

**MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL  
TUESDAY, 13 OCTOBER 2015**

Councillors Patrick Berryman, John Bevan, Barbara Blake, Sarah Elliott,  
Bob Hare, Adam Jogee (Chair) and Sheila Peacock

**CSP12. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None.

**CSP13. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**CSP14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**CSP15. DEPUTATIONS/ PETITIONS/ PRESENTATIONS/ QUESTIONS**

None.

**CSP16. MINUTES**

**AGREED:**

That the minutes of the meeting of 29 June 2015 be approved.

**CSP17. CABINET MEMBERS QUESTIONS; CABINET MEMBER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Councillor Stuart McNamara, the Cabinet Member for Environment, answered questions from the Panel regarding key areas within his portfolio as follows:

- Recycling of glass; Street banks had been removed due to contamination. However, it had been agreed to keep them where they worked and they could be brought back if need be. David Beadle, the Chief Executive of the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) commented that the best solution was if bottles could be taken back and refilled. However, deposit schemes rarely existed now. New European Commission regulations could require a higher level of re-use though. Banks were being removed due to co-mingling. Co-mingled bottles tended to be contaminated and broken. There was technology that could separate bottles but this was expensive. Work was undertaken by the NLWA with boroughs regarding the relative costs of the different options available. The value of materials had diminished considerably and it could therefore be challenging for local authorities to dispose of them.
- Timed collections were now being rolled out across the borough as well as black boxes.
- Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs); Enforcement involving HMOs was complex. The focus of enforcement in such circumstances was on the landlord of the property. The potential loss of licence could be used as leverage to promote

## **MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL TUESDAY, 13 OCTOBER 2015**

compliance by landlords. Steve Russell, the Housing Improvement Manager for Private Sector could be invited to a future meeting of the Panel to report on the licensing scheme, including statistics on the number of landlords who had had action taken against them.

- The plans for joined up enforcement involved all different levels involved in enforcement being co-located with one individual to oversee the service. There would also be closer working with partners, especially the Police. The Panel noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was looking at the development of joined up enforcement.
- The borough's Cycling Conference had been successful with over 140 people attending and the event attracting sponsorship from a number of sources.
- In respect of traffic management, the borough wide 20 MPH speed limit was due to be implemented from February onwards. In addition, a number of traffic schemes were scheduled to be completed by the end of this tax year, including Cross Safe and work to North Hill in Highgate. In addition, three traffic reviews were planned. These were in Tottenham, Green Lanes and West Green. The aim of these was to address any anomalies and tidy up current lay outs. He was happy to come along to a future meeting to report on these.

Councillor Berryman raised issues relating to the availability of facilities at Park Road pools and it was agreed that a meeting would be arranged between him and the Cabinet Member at the venue to discuss them.

In answer to a question regarding broken bicycles being left attached to cycle stands, he stated that he was happy to address this issue. Work to de-clutter streets was planned and any such bicycles could be removed as part of this process. Cycling on pavements was discouraged but there were some areas of pavement where there was dual use. However, he was in favour of demarcation and was not convinced that dual use was desirable.

### **AGREED:**

1. That the issue of ensuring that landlords fulfil their waste and recycling responsibilities and, in particular, the role on licensing within this be referred to a future meeting of the Panel; and
2. That the issue of the removal of broken bicycles left in cycle parking facilities be referred by the Cabinet Members to appropriate officers in the Environment and Community Safety service for response.

### **CSP18. REDUCING WASTE**

The Panel received a presentation on reducing waste from Tom Hemming, the Waste Strategy Manger in Environment and Community Safety. It was noted that there were significant costs arising from the collection and disposal of waste, which increased the financial pressures on the Council. Waste also impacted on the environment, created carbon and used up natural resources.

## **MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL TUESDAY, 13 OCTOBER 2015**

Efforts were therefore being made to reduce waste. This was being done in a number of ways:

- Reducing the amount of waste that was produced by seeking to change behaviour;
- 'Residual squeeze' ; Maximising recycling by limiting residual waste capacity; and
- 'Polluter pays'; Ensuring that people paid for fly tipping and that businesses, landlords and householders were made fully aware of their responsibilities.

Preventative work was undertaken by the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) who had a renewable contract with the Council to carry this out. This work aimed to bring about behaviour change through, for example, encouraging residents to avoid food waste by reducing what they bought and by, where possible, composting. In addition, the Council had implemented a "residual squeeze" through providing weekly recycling collections but fortnightly ones for other waste.

Work was taking place to address the root causes of fly tipping. However, there had been changes to the enforcement powers of local authorities to deal with fly tipping as a consequence of de-regulation. The strategy for addressing fly tipping was currently being reviewed. Engagement was a key tool to bring about behaviour change as well as, where necessary, enforcement. A multi agency and cross community response was required to address the issue successfully.

In answer to a question, it was noted that there were considerable pressures on enforcement which was why measures were being taken to join up enforcement teams across the Council.

David Beadle, the Managing Director of NLWA, stated that waste prevention was dependent on how receptive individuals were to the message. In reference to communication with Councillors, it had been agreed with representatives of Councils on NLWA that they would act as the conduit for wider communication with Councillors. However, NLWA were happy to consider alternative ways that this could be done. Social media was heavily used by NLWA as a means of communication.

Panel Members raised the fact that there had been little preventative work undertaken by NLWA in Northumberland Park ward, which suffered high levels of deprivation and was felt could benefit from engagement work. It was also suggested that communication with local Councillors could be enhanced by direct e-mail and tweeting.

In response to a question, the Cabinet Member for Environment, stated that if it was clear who was responsible for fly tipping, the expectation was that enforcement would take place. It was important that the perception of risk was increased to discourage people. There were less staff and less money available to address fly tipping. There was a persistent minority of people who were fly tipping. Such behaviour needed to be seen as socially unacceptable. Unfortunately the Council's efficiency at removing fly tipped waste had inadvertently encouraged it. The current situation was not financially sustainable. Enforcement was the sole responsibility of the Council and there was wide support for it being used more widely. Timed collections would be rolled out this year in main roads and this was also integral to dealing with dumped rubbish. Food collection had been successfully introduced. He was reluctant to take food recycling facilities away if there was non compliance. Landlords needed to hold tenants to account and ensure that they were complying. If landlords were not fulfilling their responsibilities, this could be taken up with them. Joined up enforcement

## **MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL TUESDAY, 13 OCTOBER 2015**

would increase the capacity to deal with offenders as there would be more staff available to issue fixed penalty notices.

It was noted Newham had undertaken a programme of collecting detailed data on fly tips and incorporated it into their planning processes. In addition, they had changed their definition of fly tipping and now only counted tips that had been reported. Newham had previously had the highest number of tips in London but Haringey was now the highest. The view had been taken that it was better to be open and transparent in reporting and to bring the issue to the attention of residents.

It was also noted that contamination was a major problem with recycling. Veolia had undertaken outreach work in order to educate the public regarding this. Re-use of electrical equipment could be problematic but this was possible in some cases. In particular, traders could be attracted by re-conditioned equipment. It was preferable that any equipment went to local use rather than being put up for general sale.

Panel Members raised the issue of flexibility in refuse collections. There were some locations within the borough where it was difficult for residents to move their bins to and from where they were required to be placed for collection. It was noted that it was possible for a sack collection to be undertaken if necessary. Paul Peters, the Haringey Contract Manager from Veolia, reported that they would be happy to review arrangements for the locations in question and, if possible, exercise flexibility.

In response to a question, the Cabinet Member stated that he would be happy to report in detail on action that was being taken to address fly tipping. The key issue was addressing its causes. A number of issues were being looked at including bulk waste collection and people dumping without licences. He understood that people were angry about fly tipping. However, another round of budget cuts was to come and there would be less staff at the same time that fly tipping was getting worse. A properly joined up enforcement team would help address the issue. He was happy to support bespoke solutions where there were difficulties to moving bins.

### **AGREED:**

That NLWA be requested to consider;

- How local Councillors could be better informed about local preventative activities by NLWA; and
- Undertaking appropriate preventative activities in Northumberland Park ward.

### **CSP19. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF WASTE AND RECYCLING PARTS I AND II: UPDATE ON PROGRESS**

Antony Buchan (Head of Programme – Local Authority Support, Resource London) reported on the work of Resource London. It supported London boroughs in their efforts to achieve the targets set by the Mayor. Many of the issues that had been raised at the meeting on waste and recycling were also concerns of other boroughs. HMOs were a massive issue across London and work was being undertaken to address this with the aim of providing support to boroughs. Food waste reduction was another area where work was being undertaken. Resource London was the programme of the London Waste Recycling Board, which was a joint partnership between the Mayor and London Councils.

## **MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL TUESDAY, 13 OCTOBER 2015**

Mr Hemming reported that there was a target to achieve 40% recycling by 2016. Targets had been achieved to date but it would be challenging to achieve the percentage that remained. The Council had undertaken the same initiatives as other local authorities had to address the issue. However, not all people were using the service fully and behaviour change was required. All estates now had food waste recycling and re-useable sacks were provided to assist with this.

Pan London planning advice was being developed by Resource London so that there was a common policy in relation to housing developments. In addition, new ways to report fly tipping were being explored.

Increasing the level of participation through engagement and behaviour change was a priority. In addition, there needed to be the correct ratio between residual and recycling capacity as well as proper use of containers so that contamination was minimised.

The Cabinet Member commented that officers had worked hard to implement the recommendations of the review. In reference to recommendation 1, it was hoped to be able to hold housing providers more to account and address issues relating to this within planning conditions. There was a particular responsibility on providers to ensure that proper arrangements were in place to facilitate recycling.

### **CSP20. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE**

Councillor Wright, the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, reported on the findings of the in-depth work that the Committee had undertaken on events in Finsbury Park. They would be reported formally to the Committee on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> October. The Committee had considered a huge amount of evidence. A balance needed to be found between the need to minimise noise and disturbance and the need to generate income to maintain and improve parks. There was evidence that the management of events had improved. However, communication and engagement needed to be given higher priority. The financial benefits that the events brought warranted wider publicity so that the community was more aware of them. Residents could also be involved in helping to plan how the income was spent. It was important that any damage to the park was made good by promoters and the requirements for this needed to be more explicit. It was felt that the number of events that had taken place in the park during the summer in recent years was about right.

Panel Members commented that one future option could be to stage "boutique" festivals in the park in the future, which might generate greater levels of support amongst the community. It was suggested that a more proactive approach could be taken with promoters being sounded out in advance rather than merely waiting for the Council to be approached by those interested in staging events.

In respect of the review on cycling, it was suggested that the following be looked at as part of the review:

- Cycling pods;
- Safety and signage of existing routes;
- Funding issues;
- Equalities issues; and
- Regulation.

**MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL  
TUESDAY, 13 OCTOBER 2015**

It was also suggested that Panel Members undertake a cycle ride around key locations in the borough so that Members could observe the infrastructure at first hand.

**AGREED:**

That, subject to the above mentioned issues being incorporated, the draft scope and terms of reference for the review on cycling be approved.

**Clr Adam Jogee  
Chair**

**Signed .....**

**Date .....**