

NOTICE OF MEETING

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL

Tuesday, 5th November, 2019, 7.00 pm – Haringey Civic Centre

Members: Councillors Adam Jogee (Chair), Peray Ahmet, Barbara Blake, Eldridge Culverwell, Julie Davies, Scott Emery and Julia Ogiehor

Co-optees/Non-Voting Members: Ian Sygrave (Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches)

Quorum: 3

1. **FILMING AT MEETINGS**

Please note that this meeting may be filmed or recorded by the Council for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by anyone attending the meeting using any communication method. Although we ask members of the public recording, filming or reporting on the meeting not to include the public seating areas, members of the public attending the meeting should be aware that we cannot guarantee that they will not be filmed or recorded by others attending the meeting. Members of the public participating in the meeting (e.g. making deputations, asking questions, making oral protests) should be aware that they are likely to be filmed, recorded or reported on.

By entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings.

The chair of the meeting has the discretion to terminate or suspend filming or recording, if in his or her opinion continuation of the filming, recording or reporting would disrupt or prejudice the proceedings, infringe the rights of any individual or may lead to the breach of a legal obligation by the Council.

2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

3. **ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of urgent business (late items will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items will be dealt with as noted below).

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a prejudicial interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered:

- (i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, and
- (ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must withdraw from the meeting room.

A member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Register of Members' Interests or the subject of a pending notification must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.

Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal interests and prejudicial interests are defined at Paragraphs 5-7 and Appendix A of the Members' Code of Conduct

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

To consider any requests received in accordance with Part 4, Section B, Paragraph 29 of the Council's Constitution.

6. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 8)

To approve the minutes of the previous meeting on 3rd October.

7. COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP PRIORITIES AND CRIME PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW (PAGES 9 - 22)

8. UPDATE ON THE MERGING OF HARINGEY AND ENFIELD BCUS

Verbal update.

9. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES, SAFETY AND ENGAGEMENT

Verbal update

10. UPDATE ON SLAMMIN' MAJOR EVENTS 2019 AND FINSBURY PARK RECTIFICATION WORKS (PAGES 23 - 26)

11. LIVEABLE STREETS

Verbal update.

12. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE (PAGES 27 - 32)

13. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items admitted at item 3 above.

14. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

17th December

Philip Slawther, Principal Committee Co-ordinator
Tel – 020 8489 2957
Fax – 020 8881 5218
Email: philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

Bernie Ryan
Assistant Director – Corporate Governance and Monitoring Officer
River Park House, 225 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8HQ

Monday, 28 October 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF MEETING ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON THURSDAY, 3RD OCTOBER, 2019, 6.30 PM

PRESENT:

**Councillors: Adam Jogee (Chair), Peray Ahmet, Barbara Blake,
Eldridge Culverwell, Scott Emery, Julia Ogiehor**

ALSO ATTENDING: Ian Sygrave

1. 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'.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Davies and apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Ahmet.

3. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Culverwell advised the Panel that he was a member of the Friends of Finsbury Park.

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

6. MINUTES

The Chair requested that the minutes refer to the name of the Cabinet Member as well as their title. **(Action: Clerk).**

In response to the previous action around an update on additional police resources, officers advised that this equated to 10-15 new police officers a month but that they were unsure of the breakdown of the Mayor's uplift versus the recent announcement

by the Government. Officers would provide a further update to the Panel via email. **(Action: Eubert Malcolm).**

The Clerk advised the Panel that in relation to the previous action around community conversations on youth violence and engagement with the Kurdish community, the Cabinet Member (Cllr Blake) had advised that that he had met with representatives from the Kurdish community to discuss their concerns. There were six community conversations held between March 2019 and September 2019. The community conversations were facilitated through a panel discussion, including Cabinet Members, senior officers and the police. Approximately 250 individuals were in attendance across all six events. The community conversations would continue and a communications plan was being developed.

The Clerk also advised the Panel that Cllr M. Blake was due to attend the next schools forum to raise this issue of what could be done to link up with schools around youth services. This was also something that was raised at a recent workshop attended by the Cabinet Member on reducing the numbers of young people entering the youth justice system.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting on 11th June be agreed as a correct record.

7. CABINET MEMBER Q&A - CABINET MEMBER FOR NEIGHBOURHOODS:

The Chair advised that he was going to take the Cabinet Member Q&A session before the Veolia performance update. *The minutes reflect the order in which the items were considered, rather than the order on the published agenda*.

The Panel received a verbal update from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Cllr Chandwani on her portfolio area. The Cabinet Member thanked the Panel members for their support and their involvement with evidence gathering for the implementation of dedicated disabled bays and the Blue Badges report. It was noted that phase two of the project was to be developed. The Cabinet Member also gave a brief update around the Wall of Shame scheme to educate and deter would be fly-tippers. The Cabinet Member advised that the response to the scheme so far had been overwhelmingly positive, and there had been a good number of hits generated. In response to a question, the Panel were advised that there had been over 140 FPNs issued for flytipping in the quarter from July to September 2019. The Cabinet Member also provided an introduction on the implementation of the new Parking Management IT System and the service improvements that were expected as a result of the improvements in both front and back office parking services.

The following was noted in discussion of this agenda item:

- a. The Chair sought clarification around the upcoming review of green waste charges, in response it was noted that the review would take place over the winter period once the busy autumn period had finished and that it would look at the level of charges as well any possible shortfall in the income target. The Panel was also advised that HfH were in the process of having a fresh rollout

- of their own bulky waste collection service on estates, with an accompanying communications campaign.
- b. In response to concerns around the flow of traffic and parking availability arising from the liveable streets project in Crouch End, the Cabinet Member advised that this area was the responsibility of Cllr Hearn. It was also noted that this was a rapidly developing policy area and that there was a lot of learning to be done across London.
 - c. In response to the new flytipping campaign, the Cabinet Member set out that overall a much tougher approach had been adopted with the communication messages and through adopting the Wall of Shame scheme. The Chair enquired whether it was possible to share some of the videos and communications messages with Councillors in order for them to be shared more widely. The Cabinet Member agreed to consider this. **(Action: Cllr Chandwani)**.
 - d. In response to concerns around offensive graffiti, the Cabinet Member advised that under the Veolia Contract, Veolia would remove this within 24 hours. The Cabinet Member suggested that the easiest and quickest way of reporting graffiti was through the app.
 - e. The Panel also raised concerns about dumped rubbish on Parkland Walk and a concern that some of the neighbouring properties were responsible. In response, the Cabinet Member acknowledged these concerns and advised that this would fall under the responsibility of parks rather than Veolia. The Panel were advised that officers were looking at the issue of dumped rubbish in open spaces and were looking at how to ensure that there was a consistent response for residential locations and open spaces.
 - f. In response to a question around Liveable Streets and whether a two week road closure was long enough, officers advised that all things considered this should be long enough and that, while it might be longer in an ideal world, there was always a balance to be struck and they had to consider the wider impact on road users.
 - g. The Panel requested that Liveable Streets be included on the next agenda and Cllr Hearn be invited to discuss this. **(Action: Clerk)**.
 - h. The Panel sought further information around the review of green waste charges and whether this would include an examination of the anticipated £200k income shortfall. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that the shortfall was a predicted figure but that the service was based upon seasonal demand. The review would be undertaken in the winter, following the peak summer and autumn period, an accurate assessment of the income level could not be given until then.
 - i. In response to concerns about a failure to meet recycling targets, the Panel was advised that some of the reasons for this were to do with national changes to the level of contamination accepted in recycled waste. The Cabinet Member conceded that they needed to better communicate with residents on how to prevent contamination. The Cabinet Member also advised that recycling performance also had to be seen within the context of significant funding reductions for the service. The Cabinet Member also advised that part of the conversation nationally should be focused around reusable products and reducing single use plastics, rather than just recycling.
 - j. The Panel sought comments of whether the NLWA processed a narrower range of waste items than some other authorities. In response, the Cabinet

Member acknowledged that this was the case and advised that this was largely due to the use of a 20 year old incinerator that could not be used for certain products. It was noted that the NLWA were looking to commission a state of the art incinerator to rectify this.

- k. In response to a question, the Panel were advised that the service had trialled a litter enforcement project and the use of on the spot fines. Following the end of the trial, the service was in the process of bringing a similar service back in house. In response to concerns around dog fouling, the Panel was advised that the introduction of an in house litter enforcement service would increase the level of staff available to deal with a range of issues, including dog fouling.
- l. In relation to the new Parking IT system, the Cabinet Member advised that she would be speaking to Members to engage with them around key areas and future functionality improvements such, as ANPR technology.
- m. In response to concerns about safeguards and ensuring that the Wall of Shame did not encourage vigilantism, the Panel were advised that legal advice had been sought before implementing this scheme. Furthermore, no problems had been reported from similar schemes in Barking and Dagenham or Newham. The Panel noted that it was only the second week of the scheme but that the feedback had been overwhelmingly positive and residents had welcomed the increased deterrent. It was anticipated that the scheme would create an additional risk factor for would be fly-tippers through the targeted locating of cameras in hotspot locations. The ultimate aim was to engender behaviour change but in order to this it was necessary to create a credible risk.

RESOLVED

The Panel noted the verbal update provided by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods.

8. VEOLIA PERFORMANCE - WASTE AND STREET CLEANSING UPDATE.

The Panel received a report which set out current performance on waste and recycling. The report also set out progress against Borough Plan commitments for waste and street cleansing such as fly-tipping, as well as the reduction, reuse and recycling of products. The report was introduced by Zoe Robertson, Head of Commissioning and Client Services as set out in the agenda pack. The following was noted in response to the discussion of the report.

- a. In response to a question, the Panel was advised that the number of fly-tips had reduced by around 2000 from the year before. The performance scorecard included in the report was made up of a number of contractual performance indicators and the Panel noted that overall Veolia was meeting these targets. The recycling rate was the key performance indicator that was underperforming. Officers advised that the Mayor's waste plan was scheduled to come to November Cabinet.
- b. In response to a question, officers confirmed that the Veolia contract contained provision for leaf clearance and that this was undertaken as part of street cleansing operations. Officers advised that due to the mix of trees, it was not possible to plan leaf collections around specific tree species. In response to a follow up question, officers advised that Veolia did sweep fallen leaves from

- around drains but would not pump the drains to clear leaves that had fallen in there.
- c. In response to concerns about the level of engagement with residents groups, officers acknowledged that there was active engagement work undertaken with the community and that this proved to be a valuable source of local information as well as providing a targeted service that produced value for money. Officers conceded that there was further scope for additional engagement work and that they would like to see more of this undertaken. In response, a Panel member highlighted that reductions had been made in recent years in Veolia's community engagement team. The Cabinet Member acknowledged this and emphasised that a number of very difficult decisions had been made in recent years in relation to both the client and the contract. The Cabinet Member advised that she was happy to consider recommendations from Members of active residents' groups within the borough who could be engaged with going forwards. **(Action: Panel Members to note).**
 - d. In response to a question, officers advised that they also had performance data at a ward and, in some cases, a street level. However, the indicators included in the report were contractual performance measures and therefore represented borough-wide performance. The Chair of the Panel and the Chair of OSC agreed to speak with the Cabinet Member and officers to pick up which ward level data they would like to pick up going forwards **(Chair/Cllr Das Neves).**
 - e. In response to a question about measuring waste, it was confirmed that waste was measured and broken down into categories such as dry recycling, green waste, food waste etcetera. The overall volume of waste had not decreased, however the amount of recyclable waste was on a downward trajectory.
 - f. In response to a question about waste from businesses and commercial premises, officers advised that the figures presented in the report related to household waste only and that commercial waste was monitored separately. Commercial premises were required to have a commercial waste contract in place and there were a number of different providers in Haringey (including Veolia). Officers agreed to circulate figures on the amount of residential vs trade waste generated. **(Action: Zoe Robertson).**
 - g. Officers also agreed to circulate the outcomes from the Team Noel Park pilot scheme along with an accompanying briefing note to the Panel. **(Cllr Chandwani/Zoe Robertson).**
 - h. In response to a question around food waste in flats above shops, officers confirmed that collection of food waste was not currently available due to a lack of space to store the food waste bins at these type of premises.

RESOLVED

That the Panel noted performance to date and comments on progress against Borough Plan objectives.

9. PARKING UPDATE - PARKING TRANSFORMATION PLAN AND REPORTS TO CABINET.

The Panel received two reports which provided an update on the Parking Transformation Programme as well as an update on parking related reports that were

scheduled be considered by Cabinet over September and October: The Parking Management IT System (PMIS) and Civica extension; Blue Badge and Disabled Bay Operational Review; and the Nuisance Vehicle Contract. The two reports were introduced by Ann Cunningham, Head of Operations for Neighbourhoods and Environment. The following was noted in discussion of this agenda item:

- a. The Cabinet Member advised the Panel that many of projects listed under the Parking Transformation Plan were at a fairly embryonic stage and that she would welcome the Panel's input. The Chair requested that the Parking Transformation Plan come back to the next meeting for a further discussion on these proposals and how the Panel might get involved.
- b. In response to a question, officers confirmed that parking revenue income was due to increase over the next three year period and that this was largely as a result of an expansion of Controlled Parking Zones and the introduction of a number of moving parking controls. Officers set out that an extension of the existing CPZ network was only done in response to support from local residents and that there was a 2 year waiting list due to the demand. CPZ coverage of the Borough was at around 80%.
- c. In response to a question, the Panel was advised that parking restrictions were enforced from 8am to 10pm and as part of the Parking Transformation Plan, officers were looking at extending this to 24 hour controls in and around Wood Green, in response to the growing demand on parking spaces from the night time economy.
- d. The Panel welcomed the additional investment in to parking controls and made a plea for a strategic approach to be adopted in response to CPZs. Officers acknowledged this and advised that this was one of the main reasons for examining the policy, in order to adopt a strategic approach and formalise some of the policies and learning that had been adopted.
- e. The Panel raised concerns about the potential impact of CPZs and the knock-on effect it could have on parking in neighbouring roads that were not part of a CPZ.
- f. In response to comments about abandoned cars and a perception that cars were not being taken away even after being reported, officers advised there were a series of checks and criteria that had to be met before a car could be removed. Officers set out that in a number of cases, following further investigation, vehicles were found not to be abandoned and could, for example, just have been sat there for a couple of weeks.
- g. The Cabinet Member agreed to send round a short briefing that she had drafted previously around abandoned vehicles. **(Action: Cllr Chandwani)**.
- h. In response to further questions, the Cabinet Member commented that Ward Councillors could instigate a local petition to have a CPZ installed and agreed to circulate a briefing on how this process worked to the Panel. **(Action: Cllr Chandwani)**.
- i. In response to a request for additional traffic calming measures, the Panel was advised that this was a strategic transport issue and fell within Cllr Hearn's portfolio. The Cabinet Member agreed to circulate a breakdown of the respective portfolios of the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and the Cabinet Member for Climate Change & Sustainability. **(Action: Cllr Chandwani)**.

RESOLVED

That the Panel noted the updates provided in respect of the Parking Transformation Plan and the parking related Cabinet reports.

10. PARKS UPDATE

The Panel received a verbal update from Simon Farrow, Highways, Parking, Parks & Open Spaces Manager around parks and street tree maintenance. The following was noted in discussion of this agenda item:

- a. In response to concerns raised by the Chair prior to the meeting, the Highways, Parking, Parks & Open Spaces Manager advised that parks security was dealt with by controlling access through using different gates and access points at different time of the year. The Panel noted that the Parks team were working with Community Safety to put in place more robust gates and locks to parks and open spaces and to remove some of the access points that were no longer required. Officers elaborated that they were also exploring a new type of digital lock used by the Fire Brigade which only allowed one person to have the key at any time.
- b. In response to a recent incidences, officers advise that the travellers who used Haringey's parks tended to do so seasonally and tended not to be using them for commercial activities. As a result, the level of dumping and rubbish was limited. The Panel was advised that the families that tended to use Haringey parks tended towards relatively short stays. Officers worked proactively worked with them to collect rubbish and install temporary toilets were necessary, as well arrange visits by social workers if required.
- c. The Chair suggested that he had received some complaints from residents that there were some commercial activities taking place in Priory Park. Officers requested that any evidence of this be forwarded on to them and that they would investigate and take the necessary actions. **(Members to note)**.
- d. The Panel was advised that in general, the police had more powers than the Council to remove travellers. If there was more than 6 vehicles, police colleagues could move them on in 24 hours. However, if there were less than 6 vehicles, the Council had to secure a Court Order, which invariably took a bit of time.
- e. The Panel commented that there had been a previous Scrutiny Review undertaken by the Panel around this issue and one of the recommendations raised was around securing borough-wide Court Orders, which had been used by other boroughs including Enfield. The Panel sought clarification as to whether any progress had been made on this issue since it was first identified some time ago. The Clerk to chase the AD for Stronger Communities for an update. **(Action: Clerk)**.
- f. The Panel was advised that although there was a budget for the maintenance of street trees, the reality was that the level of resources available was not sufficient to undertake the entire planned schedule for this year. Instead, officers were prioritising cases of dying or damaged trees or where an insurance claim had been made. Officers advised that they were in the process of putting in a bid for additional funding.

- g. In response to a question about staffing levels, the Panel were advised the team would, as of the following week, be up to its full complement of four permanent staff members, following a period of using some agency cover.
- h. The Panel requested a briefing around the tree maintenance programme which included further details of the growth bid. The briefing to also include a ward level breakdown of scheduled tree plantings. **(Action: Simon Farrow)**.
- i. In response to a question, officers advised that there was no capital provision for street tree planting, however the Council was on target to meet its target of 250 trees planted this year. In addition, officers advised that the Council had made a bid to the government to fund an additional 250 trees and a similar bid to the GLA. This would increase the number of trees planted to 750 a year.
- j. The Panel noted with concern that nine wards in the Borough had less than 20% street tree coverage and eight of those wards were in the east of the Borough.

RESOLVED

The verbal update was noted.

11. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

RESOLVED

- I. That the Panel noted its work programme, attached at Appendix A, and considered whether any amendments are required.
- II. That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be asked to endorse any amendments at its next meeting.

12. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

13. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

November 5th
17th December

CHAIR: Councillor Adam Jogee

Signed by Chair

Date

Report for: Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel Nov 2019

Title: Haringey Crime Performance Overview Nov 2019

Report

authorised by : Eubert Malcolm, Assistant Director for Stronger Communities

Lead Officer: Sandeep Broca, Intelligence Analysis Manager

Ward(s) affected: Key crime wards

Report for Key/

Non Key Decision: Non key-decision

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 This report should be read in conjunction with the presentation attached as Appendix A. The presentation shows Haringey's performance against the Mayor's (MOPAC) Police and Crime Plan (PCP) key priorities, including knife crime and firearms discharges.
- 1.2 The presentation outlines areas of concern and/or where performance is out of kilter with the London average. Other areas covered are critical locations and emerging problems. Officers will share mitigation ideas and key points at the Scrutiny Panel meeting.
- 1.3 Members should observe that Haringey is performing well in relation to overall non-domestic violence with injury, knife injury victims and firearms discharges. The borough is, however, performing less well in recorded levels of robbery offences. Overall crime in Haringey has increased by 2.7% in the past year, which is less than the London-wide increase of 8.3%.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

- 2.1 I am pleased to note that the partnership work that has taken place over the past year has continued to have a positive contribution to some of the key priority crime types, particularly knife injuries and overall non-domestic violence with injury. There are still a number of key areas, however, that are challenging for the borough and will require us to continue to work together to tackle, particularly around community confidence and satisfaction.
- 2.2 I look forward to sharing my thoughts and priorities with the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel and working with all partners to build on our good work and to address the challenges going forward. I also look forward to hearing from policing colleagues on their suggestions for approaches we can take to reduce risk and harm, particularly for the most vulnerable members of our community.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 That the Panel note the content of the Crime Performance Statistics pack, which highlights areas of positive performance, but also, challenging areas.

4. Reasons for decision

n/a

5. Alternative options considered

n/a

6. Background information

- 6.1 Haringey has a signed agreement with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime to contribute to tackling the Mayor's priority crimes. The agreement is accompanied by a grant of £518K for 2018/19, £553K for 2019/20 and £553K for 2020/21. This is allocated across five areas: Drug treatment intervention to reduce reoffending; Integrated Offender Management; an integrated Gang Exit Programme; Advocacy and support to victims of domestic violence; Cross-borough support to ASB victims and witnesses (Haringey and Enfield).

- 6.2 The London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) was established in 2013, bringing together a number of funding streams that had existed before MOPAC was set up. The fund ran from 2013/14 to 2016/17 in line with the Police and Crime Plan. These arrangements ended in March 2017.

- 6.3 In 2016, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime made a commitment to sustain the LCPF budget at £72m for a further four years (2017/18 to 2020/21), despite cuts to the overall policing budget. It was outlined in that decision that the fund would be split between direct borough funding and the co-commissioning fund, with direct funding allocated by a need and demand formula.

- 6.4 Quarterly returns are required which give considerable detail about our expenditure and performance to date. Haringey has an excellent reputation for compliance on both fronts.

- 6.5 Performance monitoring occurs in between Community Safety Partnership board meetings and attendance includes the holders of KPIs, the budget holders and statutory partners such as the police.

7. Contribution to strategic outcomes

- 7.1 This work contributes to the Mayor of London's Policing and Crime Strategy, Haringey's Corporate Plan priority 3 and the Haringey Community Safety Strategy. It will also help to shape Haringey's Borough Plan, Young People at Risk strategy, as well as the Violent Crime Action Plan and the refreshed Community Safety Strategy.

7.2 Officers and partners work strategically across related work areas and boards such as Youth Offending, Safeguarding Children and Adults, Health and Wellbeing, Tottenham Regeneration, Early Help and the Community Strategy.

8. **Statutory Officers comments (Chief Finance Officer (including procurement), Assistant Director of Corporate Governance, Equalities)**
n/a

Finance and Procurement

The uplifted funding may provide additional opportunities to enhance existing workstreams, as well as pursuing new opportunities. Quarterly returns are required which give considerable detail about our expenditure and performance to date. Haringey has an excellent reputation for compliance on both fronts.

Legal

n/a

Equality

There is an inherent impact on equalities of much of our community safety work and this is presented and discussed at the Community Safety Partnership meetings. This includes the peak age of offending being between 16 and 24; a very high percentage of young black males (mostly of African-Caribbean origin) involved in gangs (approx. 80%); the impact of domestic and sexual violence on women and girls; high concentrations of crime occurring in areas of deprivation; and vulnerable individuals and communities becoming victims of hate crime.

This report considers the areas of challenge in direct correlation with the impact on victims, especially vulnerable victims. In this respect, significant attention is being given to the disproportionate impact.

9. **Use of Appendices**

1x Appendix A – Haringey Crime Performance Overview pack

10. **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

This page is intentionally left blank

Haringey Crime Performance Overview

November 2019

Sources:

Except where noted, all data from Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) Website and MPS AWARE System, [haringey.gov.uk](https://www.haringey.gov.uk) and covers the 12-month period to October 2019.

Performance Overview

- The Mayor's Police and Crime Plan (2017-2021) has outlined key priorities for Haringey:

Mandatory High Harm Crimes:

- Sexual Violence
- Domestic Abuse
- Child Sexual Exploitation
- Weapon-Based Crime
- Hate Crime

Mandatory Volume Crime:

- Anti-Social Behaviour

Local Priorities:

- Robbery
- Non-Domestic Violence with Injury (VWI)


- Key focus on Violence, Vulnerability and Exploitation, whilst balancing response to volume crime
- Ranking tables show Haringey in the London context (No.1 indicates best performing borough)

Total Notifiable Offences

Borough	TNO	London Rank	Volume
Wandsworth	-1.3%	1	25468
Brent	0.2%	2	30052
Lambeth	1.0%	3	34943
Newham	1.1%	4	35488
Richmond upon Thames	1.2%	5	12802
Havering	1.3%	6	18718
Islington	1.3%	7	29209
Redbridge	2.0%	8	23668
Haringey	2.7%	9	31379
Hammersmith and Fulham	2.8%	10	22334
Tower Hamlets	4.5%	11	33658
Waltham Forest	4.8%	12	24094
Camden	5.0%	13	38252
Hounslow	6.3%	14	26669
Barking and Dagenham	6.4%	15	19041
Merton	6.5%	16	14505
Bromley	6.8%	17	24281
Hillingdon	7.6%	18	29328
Kingston upon Thames	7.7%	19	12655
Croydon	7.8%	20	32294
Enfield	8.5%	21	29205
Ealing	8.8%	22	30323
Kensington and Chelsea	9.6%	23	23181
Greenwich	10.6%	24	27597
Southwark	10.7%	25	38507
Barnet	12.7%	26	30409
Sutton	12.7%	27	13426
Hackney	13.1%	28	34052
Lewisham	13.1%	29	28425
Bexley	17.3%	30	17380
Harrow	17.3%	31	16535
Westminster	32.0%	32	77807
London Total	8.3%		885685

Overall recorded crime in Haringey has increased by **2.7%** in the 12 months to October 2019, which is better than the London wide average increase of 8.3%.

The main hotspots are located around Wood Green High Road and around the A10 corridor, from Bruce Grove to Seven Sisters.




Sexual Offences

Borough	Sexual Offences	London Rank	Volume
Barnet	-12.1%	1	492
Kingston upon Thames	-10.9%	2	261
Haringey	-10.6%	3	626
Kensington and Chelsea	-9.4%	4	346
Southwark	-9.4%	5	769
Hillingdon	-7.9%	6	511
Lambeth	-7.1%	7	859
Newham	-7.1%	8	771
Tower Hamlets	-5.3%	9	665
Brent	-5.0%	10	629
Camden	-4.9%	11	584
Hackney	-4.6%	12	704
Barking and Dagenham	-4.0%	13	474
Wandsworth	-3.0%	14	654
Redbridge	-1.6%	15	480
Richmond upon Thames	-1.5%	16	256
Westminster	-1.4%	17	969
Sutton	-1.4%	18	282
Bexley	-1.1%	19	356
Waltham Forest	-0.6%	20	508
Lewisham	-0.2%	21	644
Greenwich	1.6%	22	653
Hounslow	2.0%	23	551
Hammersmith and Fulham	2.3%	24	409
Merton	3.2%	25	358
Ealing	3.2%	26	637
Bromley	4.5%	27	561
Enfield	5.3%	28	601
Havering	5.6%	29	436
Croydon	5.6%	30	888
Islington	10.9%	31	611
Harrow	11.8%	32	322
London Total	-2.1%		17867

Overall sexual offences in Haringey have decreased by **10.6%** in the 12 months to October 2019, compared to a London wide average reduction of 2.1%.

44% of sexual offences in Haringey are categorised in the most serious category of rape, which is slightly above the London wide average of 40%.

Offences are spread across entire borough, with more clustering towards the East.



Non-Domestic Abuse Violence With Injury **Haringey**




Borough	Non-Domestic Abuse VWI	London Rank	Volume
Havering	-12.8%	1	1158
Camden	-11.8%	2	1792
Richmond upon Thames	-10.0%	3	602
Haringey	-9.8%	4	1860
Waltham Forest	-6.0%	5	1378
Islington	-4.0%	6	1702
Lambeth	-3.3%	7	2520
Wandsworth	-2.5%	8	1621
Brent	-2.4%	9	2182
Barking and Dagenham	-2.4%	10	1281
Hounslow	-1.0%	11	1615
Newham	-0.9%	12	2173
Southwark	-0.6%	13	2273
Ealing	-0.6%	14	2017
Croydon	1.0%	15	2235
Hillingdon	1.2%	16	1797
Greenwich	1.8%	17	1851
Kingston upon Thames	1.9%	18	872
Hammersmith and Fulham	2.5%	19	1388
Tower Hamlets	2.8%	20	2052
Bromley	3.6%	21	1429
Redbridge	4.0%	22	1503
Barnet	4.0%	23	1472
Merton	4.7%	24	891
Harrow	5.3%	25	989
Enfield	6.2%	26	1703
Kensington and Chelsea	6.7%	27	1077
Hackney	7.3%	28	2258
Lewisham	8.9%	29	2003
Sutton	10.7%	30	938
Westminster	12.1%	31	3274
Bexley	16.8%	32	1203
London Total	0.8%		53109

■ Non-domestic VWI offences have decreased in Haringey by **9.8%**, compared to a London-wide increase of 0.8%.

■ A significant proportion of incidents occur in busy locations, such as shopping centres, transport hubs and key thoroughfares.


■ Some incidents are also linked to retail/night time economy related issues, including when individuals have been refused entry to shops or bars/pubs and subsequently attacking staff/security.



Personal Robbery

Borough	Personal Robbery	London Rank	Volume
Waltham Forest	-18.7%	1	762
Lambeth	-17.3%	2	1156
Bromley	-15.9%	3	361
Sutton	-14.8%	4	248
Islington	-14.7%	5	1349
Tower Hamlets	-12.1%	6	1274
Brent	-10.7%	7	1246
Camden	-9.6%	8	1636
Newham	-7.7%	9	1689
Wandsworth	-7.6%	10	728
Croydon	-3.4%	11	987
Redbridge	1.1%	12	927
Bexley	7.3%	13	294
Hammersmith and Fulham	9.2%	14	757
Merton	10.8%	15	360
Havering	14.9%	16	657
Kensington and Chelsea	19.3%	17	774
Barking and Dagenham	23.8%	18	977
Lewisham	23.9%	19	1121
Enfield	24.7%	20	1372
Haringey	26.1%	21	2171
Greenwich	26.5%	22	715
Southwark	32.5%	23	2164
Hounslow	33.8%	24	745
Ealing	35.2%	25	1122
Kingston upon Thames	41.4%	26	287
Hackney	42.4%	27	1888
Hillingdon	42.5%	28	694
Barnet	44.9%	29	990
Richmond upon Thames	57.3%	30	431
Westminster	57.4%	31	4073
Harrow	86.2%	32	512
London Total	13.8%		34467


- Personal robbery has increased in Haringey, by **26%**. Almost 2,200 offences a year take place. London wide offending has also worsened, experiencing an increase of 14%. North London in particular has seen large increases in robbery,
- Mobile phones continue to be the most commonly stolen items during robberies, as well as cash and jewellery.



Knife Injury Victims

Borough	Knife Injury Victims	London Rank	Volume
Tower Hamlets	-48.4%	1	129
Harrow	-34.4%	2	59
Bromley	-29.1%	3	61
Hillingdon	-25.4%	4	106
Brent	-25.2%	5	160
Lambeth	-23.8%	6	183
Waltham Forest	-23.2%	7	126
Sutton	-22.9%	8	37
Havering	-22.2%	9	77
Greenwich	-20.2%	10	142
Southwark	-17.6%	11	202
Newham	-15.8%	12	176
Bexley	-13.0%	13	47
Barking and Dagenham	-11.7%	14	91
Enfield	-11.2%	15	158
Camden	-10.8%	16	141
Croydon	-10.5%	17	153
Islington	-5.8%	18	145
Redbridge	-5.2%	19	110
Ealing	-4.9%	20	156
Haringey	-4.9%	21	176
Lewisham	-4.5%	22	169
Kingston upon Thames	-2.7%	23	36
Wandsworth	0.0%	24	121
Hounslow	1.8%	25	116
Barnet	2.7%	26	116
Westminster	3.9%	27	188
Richmond upon Thames	11.8%	28	38
Hackney	13.1%	29	190
Hammersmith and Fulham	20.7%	30	111
Merton	30.4%	31	73
Kensington and Chelsea	39.5%	32	113
London Total	-11.7%		3906

- The volume of overall knife injuries has reduced by **4.9%** in Haringey, compared to a 11.7% London-wide reduction.
- However, serious incidents still occur, which often lead to serious and life-changing injuries.**
- Key locations are Wood Green High Street, Turnpike Lane and Bruce Grove
- Hotspots have continued to shift, following targeted partnership work in long standing high volume locations.




Lethal Barrelled Firearm Discharges

Borough	Lethal Barrelled Firearm Discharges	London Rank	Volume
Sutton	-100.0%	1	0
Kingston upon Thames	-100.0%	2	0
Kensington and Chelsea	-100.0%	3	0
Croydon	-92.3%	4	1
Newham	-66.7%	5	11
Bexley	-66.7%	6	3
Havering	-60.0%	7	2
Harrow	-58.3%	8	5
Greenwich	-46.2%	9	7
Barking and Dagenham	-44.4%	10	5
Waltham Forest	-36.0%	11	16
Tower Hamlets	-33.3%	12	8
Southwark	-28.6%	13	15
Haringey	-18.4%	14	31
Islington	-18.2%	15	9
Brent	-12.0%	16	22
Hackney	-10.7%	17	25
Lambeth	-2.2%	18	44
Richmond upon Thames	0.0%	19	1
Merton	0.0%	20	5
Lewisham	7.7%	21	14
Hillingdon	11.1%	22	10
Ealing	14.3%	23	8
Bromley	25.0%	24	5
Westminster	25.0%	25	10
Wandsworth	33.3%	26	8
Camden	50.0%	27	9
Enfield	100.0%	28	20
Barnet	150.0%	29	5
Hounslow	266.7%	30	11
Redbridge	300.0%	31	16
Hammersmith and Fulham	N/A	32	3
London Total	-15%		329

▪ Lethal barrelled firearm discharges in Haringey have decreased year on year by **18.4%**. London has decreased by 15% over this same period.

▪ This is a notable improvement from mid-2018, during which significantly higher volumes of firearms discharges occurred.

▪ Firearm related incidents mostly occur to the East of the borough, and show some correlation with known gang linked areas. Offences also demonstrate some geographical clustering.



Summary

- Several areas of positive performance
- Current MOPAC Police and Crime Plan priorities (Robbery and Non-DA VWI) continue to be high-volume and high risk
- Challenges include :
 - Responding to robbery and weapon enabled crime
 - Continuing to tackle vulnerability, exploitation and youth violence.

This page is intentionally left blank

Briefing Note

Title: Slammin' 2019 and Finsbury Park Rectification Works
For Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel – 5th November
From Sarah Jones, Events & Partnerships Manager

Introduction

- The Friends of Finsbury Park have raised concerns in an email to the Chair regarding issues arising from the Slammin' Events managed festivals that took place in Finsbury Park in September 2019.
- Concerns raised are around the high noise levels experienced, and damage to the park.
- For events to take place in Finsbury Park there are two very clear and separate processes for event organisers to follow in order to operate in the Park: park hire and the licensing of regulated activity.
- The Panel are asked to note that although this briefing paper provides an overview on the noise levels emitted from the events this year, and the reasons why this occurred, the noise levels are set and monitored through the licencing process and are therefore outside the purview of the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel. If the Friends of Finsbury Park or any other group or individual want to raise concerns around any aspect of the event licence, then they would need to do this through the formal licencing process.
- This briefing paper provides an overview on the music festivals – Hospitality & Abode - that took place over the weekend of the 21st and 22nd September 2019. And provide some background and answers to the points raised by the Friends.

Event Overview

Slammin' Events has hosted music festivals in Finsbury Park for the past five years. For two of those years (2017 & 2018) they have also hosted a two-day music festival in June, in addition to their September events.

The events are drum 'n' bass festivals, contained within the Bandstand Field area of Finsbury Park. The event space consists of 6/7 tents, with various DJs playing throughout the day. 12,500 tickets are sold for each event day.

There are two process involved in allowing the events to take place:

- **Park Hire:** This is overseen by the Outdoor Events Policy with the Council hiring a space within the park to the organiser to use to host their event. Through this process the Council have a duty to oversee the event activity, ensuring park users and residents are protected from any potential impacts that the event may bring to the area. It is also through this process that the plans are put in place to protect the park infrastructure as much as possible, from any damage caused by the event.
- **Premises Licence:** This is overseen by the Licensing Act 2013 and is a statutory process that oversees the provision of regulated activity including the selling of alcohol, the provision of live music etc. It is through this process that specific conditions are set within the Licence, that the Licence holder must operate within, including noise limits. There are currently three Premises Licences issued to promoters to offer licensable activity in Finsbury Park. These licences are independent of one another and specific to the relevant licence holder. They are not all subject to automatic changes to the conditions because one of the three licenses has been reviewed and changes made to that licence.

Briefing Note

2019 Noise Issues

The following information is provided for 'information purposes only' the issue relating to noise are a matter for the statutory Licensing process and fall under the remit of the Licensing Sub Committee. There is in place a formal Licensing Review Process and complaints about noise would be dealt with via this process.

The September events were held using the Slammin' Events Premises Licence. This was issued to Slammin' Events in 2015 and lasts until September 2025.

Noise levels set within the Licence vary according to the background levels and are set at residential sensitive receptor points. Sound levels from the events should not exceed the background level by more than 15dB when measured as a 15 minute LAeq.

The event organiser is responsible for monitoring and will employ an independent noise consultancy contractor who has experience with providing noise management for music festivals. Council noise officers are also on hand to monitor noise levels at complainants' properties.

In previous years the Slammin' managed event have receive a maximum of 15 complaints in total, across the two days.

This year, the level of complaints was unprecedented for this event, and included:

- 44 complaints made to the advertised complaints line, based onsite during the two days of the event -
 - 6 on Saturday
 - 38 on Sunday
- 73 complaints made directly to the Council

As the large number of complaints started to be received on Sunday, discussions took place between the onsite noise engineer and Licensing Officer to see what could be done to reduce the bass, as this appeared to be the main source of the complaints. Two of the dance tents had the bass reduced and subsequently stopped earlier than intended. The sound engineer explained that the pattern of complaints shifted as was expected due to the wind shift. This meant that Rowley Gardens became the most critical location.

With Sunday's wind shift complaints were anticipated from the N/NE of the site which was largely what happened due to the direction of the wind. Interestingly there were a number of complaints that were in excess of 1km, some 3km+ from the venue on Sunday.

Whilst events on Sundays can always be expected to generate more complaint for a variety of reasons, the level of complaints was disappointing even though the noise levels set in the current premises licence were not breached at any time.

The number of complaints received could also have been exacerbated due to residents expecting the conditions under which this event operated, to be inline with those of the Live Nation Licence such as the finishing time on Sunday. For the Slammin' event this was 10pm, but for Live Nation it is 9.30pm.

Discussion have been had with the licence holder relating to the level of complaints received on the day, the possibility of reviewing the licence in order to update the background noise levels and introduce relevant bass monitoring conditions. The Noise Environment Health Officer – Responsible Authority has requested that the Premises Licence holder apply for a Variation to bring their Licence

Briefing Note

in line with that of Live Nation, and if they do not within the next three months, a consideration will be given to a Review by the Noise EHO – Responsible Authority.

Rectification Works

One of the main risks of allowing events to take place in an outdoor arena is the weather. Weather is the only thing that cannot be influenced or changed, although planning for all types of weather is a necessity when using a park.

Council officers work with the event organiser to ensure that appropriate ground protection is used, although if heavy rainfall happens during an event or during the build and break which impacts the ground conditions, it is highly likely some form of damage will occur.

London has experienced higher levels of rain since the end of September, than usually anticipated.

Rain fell overnight of the 21/22 September. Although this didn't have a significant affect on the ground for the event to take place on Sunday, it continued to rain heavily on the following Monday and all during the week the event infrastructure was being taken down and moved off site.

A planned programme of works has been commissioned, but because of the rainfall experienced throughout October, the ground on and around the Bandstand Field is far too saturated for restoration vehicles such as tractors to access without churning the ground even further.

Once the rain stops and we experience a few dry days for the sitting water to soak away, the contractor will commence ground works. These are expected to take approximately one week, and will involve the following:

- Harrowing: levelling the ground - flattening ruts, dips and depressions
- Verti-draining: decompaction of ground - letting in air and water out
- Top dressing: 300 tonnes of 70/30 mix of soil and sand
- Over seeding: using a deep rooted, hard-wearing seed variety
- Application of slow release fertiliser: to assist germination of seed and early growth
- Use of tractor with specialist implements

If the right conditions are experienced, it is anticipated that the works together with the increased time between major events, will allow for a deeper rooted and harder wearing sward to form so even when the grass coverage has been worn down by the increased footfall during the June/July events, the root has established enough to re-grow as soon as the rain starts to fall.

Risks which could affect the success of the planned works again come back to the weather: too wet, too soon after the seed has been sewn and there's a chance it could be washed away; to dry or too cold and the seed won't germinate.

The area where restoration works will take place will be tapped off to deter people traversing across the ground, with notices put up informing people of the works.

Future Proposals

The proposed Finsbury Park major event season for 2020 is currently out to stakeholder notification and they do not include any events in September 2020.

The proposals seek to reduce the number of events in the park and contain them all to within one concentrated, concerted period. This approach will reduce the level of income received but allow the park to generate enough income for its basic maintenance, enhanced staffing levels and a

Briefing Note

reasonable level of investment within the park each year. The future investments will focus on creating a safer park and responding to the investment priorities set as part of the recent public consultation about the park.

Event	Dates 2020	Daily capacity	Licence Holder / Organiser
Community Festival weekend	26 – 28 June (3 days)	45k	Live Nation / Festival Republic
Wireless Festival weekend	3 – 5 July (3 days)	45k	
TBC	10 OR 11 July (1 day)	45k	

New for 2020

- The major event season in Finsbury Park will be contained to a four-week period (inc build and break) during late June/ early July
- There will be no other 'major' music festivals taking place within Finsbury Park in 2020
- A reduction in the number of major events across the events season for 2020 will result in three weeks shorter occupancy period of build and break days in the park (2020: 24 / 2019: 44)
- Less chance of damage occurring to the grass and paths, and emissions from event vehicles cut by two thirds– one load in / one load out rather than three
- Focusing events into these four weeks will ensure public usage of the areas can increase and the grass condition can be improved to reduce the intensity and severity of any damage to the grass areas during events
- Removes events that take place in the wetter months and thus significantly reducing the potential for damage
- With Steel Yard not going ahead, the park would be free of events during the May half-term school holiday

Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel - Work Plan 2018-19

<p>1. Scrutiny review projects; These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all of these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.</p>		
Project	Comments	Priority
Supporting Better Access to Parking for Disabled People and Blue Badges	<p>The review will examine the barriers faced by disabled people in getting and using a blue badge. The review will also try to examine how they find accessing parking services and where could improvements be made to this service (that sit within the remit of the Council). In doing this it will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are residents’ experiences of accessing and using a Blue Badge; • How can the process of issuing Blue Badges and replacement Blue Badges be improved? What, if any, are the delays involved in the process? Is there scope for issuing temporary Blue Badges; • What do disability organisations say about our Blue Badge and disabled parking services? How accessible is our parking services interface; • How helpful is our written correspondence to residents around Blue Badges. 	
Reducing the amount of plastic/developing a plastic free policy.	<p>Examining the Council’s recycling performance around plastic waste and seeing what more could be done to reduce the use of plastics. What could the Council do to lead by example in this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine the Council’s current position in relation to plastic waste and what other boroughs are doing around this issue. In order to do this, the Panel will look at the Council’s current recycling policy in relation to different types of plastic. 	

Appendix 1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine how the Council could reduce plastic waste and increase its recycling performance, looking at innovative ideas from across the sector. • Examine how the Council could interact with the young people within our borough to positively change behaviour. What could be done to assist schools to reduce the amount of plastic waste? Is there scope for the Council to develop a plastic free pledge for schools to sign up to? • Examine the how the Council can develop a plastic-free policy and what other measures the Council could undertake to lead by example. 	
--	---	--

Date of meeting	Potential Items
13 th September 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Questions; Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel's terms of reference that are within that portfolio). • Membership & Terms of Reference. • Appointment of Non-Voting Co-opted Member. • Service Overview and Waste, recycling and street cleansing data. • Work Programme: To agree items for the work plan for the Panel for this year. • Review of Fear of Crime: Update on implementation of recommendations.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knife Crime and MOPAC performance Overview.
16 th October 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police Priorities in Haringey. Will include an update on Stop and Search and Lethal Firearm Discharges as requested by the Panel. • Financial Monitoring: To receive an update on the financial performance relating to Corporate Plan Priority 3. • Cabinet Member Q&A – Environment: To question the Cabinet Member for Environment on current issues and plans arising for her portfolio. • Waste, recycling and street cleansing data • Work Plan update – The Panel to agree its work plan for OSC to formally approve on 19th November.
<p>Budget Scrutiny</p> <p>18th December 2018</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Scrutiny. • Air Quality. • 18 month follow-up on the recommendations to the Scrutiny Review on Cycling. • Green flags. • Work Programme and scoping document for Scrutiny Review into plastic waste.
11 th March 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Flags in parks – An update on the red and amber ratings awarded in parks. Cllr Hearn to attend. • Update around the Gangs Matrix.

Appendix 1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing Criminalisation of Children. • Cabinet Member Q&A –Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio).
8 th April 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Waste charges, Fly-tipping strategy and bulky waste collection • Update on Parks Transformation • Parking issues - disabled bays and blue badges • Cabinet Member Q&A – Environment: To question the Cabinet Member for Environment on current issues and plans arising from her portfolio.

2019-2020

11 June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership & Terms of Reference. • Appointment of Non-Voting Co-opted Member. • Community Safety Strategy • Update on Youth at Risk Strategy • Work Programme
---------	---

Appendix 1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Questions; Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio).
3 rd October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Q&A –Neighbourhoods: To question the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods on current issues and plans arising for her portfolio. • Veolia Performance - Waste and Street Cleansing update. • Parks update including vehicle access and locking gates at night. • Update on the Parking Transformation Plan. • Update on Parking reports going to Cabinet. • Work Programme.
5 th November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Q&A –Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio). • Community Safety Partnership; To invite comments from the Panel on current performance issues and priorities for the borough’s Community Safety Partnership. To also include an update on statistics on hate crime. • SNT Policing model and the impact of the merging of Haringey and Enfield SNTs. • Liveable Streets • Update on Events in Finsbury Park – Adobe Festival & damage to the bandstand field.

Appendix 1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further update on implementation of Parking Action Plan
<p>17th December (Budget Scrutiny)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Scrutiny • Cabinet Member Q&A – Climate Change and Sustainability; To question the Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability on current issues and plans arising for her portfolio. • Single use Plastics.
<p>2nd March</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Q&A –Neighbourhoods: To question the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods on current issues and plans arising for her portfolio. • Waste, recycling and street cleansing data • Performance update – Q3 • Budget Monitoring Q3