions that were largely duplicates. The Clerk called out the name of the questioners in turn and they were invited to ask their questions. The Chair then read out a written response to each question.

Question 1

How are you assessing the impact of this LTN on the local residents, business and commuters.

Response:

The trial LTNs are subject to comprehensive monitoring. Details of monitoring for each LTN are provided in published Monitoring Strategies on the Council's Streets for People webpages. All data collected to date is published on Haringey My Maps and residents can download the raw data as provided by our contractors. Once some time has passed to allow the scheme to bedded in, we will also launch residents' perception surveys which will give residents and businesses a further chance to have their say on the trial schemes. We will keep communication channels open throughout the trials. The Council will appoint a third party consultant to analyse the monitoring data and prepare a summary Monitoring Report before the end of the trial period

Question 2

Why did they not think of the results of doing this? By doing this, did they not consider the inconvenience to motorists who do not know as well as the visitors of residents.

Response:

The Council's decision to proceed with the trial LTNs was informed by an extensive listening exercise with residents, businesses and other stakeholders, High-Level Transport Assessments assessing the potential impact of each of the LTNs on the highways network, as well as an Equalities Impact Assessment assessing the likely impacts of the proposed LTNs on groups with protected characteristics

Question 3

Why did the consultations documents for the St Ann's LTN only have option A or option B why was there no box to say no to both

Response:

You are correct that the survey did not provide an option to specifically reject both options A and B. However, it did provide the opportunity to provide feedback on both options on a scale of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive). It was therefore possible to indicate a negative view of both proposals within the same survey.

Question 4

Why was option A implemented when Haringey Councils own report states that option A was not well received, and that option B was the more popular choice and if this was the case why was Option B not implemented?

Response:

With respect to the St Ann's LTN, there was a more positive consultation response to Option A than Option B. 62% of respondents were positive about Option A with 32% negative. 34% of respondents were positive regarding Option B and 43% were negative.

Question 5

The public consultation for the Bounds Green LTN was conducted by Sustrans, which is a cycling advocacy group. Do councillors deem this at all appropriate?

Response:

While we note that Sustrans does promote walking and cycling, and is a custodian of the National Cycle Network, it is also the case that organisation has a transport consultancy arm which offers a range of quality transport planning, design and public engagement services to local authorities. Sustrans was commissioned by the Council as it was the best placed consultant to support the Council with engagement on, and design development of, the LTNs.

Question 6

Why are there no exemptions in place for us residents who simply want to drive freely around our area/bottom of our road. We are not rat running on our own roads. The technology clearly exists for BB holders to be considered, put in the system and made exempt. Us residents who have already had to qualify for residents' status for the CPZ parking zones should already be in a database somewhere already? Why can't our VRMs not be matched up with your new LTN/ANPR systems?

Response:

The Council considers that an approach of exempting all residents from their home LTN would conflict with the primary objectives of LTNs and therefore this option was discounted. The Council has a comprehensive exemptions approach to help meet the needs of residents with access and disability needs.

Question 7

So many streets/households did NOT have an information pack delivered including myself, houses with multiple flats, Kitchener Rd, Handsworth Rd, Dongola Rd, Clonmell Rd and Broadwater Farm estate to name a few? Many were promised redelivery and to date still haven't received the leaflet. Can you tell us who you used to deliver these leaflets and explain why so many households were missed out in the direct LTN zone? Hundreds are left unaware of the whole thing and not everyone can access the stuff online. This seems deliberate on your part not to inform people properly.

Response:

LBOX communications hand delivered letters and leaflets to addresses within consultation area. All deliveries were geo-tracked and reports provided by the delivery company did not indicate any large areas not being covered. We understand that some individual addresses may have been omitted for a number of reasons and whenever reported a redelivery was arranged.

Question 8

Is there Air Quality data/measurements for the immediate and adjacent area of the trial LTN, before LTN introduced (and planned for after).

Response:

Yes. The Council has air quality monitoring in place using both diffusion tubes and air quality sensors. Further information is available in the Monitoring Strategy for each LTN which can be viewed on the Council's website. All data is available on Haringey My Maps. Monitoring was initiated ahead of implementation and will continue throughout the scheme trial.

Question 9

Is there Traffic data/measurements (both quantity and routing) for before LTN introduced (and planned for after).

Response:

The Council has a comprehensive monitoring programme in place in relation to traffic. Further information is available in the Monitoring Strategy for each LTN which can be viewed on the Council's website. All data is available on Haringey My Maps. Monitoring was initiated ahead of implementation and will continue throughout the scheme trial.

Question 10:

How are we to get to our families or our elders if you block entrance to the roads. Some of us a lot of us look after sick, our in-firmed, our people who are unable to go the distance. How are we the drivers to get to them.

Response:

The Local Government Association's guidance on consultation sets out that "Consultation is technically any activity that gives local people a voice and an opportunity to influence important decisions. It involves listening to and learning from local people before decisions are made or priorities are set." The Council carried out three rounds of engagement/consultation in advance of a decision to approve the making of experimental traffic management orders to implement the LTNs. This was not statutory consultation bound by legal requirements rather it consisted of an extensive listening and learning exercise. The Council took account of all feedback received in reaching its decision and the feedback influenced key aspects of the approved schemes, including design and the subsequently approved exemptions approach. The LTN consultation reports provide full details of consultation feedback and the Council's response. In relation to the experimental traffic management order, the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations

1996 set out the statutory requirements for consultation relating to the making of traffic management orders (which are the legal documents that the Council used to give effect to the trial LTNs). The Regulations require the Council to consult certain consultees (Regulation 6) and also include specific provisions relating to the publication of proposals (Regulation 7). The Council has complied in full with these requirements for the LTNs. Indeed, it has gone significantly beyond the statutory requirements in terms of the engagement and consultation it carried out. During the first six month period in which the experimental traffic management order is in force, it is subject to a statutory public objection period.

Question 11:

How are we to get to our families or our elders if you block entrance to the roads. Some of us a lot of us look after sick, our in-firmed, our people who are unable to go the distance. How are we the drivers to get to them.

Response:

All addresses within the LTNs continue to be accessible by car although we acknowledge drivers may need to use a different route to access their destination. The Council has an exemptions approach in place which helps meet the needs of residents with access and disability needs. Please refer to our website for details.

Question 12:

Will the Councillors define what the success criteria are for the three Haringey LTNs (Bounds Green, St Ann's and West Green/Bruce Grove), including specific targets for demonstrating success? And if no specific targets can be given, why not and when will you be able to specify detailed targets? Additionally, will the Councillors confirm that if the specific targets are not achieved in 18 months from implementation that the LTNs will be scrapped?

Response:

Any future decision on LTNs will be considered in light of all relevant considerations, including feedback received during the trial, formal objections to the traffic orders giving effect to the trial and evidence collected as part of the monitoring process.

Question 13:

Have the architects of this scheme ever actually travelled down west green road? If so, how can they in sound mind justify increasing the pressure on a road which is already prone to severe delays? This is surely just going to result in more stationary traffic on the road, increasing pollution and thereby negating a key aim of the scheme?

Response:

The scheme has been designed by the Council with support from expert consultants and all parties involved are familiar with the borough and its roads. The potential impacts of the LTNs were assessed via High-Level Transport Assessments. In regard to West Green Road, specific assessment was carried out looking at the cumulative impact of the St Ann's LTN and Bruce Grove West Green LTN. The Council is closely

monitoring the impacts of the LTNs on traffic and air quality as set out in the Monitoring Strategies published on the Council's website. At the moment, there is insufficient post-implementation data available. However, once some time has passed to allow the scheme to bed in, the Council will appoint a third party consultant to analyse the feedback received to date including formal objections received during the first six month period, and monitoring data, together with feedback received following further engagement to be undertaken with stakeholders. A Monitoring Report for each LTN will subsequently be produced which will help inform future decisions on the scheme. The Council is aware of specific issues with congestion on West Green Road since the introduction of the St Ann's LTN which has negatively impacted bus journey times. We are working with London Buses/ TfL road network planners to identify ways of mitigating these delays, improving bus operation. The traffic signals in the West Green Road area have already been optimised to improve efficiency of traffic flow.

Question 14:

What is the purpose of all these restrictions? These roads have never been congested long enough for car emissions to be polluting the streets, never had accidents on them and have been short cuts to save people like myself time and money to get to where we need to be.

Response:

Haringey is embarking on a programme of implementing LTNs to deliver the objectives set out in the adopted 2018 Transport Strategy and the adopted 2022 Walking and Cycling Action Plan. LTNs are needed across the borough to 1) reduce pollution, especially NO2 and particulate matter, which can affect lung function and breathing, worsening respiratory diseases including asthma in children and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) in adults; 2) improve health outcomes related to inactivity; 3) reduce motor traffic collisions; 4) reduce carbon emissions in our attempt to avoid catastrophic climate change and finally 5) reclaim neighbourhood streets for pedestrians and communities and to make safe welcoming, inclusive spaces for all residents. The rationale for specific schemes are provided in the related Cabinet reports from 7 December 2021.

Question 15:

Where is the argument and examples that this clears air pollution rather than just moving it?

Response:

The ultimate goal of the LTNs is to reduce traffic both within the LTNs and on the boundary roads of the LTNs. Evidence from Waltham Forest has shown LTNs can reduce air pollution within both LTNs and on their boundary roads. The Council is carrying out comprehensive monitoring of air quality to understand what impacts the trial LTNs are having on air pollution. Details of air quality monitoring are provided in the Monitoring Strategies for each LTN and data collected to date is published on Haringey My Maps.

As per, the Committee Procedure Rules, the following supplementary questions were allowed:

- a. The deputation spokesperson advised the Panel that he believed that some of the information contained in the responses to the questions was inaccurate.
- b. The Panel was asked why, in light of comments about people not being consulted, the consultation letter was not sent out to everybody in the borough along with their annual Council Tax statement? Concerns were also raised about the fact that residents could not find any useful information about the LTNs on the website. It was also queried whether the company that carried out the consultation was asked to consult a percentage of residents or what that methodology used was? A further question was why the west of the borough had been omitted from any of the LTN trials?
- c. A resident advised the Panel that she had a disabled child who needed to travel by taxi as his parents could not care for him whilst travelling if they were driving a car. The Panel was asked, in light of this, why those with similar care needs did not receive a blanket exemption from all LTNs? It was argued that the no left turn on Seven Sisters Road had added around £5 to a typical taxi journey and that this had a financial impact on their family. The resident gave an example of her child being stuck in traffic for two hours due to the congestion caused by the LTNs and that the child had suffered a seizure as a result. It was commented that Haringey had adopted a social model of disability, which involved removing barriers to those with disability. LTNs, it was suggested, literally involved putting barriers in peoples way. The resident advised that her local area was effectively an experiment and questioned why they should be the subject of this experiment, given that it involved some of the poorest and most vulnerable parts of the borough.
- d. In response to the above comment, the Chair acknowledged her own experiences of speaking to residents and advocated the need for people who provide domiciliary care to be able to use cars to reach their patients.
- e. The Chair advised that she would speak to the Cabinet Member and would provide a response in writing to the supplementary questions.

174. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the previous meeting on 5th September were agreed as a correct record.

175. HARINGEY CRIME PERFORMANCE AND PRIORITIES OVERVIEW

Clerks Note- The meeting was adjourned for a short while following a disturbance by a member of the public who had been present in the Westbury room observing the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 19:41 and re-adjourned at 19:50.

The Committee received a presentation and accompanying cover report which provided an overview of Haringey's crime performance and the local priorities for the

Community Safety Partnership. The Panel were invited to provide comments on these priorities as well as current community safety issues in general. The update also included information relating to domestic violence and hate crime, which Panel members had requested at a previous meeting. The presentation was provided jointly by officers from the Community Safety team and also by the North Area BCU Commander, Detective Chief Superintendent Caroline Haines (Police). The following arose during the discussion of this agenda item:

- a. The Panel raised concern about a perceived lack of visibility for local Safer Neighbourhood Team officers and were keen that that a visible local police presence at a ward level was maintained. The Panel also commented on the importance of tackling drug-related crime to local residents. In response, the Borough Commander acknowledged that there was a feeling in the community of police not being visible enough. The Borough Commander set out that there was a commitment to two ward officers and a PSCO per ward (as part of the Safer Neighbourhood Team), however it was acknowledged that resources were also stretched across the frontline. As a result, police officers could be called away centrally to undertake other policing duties, which were referred to as 'abstractions'. The Borough Commander acknowledged the influence of drugs on the proliferation of crime and advised that the police were working closely with the Council to provide weeks of action, which would increase visibility within a targeted location for that week.
- b. The Panel raised concerns about Stop and Search and the harm that could be done, particularly around disproportionality towards young black men. The Panel questioned how the value of the use of Stop and Search was measured against the harm that it caused to individuals. In response, the Borough Commander advised that her officers did a lot of work across the community and also with new police recruits to make sure they were aware of the disproportional elements of Stop and Search, particularly the impact on young black men. The Borough Commander advised that they regularly reviewed the data around Stop and Search, both in terms of its effectiveness and also in terms of disproportionality. The Panel was advised that the key for police colleagues was to minimise disproportionality where possible. Enhanced training was undertaken with the Haringey Independent Stop and Search Monitoring Group for new recruits, which had also been extended to a pan-London community training initiative to improve trust and confidence in policing.
- c. The Borough Commander also identified that the BCU deployed a number of external resources including TSG and BTCF to tackle violent crime. These officers were specially briefed and trained on Stop and Search. The Borough Commander advised that she held a meeting with key stakeholders in the community monitoring group and the independent advisory group, along with others from trusted partners to get feedback on trust and confidence in policing and the use of Stop and Search.
- d. The Panel sought clarification around evidence for the efficacy of Stop and Search in taking weapons off the street, compared to other types of interventions. In response, the Borough Commander advised that this was difficult to measure as the police did not have an indicator around trust and confidence as a result of a Stop and Search intervention. Instead the data was more qualitative and that this had to be weighed up against data on the fear of crime and the reduction of high harm crimes, such as knife crime.

- e. The Chair questioned how the police worked with the community and which parts of the community it sought to engage with. In response, the Borough Commander advised that times had changed in policing since the 1990s and that the model of the BCU was a much broader geographic area than the old Tottenham division. In terms of how priorities were identified, it was noted that much of this was pulled out from the public attitudes survey as well as what the community advisory groups told the police. The Borough Commander advised that they focused on high harm wards and were also very much driven by the data, as well as feedback from local communities. In relation to resources being spread thin, the Borough Commander advised that she had made herself as visible in the borough as she could.
- f. The Panel noted that the new Commissioner of the Met. Had made a commitment that all burglary incidents would receive a police visit and it was questioned how well Haringey was doing in relation to burglaries and how long before a 100% target might be reached. In response, the Borough Commander acknowledged the impact of burglaries on victims and that she envisaged that Haringey would be adhering to those targets. The Panel were advised that the Borough Commander would provide a written response on this to the Members. **(Action: Borough Commander)**.
- g. In relation to a question on school visits, the Borough Commander advised that visits did take place and that there was a dedicated officer attached to each school. In relation to its success in reducing disproportionality of young black men in prison, the Borough Commander advised that it was a much more complex problem than just engagement with schools and that a much more wider programme of engagement was required.
- h. The Panel sought assurances about whether social services would be involved with a child who was brought into a custody suite. In response, the Panel was advised that the custody worker would identify the most appropriate solution and one of these would be contacting social services. In addition, anytime a young person had an interaction with police, a Merlin report would be generated which would be processed by the multi-agency hub which also had links into social services.
- i. The Panel questioned the level of effectiveness for judicial orders and how this could potentially be effected by a lack of visibility, particularly in terms of the number of police stations being cut. In response, the Borough Commander advised that it was hard to measure how effective a judicial order was as you would never know the reason why a crime was not committed again, it could be the order, or it could be something else. The Borough Commander advised that where orders were breached, the police prioritised risk and harm and the activity would be tasked into the operations room which ran on a 24/7 basis. Therefore this was not connected to whether a police officer was visible or not, but rather based on a phone call to 999 or 111.
- j. The Panel requested a further breakdown on the hate crime data, so that it showed different segments within hate crime including racially motivated hate crime, homophobic hate crime and antisemitism, for example. The Borough Commander agreed to share this data with members. **(Action: Borough Commander)**.
- k. The Panel queried how the statistics had been compiled in the presentation in relation to the ward boundary changes, given that the new ward boundaries had not been changed on the police IT systems. In response, officers advised

that the data in the pack was based on the old ward boundaries and that future reports would reflect the new ward boundaries, future reports would also backdate the data to May when the changes came into effect. It was acknowledged that the ward level figures may change following this, but that the total number of crimes would stay the same.

- I. In relation to whether this would impact how long this might impact the ability to undertake comparisons on a ward level basis, officers advised that they were exploring ways to see how a like for like comparison could be done going forwards.

The Chair thanked the Borough Commander and officers for their time.

RESOLVED

That the Haringey Crime Performance and Priorities Overview was noted.

176. UPDATE ON HARINGEY COMMUNITY GOLD

The Panel received a report, which provided an update on the Haringey Community Gold (HCG) Scheme, including an overview of the scheme, timelines and the latest outcomes. The report was introduced by Eduardo Araujo, Senior Tottenham Community Safety Manager as set out in the agenda pack at pages 29 to 36. The following arose during the discussion of the report:

- a. The Panel sought assurances around the stated £71k carry forward from the scheme and what this would be spent on, in response officers clarified that this was the savings accrued over the three years of the scheme.
- b. The Panel questioned whether HCG had any activities in place to tackle young people and in-work poverty. In response, officers advised that on the ground this would likely be a navigation service, which would pinpoint people towards where they could receive support. Officers advised that they had, for example had been able to direct young people to support with food poverty. Officers also advised that there were also a number of qualitative outputs that would come to fruition as the scheme matured
- c. In relation to a question around partners, officers advised that there were six named partners, along with 75 other organisations that they worked with.
- d. The Chair questioned whether HCG had linked in with the Bridge of Hope organisation who had large partners such as Costco and also had clear outputs around health and wellbeing, including for young people. The Chair agreed to share the contact details for the organisation with officers. **(Action: Chair).**

RESOLVED

Noted.

177. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, JOBS & COMMUNITY COHESION

This agenda item was withdrawn.

178. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

RESOLVED

That the Panel noted the draft work programme.

179. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

180. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

15 December 2022

16 March 2023

CHAIR: Councillor Michelle Simmons-Safo

Signed by Chair

Date